



29 October 1998

A4-0376/98

## REPORT

on the Draft Council Resolution on guidelines and measures for the prevention of organised crime with reference to the establishment of a comprehensive strategy for combating it (9986/98 - C4-0494/98)

Committee on Civil Liberties and Internal Affairs

Rapporteur: Mrs Charlotte Cederschiöld

DOC\_ENRR\364364600

PE 228.550/fin.

- \* Consultation procedure  
simple majority
- \*\*I Cooperation procedure (first reading)  
simple majority
- \*\*II Cooperation procedure (second reading)  
simple majority to approve the common position  
majority of Parliament's component Members to reject or amend the common position
- \*\*III Assent procedure  
majority of Parliament's component Members to give assent  
but simple majority under Articles 8a, 105, 106, 130d and 228 EC

- \*\*IV Codecision procedure (first reading)  
simple majority
- \*\*V Codecision procedure (second reading)  
simple majority to approve the common position  
majority of Parliament's component Members to adopt a declaration of intended  
rejection of the common position, and amend the common position or confirm its rejection
- \*\*VI Codecision procedure (third reading)  
simple majority to approve the joint text  
majority of Parliament's component Members to reject the Council text

## CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Procedural page .....	3
A. MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION .....	4
B. EXPLANATORY STATEMENT .....	9

By letter of 29 July 1998 the President of the Council of European Union forwarded to the European Parliament a draft Council resolution on guidelines and measures for the prevention of organised crime with reference to the establishment of a comprehensive strategy for combating it (9986/98 - C4-0494/98).

At the sitting of 14 September 1998 the President of the European Parliament announced that he had referred this draft to the Committee on Civil Liberties and Internal Affairs as the committee responsible.

At the meeting of 2 September 1998 the Committee on Civil Liberties and Internal Affairs appointed Mrs Cederschiöld rapporteur.

It considered the draft report at its meetings of 12 October and 26 October 1998.

At the latter meeting it adopted the motion for a resolution unanimously.

The following took part in the vote. d'Ancona, chairman; Reding, vice-chairman; Cederschiöld, rapporteur, Berger (for Crawley), Bontempi, Chanterie (for De Esteban Martin), Colombo Svevo, Deprez, Elliott, Lindeperg, Mendes Bota, Nassauer, Oostlander (for Posselt), Pradier, Schaffner, Schmid, Sturdy (for Pirker pursuant to Rule 138(2)), Terrón i Cusí and Zimmermann.

The report was tabled on 29 October 1998.

The deadline for tabling amendments will be indicated in the draft agenda for the relevant part-session.

A  
MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

**Resolution on the Draft Council Resolution on guidelines and measures for the prevention of organised crime with reference to the establishment of a comprehensive strategy for combating it (9986/98 - C4-0494/98)**

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the Draft Council Resolution (9986/98 - C4-0494/98),
  - having regard to the action plan to combat organised crime (hereinafter: the action plan)<sup>(1)</sup>,
  - having regard to its resolution of 20 November 1997 on this action plan<sup>(2)</sup>,
  - having regard to Articles B, F, K.1, paragraphs 5 and 7 to 9, K.3(2), and K.6 of the EU Treaty currently in force,
  - having regard to Articles 2, 6, and 29 of the EU Treaty, as amended by the Treaty of Amsterdam, and notably Article 29 which stresses the responsibility of the European Union to prevent and combat organised crime and views this as a key precondition for the gradual establishment of an area of freedom, security and law,
  - having regard to its resolution of 24 January 1994<sup>(3)</sup> on small-scale crime in urban areas and its links with organised crime,
  - having regard to its resolution of 6 October 1998<sup>(4)</sup> on the communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on a Union policy against corruption,
  - having regard to the public hearing organised on 9 October 1997 by the Committee on Civil Liberties and Internal Affairs with representatives from LIBERA, the Italian anti-Mafia organisation,
  - having regard to the report of the Committee on Civil Liberties and Internal Affairs (A4-0376/98);
- A. whereas the Council has taken up the demand emphatically made by the European Parliament in its resolution of 20 November 1997 on the action plan that more attention should be paid to preventive aspects in combating organised crime and is now endeavouring to rectify this omission in the action plan,

