



*The Police
Foundation*

Lecture 2000

Sponsored by



**Police Foundation Lecture
11 July 2000**

*Sir John Stevens - Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis
Mr Nick Ross - Broadcaster and Journalist*

**Out of Step with the Modern Beat - Policing for a New
Century**

SIR JOHN STEVENS

Good evening ladies and gentlemen. Let me start by saying what a pleasure it is to share the platform with Nick Ross. As well as presenting 'Crimewatch' he is an old friend and experienced commentator on policing issues.

Tonight we depart from the traditional formula for this lecture and we have been asked to use an unusual joint approach - with two speakers. It should be said that like modern day policing this approach reflects the need for collaborative partnership and not the somewhat isolated practices of 'yesteryear'.

NICK ROSS

John and I have known each other since we both served on a long defunct Home Office committee on crime prevention. The committee didn't achieve much but we found we shared a philosophy.

Broadly speaking it is this: that crime could be drastically cut, but not if we go on doing what we have done in the past, and not if we go on relying on conventional attitudes to law and order.

In this lecture we will attempt to predict what policing may be like in the century ahead - and we will conclude that the police are currently out of step with the modern beat, but so too are the media, the politicians, the courts and public.

SIR JOHN STEVENS

As you may be aware previous lectures have attempted to visualise or predict the future. Well, quite frankly we're there. It's now past the time for talking about radical change as though it was something we must think about.

In fact 'policing philosophy' remains pretty much the same as when the MPS was founded 170 years ago. I believe we have done a pretty good job over that time. We remain among the most trusted of police services anywhere in the world. But we're a long way from the 1820s. We need to re-think what we deliver society, and how we deliver it.

When I took over as Commissioner I pledged to Londoners that not only would we tackle crime and the fear of crime - we would make London the safest major city in the world. This requires 'new thinking' and today, in part, is about that. New tactics for a new Century. We must always be examining what we do and the way

we do it. We will continue to ensure the name New Scotland Yard remains recognised as a by-word for excellence through using hard edged policing and shifting fear from victims to criminals.

Above all we want to break out of the spiral of being so reactive. This is an opportunity to think about the century ahead. We propose a change in emphasis, where we move from chasing criminals - to getting ahead of the game.

NICK ROSS

John has mentioned that the police are essentially a nineteenth century creation. And the basic concept has changed little. The police still have two main functions: the maintenance of public order, and tackling crime. Their record on public order is generally good; and surveys in London suggest that over 80% of Londoners trust the police, but public confidence about crime appears to be declining.

We submit that the better record on public order is because of two features: partnerships and proactivity. The key has not been on reactive policing. It's been consensual government, so there are few incentives to rebellion; and when the police are involved, as with the so-called anti-capitalist riots, they're expected to head off trouble, not clear up after it's gone wrong.

On the other hand the defining feature of crime control is that we have fobbed off responsibility to the police in a way we do not do with public order. We leave the police to chase symptoms, not solutions. In this century we will see a heroic shift in policing away from shutting doors after the horses have bolted. As with public order, the job of police will be in support of the community as a whole, to stop the problems happening in the first place.

In this century the police must have a growing influence on decisions across the community that lie well upstream of crime. We must place their hands on the levers that control crime.

If we're to break out of what John calls the "spiral" of reactivity, we have to dispel two delusions: two ingrained pieces of folklore that keep us locked into old thinking. The first myth is that crime is a product of falling moral standards. The second falsehood is that most criminals are different from you and me. If you believe those myths you are bound to be a pessimist and a fatalist. How are you going to re-engineer human morality; how are you going to recast the "criminal classes"?

In fact the real reasons crime has risen are not only different, but give cause for hope - because each of them leads to solutions.

The first sponsor of crime is opportunity. Without it crimes can't take place. And now there is more to steal, more easily, than ever before in history. Crime is not a result of society's failures, as much as a result of its successes! If we didn't have to lock our doors in generations past it's because we didn't have credit cards, video-recorders, and kids didn't get mugged for their £100 trainers. Designer labels have created fashion victims in more ways than one.

Watch out, there's temptation about.

Some years ago I was in China for the BBC - on your behalf, and at your expense (to quote Beyond the Fringe). In a village in the heartland of China I was surprised

to see barbed wire around some new houses. "It's to stop burglary," the head man told me. "we've had some televisions stolen." I said that I didn't think China had much burglary, or was that just Communist propaganda? "NO", said the head man. "My parents, and grandparents, never heard of burglary." So, I asked why do you have burglary now? He looked at me as if I came from another planet. "They didn't have televisions." He replied.

Here was oriental wisdom that seems to evade us in the West. TV breeds crime not because of the programmes but because of the TV's themselves. Quite ordinary artefacts have now become temptation and almost every one of the other benefits of a free and rich society has consequences which encourage crime.

First there's more to steal.

The second by-product of economic success is that people have more time on their hands.

Third, there's more beer money: far more social drinking, often with anti social results, and – yes - drugs.

Fourth, there's more mobility – and as we all know, being away from the constraints of home opens up new temptations as well as new opportunities.

Fifth, there's anonymity. The fact is it's easier to get away with behaving badly if no-one in the village knows you.

Sixth, there are so many new inventions that create entirely new crimes. Old offences like sheep stealing, horse theft and highway robbery become extinct, but new ones multiply: car theft, credit card deception, air time fraud with mobile phones and crime scams through the Internet.

And seventh there's more liberty. Freedom to wear provocative clothes, to behave loudly, to offend people, to do your own thing. There is simply more acceptance of individual differences – which means there's correspondingly less conspicuity if you're behaving oddly.

So seven results of economic prosperity which contribute at least as much to crime as the seven deadly sins. There is no doubt they promote crime but let's keep things in perspective. Historians point out people always felt crime was bad, in every generation, and the papers have been lamenting it, since at least the Victorian penny dreadfuls.