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 251, 15.8.1997, p.1

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ C 371, 8.12.1997, p.165

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ C 20, 24.1.1994, p. 158

<sup>(4)</sup> Minutes of the sitting of 6 October 1998, p. 41

- B. whereas the Presidency of the Council has forwarded to the European Parliament the *draft Council resolution on guidelines and measures for the prevention of organised crime with reference to the establishment of a comprehensive strategy for combating it* (hereinafter: the draft),
- C. whereas owing to the many forms assumed by organised crime, counter-measures cannot be limited to individual approaches (such as only repression) or individual aspects (such as only drugs-related crime), and the measures taken to prevent the existence and development of organised crime must therefore be as comprehensive as possible,
- D. whereas also a transfrontier approach is needed to combat organised crime and measures are therefore required at European level, since national counter-measures by themselves are not nearly sufficient,
- E. whereas measures to combat organised crime must form part of an overall plan that is as comprehensive and coherent as possible and takes into account both preventive and repressive aspects, and the draft should not therefore enter into competition with the action plan or even replace it, but rather reinforce its underlying orientation,
- F. whereas, however, the recommendations of the action plan are being implemented only very slowly (so far only recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 15, 19, 21 and 22 have been totally implemented) and implementation is considerably behind schedule: the deadlines for the full implementation of recommendations 6, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20 and 23 were not respected (the European Council meeting in Cardiff only extended the deadline for the implementation of recommendation 6 to the end of 1998); as far as recommendations 7, 8, 13, 14, 18, 25, 26, 29 and 30 are concerned, it is already very unlikely that they will be fully implemented by the end of 1998, as stipulated in the action plan,
- G. whereas, in addition, there is a need to maintain the distinction between the concepts of organised crime and common non-organised crime, whereas, however, the links and connections between them reveal themselves in many forms,
- H. whereas the willingness to take swift and effective countermeasures at European level is clearly not keeping pace with the spread of organised crime in Europe and there is an increasing risk that individual Member States - and thus the European Union itself - will be permeated or undermined by organised crime, at least in some sectors,
- I. whereas the draft can be viewed only as an initial response to the extremely complex problem of prevention which can only be a starting point and not the final stage in the debate about prevention,
- J. whereas civil society in particular must make a greater contribution towards combating organised crime and, given the particular dangers faced by the democratic rule of law and the market economy if organised crime manages to permeate public administrations or the illegal economy through corruption, measures to prevent corruption are of central importance,
- K. whereas preventive measures against organised crime can lead to an more advanced degree of state intervention which poses the threat of an extension of state surveillance, unless effective

corrective mechanisms and restrictions on state intervention are set in place to ensure that the private sphere and family life, the home and communications are sufficiently respected,

- L. whereas preventive measures - in particular those based on technological and electronic methods - must meet the requirements of the European Convention on Human Rights and must therefore be commensurate with the object pursued and comprise an appropriate and effective mechanism to prevent abuses (judicial and parliamentary controls),
1. Calls on the Council, the Commission and the Member States to implement the action plans recommendations more promptly than hitherto and, wherever the target date has already been exceeded, to meet the necessary conditions for implementation forthwith or at the latest within a year of the expiry of the deadline;
  2. Welcomes the draft of a resolution - supplementing the action plan - which seeks to improve measures to combat organised crime by resorting to prevention; welcomes the comprehensive approach and the layout of the draft which is based on the action plan (directives and concrete measures); calls on the Council to develop one or more corresponding measures for each guideline and clearly to stipulate the responsibility and target date for implementation, as in the action plan;
  3. Regrets that the draft contains few concrete measures; calls therefore on the Council to supplement the draft in this respect and to provide specific demands, concrete recommendations and direct action guidelines and to avoid merely descriptive endorsements of certain types of behaviour without any practical mission, or statements of intent about merely examining some matter;
  4. Calls on the Council also to involve the applicant countries and (at least) neighbouring third countries in this preventive strategy against organised crime and to request them to draw up together a specific cooperation programme incorporating at least exchange of information, guidelines for common standards and methods of prevention, exchange of experience, research and any other measures appropriate for the purpose of achieving that objective;
  5. Is of the opinion that judicial cooperation amongst the Member States in the fight against organised crime must be developed in parallel with a gradual increase in the account taken of respect for the rights of the defence, the protection of witnesses and the safeguarding of individual and procedural guarantees;
  6. Is convinced of the importance of serious-minded, objective and sustained participation by the media in information and awareness-raising campaigns concerning the dangers which organised crime poses to democracy, the rule of law, freedom and human rights;
  7. Stresses the particular importance of civil society in preventing crime in general and calls on the Council and Member States to provide it with consistent support in its various efforts to assume responsibility, namely through:
    - targeted measures in the fields of labour, health (taking into account in particular the problem of drug addiction), social, educational, training cultural, youth and family policy, so as to influence, in a positive way, the circumstances and causes of crime (a reduction in factors which encourage and a promotion of factors which discourage crime),

- the development of innovative and people-friendly town planning which hinders crime and takes account of the need for preventive action, including the planning of the urban environment and development of architecture inimical to crime (reduction in opportunities for breaking the law), measures to correct past town planning mistakes (slums, run-down housing estates),
- recalls in this context the importance of, and the link between the new proposals and Recommendation No 9 in the action programme, which envisages making use of the opportunities presented by the European Social Fund and the Urban programme in order to prevent the Union's big cities from becoming the favoured domain of organised criminals, and improving the exchange of information on projects that have proved useful in this area,
- the elimination of social disorganisation and a strengthening of relations within the immediate solid environment (measures to promote the creation of tenants' groups and to stimulate neighbourhood contacts) which can also increase informal social controls ('neighbourhood watch'),
- a strengthening of a sense of community (the promotion of voluntary service for social policy objectives, the communication of values through private socialisation and integration systems, such as families, kindergartens, schools, churches and leisure associations), a strengthening of self-esteem and individual attachment to social values and objectives and a readiness to have the courage of one's convictions,
- the integration of marginalised groups (the involvement of minorities in the social and political dialogue, the introduction of voting rights at communal level after a certain period of legal residence),
- measures to promote the establishment of bodies at local and regional levels aimed at preventing crime (crime prevention boards),
- comprehensive information about the real nature of criminal organisations, so as to make people less disposed to tolerate or actively support them,
- promoting and supporting measures and projects to educate citizens to be law-abiding, paying particular attention to initiatives by local authorities and civil society and their organisations and associations; these initiatives should be encouraged where the presence or risk of organised crime is the greatest and its links with common crime the closest,
- community policing an approach by which the police do not merely react to existing problems but seek to identify and analyse problem at an early stage and inform and consult citizens: this facilitates the establishment of a relationship of trust between the police and local residents,
- measures to make citizens more prepared to make statements to and cooperate with the police and the judicial authorities (by protecting witnesses, for example),

- care for those in need (for example, support for children, young people and families at risk from delinquency, availability of a sufficient number of therapy places for drug addicts),
  - measures to reduce the probability of repeat offending (the avoidance of stigmatisation, particularly for first-time offenders; increased importance should be attached to alternative forms of reaction, such as compensation between perpetrators and victims, the payment of money or the provision of labour for community institutions and social training courses; measures to strengthen (re) socialisation efforts in the case of repeat offenders; social and psychological care for prisoners; careful preparation before their release, etc.),
  - the establishment of programmes to help and treat victims,
  - the introduction and/or strengthening of measures to prevent all forms of trafficking in children and women;
8. Calls on the Council to translate the realisation that transparency and controls are effective preventive measures against corruption and organised crime into functional measures and to support the introduction of these two principles as a general democratic principle in all important decision-taking procedures in the spheres of administration, the economy and politics;
9. Calls on the Council and the Member States to give priority to crime prevention projects within the context of the reform of the Structural Funds and other regional assistance programmes;
- \*  
\* \*
10. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission, the governments and parliaments of the Member States and the applicant states.

**B.**  
**EXPLANATORY STATEMENT**

**The Draft**

The *Action Plan to Combat Organised Crime* (hereinafter: the Action Plan)<sup>(1)</sup> adopted by the European Council meeting in Amsterdam on 16 and 17 June 1997 contains a number of political guidelines and implementing measures. However, the main focus of the guidelines is on repression. This led the European Parliament in its resolution of 20 November 1997 on this Action Plan<sup>(2)</sup> to call, inter alia, for more attention to be paid to preventive approaches to combating organised crime (see paragraphs 26, 48, 49 and 50 of this Resolution).

The Council has taken up this demand made by the European Parliament and has now submitted a *draft Council resolution on guidelines and measures for the prevention of organised crime with reference to the establishment of a comprehensive strategy for combating it* (hereinafter: the Draft). The Presidency of the Council forwarded this draft by letter of 29 July 1998 to the European Parliament. The Council intends to revise this Draft and to adopt it at the meeting of the Council of Ministers of Justice and the Interior on 3 and 4 December 1998. The European Parliament should have drawn up its views on this matter by then.

The Preamble to the draft specifically cites the European Parliament's demand for closer consideration of the prevention aspect as one reason for this Resolution; it also refers to the conclusions of the Conference on *achieving a corruption-free commercial environment - the EU's contribution* organised on 14 and 15 April 1998 jointly by the Commission, the UK presidency and the European Parliament. (This is the first time that specific reference has been made to the European Parliament's positions in the sphere of judicial cooperation in penal matters).

The draft acknowledges that organised crime must be combated not only by effective and continuous repression but also by a variety of creative prevention measures. It is structured like the Action Plan and consists of guidelines to combat organised crime by prevention and measures to implement of the guidelines.

The guidelines cover three areas:

- in the section on 'Strategy' Member States are urged to develop national programmes to combat organised crime, to accord particular importance to the prevention of organised crime and to keep each other fully informed;
- in the section on 'Findings and Experience' Member States are urged to make use of relevant research programmes and actively to use Community programmes (for example the Falcone programme); furthermore, they are urged to conduct an exchange of information based on scientific work or practical experience and to include third countries, particularly applicant countries and neighbouring countries, in such an exchange of information. The expertise and experience obtained by Europol and UCLAF should also be used. Specific reference is made

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ C 251, 15 August 1997, p. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ C 371, 8 December 1997, p. 165.

to a plan for drawing up a European code of good practice. The Commission is also invited to make contributions to increase knowledge on how to prevent organised crime;

- in the section on 'Implementation', the Member States are urged to give priority to the swift implementation of valid prevention measures. Reference is also made to the efforts of civil society in preventing organised crime and it is acknowledged, as a matter of principle, that social security for citizens, education and training systems, measures to combat unemployment and poverty as well as creative and humane urban planning and urban design geared to prevention can play a key role in prevention. Furthermore, the Member States are urged to set up 'crime prevention boards' and generally to engage in close cooperation with NGOs involved in crime prevention and with institutions and groups of persons that are responsible for shaping the cultural environment and individual responsibility in a community; the need for cooperation by the media in public relations and information campaigns is also highlighted. Furthermore, recommendations are made for the development and spreading of technical equipment to prevent drug abuse, corruption and ensure transparent funding of political parties, to ensure a greater degree of integration of marginalised groups and to assist the social reintegration of offenders. A general recommendation is made in framing and enacting new laws to check the extent to which they are open to exploitation by organised crime. Finally, the Member States and the Commission are urged to report to the Council by the end of the year 2000 on the measures that have been taken.

### **Position regarding this draft**

#### 1. General

Firstly, this Council draft is to be welcomed in principle, because the struggle against organised crime must take place by means of an overall plan which is as comprehensive and coherent as possible and which comprises preventive aspects in addition to repressive aspects. Moreover, this draft meets a key demand made by the European Parliament, namely that a substantive omission in the action programme be addressed.

In order to assess the importance of the draft correctly, it should be stated that the outset that it should not enter into competition with the action plan or even seek to replace it but rather strengthen its underlying orientation and effectiveness.

However, it is also important to point out that, owing to the multifaceted problems raised by the comprehensive objectives it set itself, this draft can only be an initial approach to the extremely complex problem of prevention and can thus only be a starting point and not by any means the final stage in the debate on prevention.

#### 2. Understanding the concepts involved and the scope and limits of prevention in combating organised crime

In the debate on crime policy, the concept of prevention is set against the concept of repression. While repression tackles existing dangers and the existing disruptions in respect of protected legal assets, prevention deals with possible dangers and potential disruptions. The object of crime prevention is therefore to prevent criminal behaviour.

In the past measures to combat crime have concentrated primarily on state prosecution, and few specific measures were taken to prevent crime. While prevention cannot succeed without the possibility of punishment, criminal prosecution - as the most intensively intensive form of state action - must always remain the last resort in controlling crime. This means that all effective avenues of non-repressive crime control must be exhausted before repression is resorted to. The need to consider preventive means of combating organised crime can thus also be based on considerations of commensurability, since the prevention of crime can usually be made less intrusive and thus more humane than repression.

A debate on this specific problem of crime policy began in the USA in the early 1960s. In Scandinavia, so-called 'crime preventive boards' were set up in the 1970s. Particularly in Denmark and Sweden a multifaceted approach was developed which received scientific backup from the relevant state research institutes.

In the current debate, crime prevention is structured according to the following graded model:

- (a) Primary prevention comprises measures directed at society which are intended to influence the conditions responsible for the outbreak of crime, particularly through the absorption of laws and values in the family socialisation process, the teaching of law in schools and the establishment of conditions and circumstances, for example in labour, social or social housing, youth and family policy, which make society resistant to crime.
- (b) Secondary prevention covers all efforts directed at groups of potential offenders or potential victims and intended in principle to prevent people inclined towards crime from actually carrying out crimes, for example by altering opportunities for crime, reducing situations which encourage crime, increasing the risk of detection, reducing the benefits of crime, warning, or ensuring the safety of potential victims or individual help and support for potential offenders.
- (c) Tertiary prevention comprises measures which are intended to prevent recidivist behaviour, i.e. prevent individual offenders from reoffending or at least to reduce the risk of this occurring and prevent people becoming repeat victims.

Measures to prevent crime can lead to an extension of the state's intervention policy. This may mean the development of state surveillance. For this reason preventive measures must be accompanied by effective correctives and restrictions on intervention, so as to guarantee that the private sphere, family life, the home and communications are adequately respected. This means that preventive measures must also satisfy basic constitutional requirements and should be commensurate with the object pursued and be accompanied by an appropriate and effective mechanism to prevent abuse (judicial and parliamentary controls).

Preventive measures cannot thus be used without restrictions but must meet a number of requirements: intervention must be minimised and undesirable side-effects avoided, and they must be effective and based on constitutional law. The use of these measures is therefore restricted by three framework conditions:

- the measures may only prevent negative initiatives which lead to crime. The control measures may not be so powerful and indiscriminating that they also stifle all positive initiatives which conform with socially-acceptable behaviour;

- the measures must result in a genuine reduction in crime. They may not therefore consist merely in shifting the time or place in which crimes are committed or changing the type of crime. The effectiveness of individual measures must therefore always be assessed;
- the measures may not violate achievements of the modern constitutional state (for example data protection) or foster the very criminal behaviour which they are intended to prevent.

### 3. A number of proposals regarding the draft

#### 3.1. A reduction in the delay in implementing the Action Plan's recommendations

As stated above, preventive measures are designed to supplement the Action Plan and thereby to enhance its effectiveness. However, this objective will only be achieved if the Action Plan itself is implemented in a committed manner and on time.

Unfortunately, this has only occurred to a limited extent: thus at the moment this report is being drawn up (September 1998) implementation of the Action Plan is lagging far behind the target dates. So far only recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 15, 19, 21 and 22 have been completely implemented (some of them admittedly late). On the other hand, recommendations 6, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20 and 23 have still not been completely implemented although the deadlines have already expired. Given the present state of progress, it is more than questionable whether recommendations 7, 8, 13, 14, 18, 25, 26, 29 and 30 will be implemented on time, i.e. by the end of 1998, as stated by the Action Plan. The overall impression is that the Action Plan is being implemented haltingly, which threatens to reduce its value. The Union is clearly unwilling or unable, given its present working structures, to move against organised crime at the same pace as the latter is spreading in Europe. This is a cause for concern. For this reason the institutions responsible for implementation (primarily the Council, but also the Commission and the Member States) should be urged to ensure that the Action Plan is implemented more swiftly than hitherto and that the deadlines are not exceeded by more than a year.

#### 3.2. Clarification of the basis and structure of the draft

The layout of the draft which is based on the Action Plan (guidelines and specific measures), its comprehensive approach and the positions contained therein are broadly to be welcomed. The responsibility of the European Union in preventing organised crime has been clearly set out, at the very latest, in Article 29 of the EU Treaty in the Amsterdam Treaty version which states that the objective of providing citizens with a high degree of security in an area of freedom, security and law shall be achieved, inter alia, by preventing and combating organised and non-organised crime. In addition to this mandate for activity specifically set out in the Treaty, the negative aspect of the principle of subsidiarity calls for action at Union level: it is quite clear that measures to combat cross-border organised crime must also adopt a cross-border approach. This means that consistent measures must be taken at European level, because national counter-measures by themselves are now totally ineffective in dealing with this phenomenon.

However, the present version of the draft needs numerous improvements. Thus, as in the case of the Action Plan, each guideline should be marked by one or more measures clearly establishing responsibility and the target date for implementation. These measures should contain precise demands, specific recommendations and direct instructions for action to be taken; mere descriptive

endorsements of certain forms of behaviour without any practical mission or statements of intent merely to examine some aspect of the problem should be avoided as far as possible.

### 3.3. Demand for a more detailed treatment of individual sectors

Out of all the possible measures, three sectors should be singled out requiring a more detailed treatment in the draft:

#### (a) The inclusion of third countries

Organised crime is not only an internal EU problem.

For this reason it would be very beneficial if the applicant countries and (at least) the neighbouring third countries were included as comprehensively and as early as possible in this prevention strategy against organised crime (for example, through notification of standards and methods of prevention, the establishment of a functioning system for the exchange of information based on experience).

#### (b) The prevention of corruption

Measures to prevent corruption are of key importance, particularly given the numerous connections between corruption and organised crime. If organised crime manages through corruption to permeate public administration and the legal economy, this creates particular dangers for the democratic rule of law and the market economy, because criminals can obtain access to important information in this way which increases the likelihood that they will be able to use legal structures for their illegal purposes. Against this background, the necessary practical conclusions must be drawn from the realisation that transparency and controls are effective preventive measures against corruption and organised crime. The best way of doing this is by introducing transparency and controls as general democratic principles in all significant decision-taking processes in the administration, the economy and politics. (Reference should be made in this connection to the comprehensive approaches set out in the European Parliament resolution of 6 October 1998 on an EU policy to combat corruption.<sup>(1)</sup>).

#### (c) The contribution of civil society

As already set out in its resolution of 20 November 1997, the European Parliament takes the view that the various efforts of civil society to assume responsibility need to be promoted and strengthened. This could comprise the following specific measures:

- targeted measures in the field of labour, health (taking into account in particular the problem of drug addiction), social, educational, cultural, youth and family policy, so as to influence the conditions and causes of crime (the reduction of factors which encourage, and the promotion of factors which discourage, crime);
- the promotion of a type of architecture which is inimical to crime, so as to reduce local opportunities for committing offences. Past mistakes committed by town planners (slums, rundown housing estates) should be corrected and a uniform construction style avoided in new buildings. Run-down, bleak looking buildings should be renovated and high-rise blocks subdivided in residential units which are as small and manageable as possible and be

---

<sup>(1)</sup> R4-0285/98

surrounded by green areas. In this way the urban environment can be turned back into a place of human communication which will also lower the crime rate;

- the promotion of social structures which discourage crime: social disorganisation should be eliminated and certain patterns of behaviour (the promotion of tenants' groups, the establishment of neighbourly contacts) should be facilitated, thus contributing to the establishment of 'a sense of the interests of the neighbourhood'. A 'sense of local area' will be present when inhabitants can identify with their house and their residence area and when they take an interest in events in their common area (increasing the risk of detection through informal social controls - 'neighbourhood watch');
- the reinforcement of the 'sense of community' (the promotion of voluntary service for social policy objectives, the communication of values through private socialization and integration systems such as families, kindergartens, schools, churches and leisure associations);
- the strengthening of self-esteem and of individual attachment to social values and objectives, together with a willingness actively to defend them (a sense of civic responsibility); this could be supplemented by increasing the willingness of citizens to make statements to, and cooperate with, the police and judicial authorities backed up by measures to protect witnesses;
- the integration of marginalised groups (the inclusion of minorities in the social and political dialogue, the introduction of voting rights at communal level after a certain period of legal residence);
- support for potential victims of crime by reducing opportunities for crime ('opportunity makes a thief'), warnings and an increase in the physical ability of the population to fend off criminals (for example, self defence courses). Other measures would include a reduction in circumstances which encourage crime (for example no alcohol to be served at football games, measures to increase the risk of detection or reduce the potential rewards of crime);
- measures to promote the establishment of boards aimed at prevention at local and regional level (crime prevention boards);
- comprehensive information on the real nature of criminal organisations so as to reduce a susceptibility to passive toleration of, or active support for, them;
- community policing which does not only react to existing problems, but tries to identify, analyse and, as far as possible, tackle problems at an early stage. Citizens should also receive advice and information. These measures are intended to facilitate the establishment of relations of trust between the police and local residents. The citizens and the police can even become partners in joint efforts to reduce crime: citizens could be involved in police decisions by power-sharing and the community put in a position, with the help and through the advice of the police, (once again) to make a considerable contribution to solving their problems;
- care for those at risk: support and care for children, young people and families at risk from delinquency (for example, through the recognition, at the earliest possible stage, of signs of neglect or abuse of children, so that the necessary counter measures can be taken at kindergarten age or during the first years of school; through school coaching geared to individual needs and an adequate provision of training places for young people; through a

concentration of social work on 'multi problem families' characterised by numerous problems, for example, poor work habits, a large number of children, disease, alcohol and drugs consumption and sexual abuse and living in dire poverty without any future prospects or plans); making available an adequate number of therapy places for drugs addicts,

- a strengthening of general preventive effects (thus negative general prevention seeks to deter potential criminals by threatening punishment, conducting criminal prosecutions and handing down and executing sentences in other comparable cases, while positive general prevention seeks to encourage respect for the law and a readiness to obey the law);
- group oriented attempts to give intensive care to young delinquents in the community through social pedagogues: given that delinquency is generated by group pressure and can also be shed through group pressure, the aim here is to influence the entire group of delinquents, the delinquent sub culture, types of behaviour and values (for example, group therapy for people of the same age-group);
- Measures to reduce the likelihood that offenders will re-offend (reducing the stigmatization of first time offenders; a stronger emphasis on alternative forms of reaction such as seeking compensation between perpetrators and victims, the payment of money or provision of labour for community institutions, social training courses; the fostering of (re-)socialisation attempts in the case of repeat offenders; social and psychological care for prisoners about to be released);
- programmes to help and treat victims aimed at helping them come to terms with the psychological and social consequences so as to ensure that they do not become victims for a second time (this can happen, for example, if persons close to the victim or major organisations such as hospitals, the media, the police and the judicial authorities fail to react appropriately to the first incident). These programmes are necessary for humanitarian but also preventive considerations, because a failure to treat victims can have negative consequences: victimisation can become a basic character trait of the person concerned; if left untreated, victimisation can generate lasting physical, psychosomatic and social consequences which make those concerned vulnerable to antisocial and criminal behaviour.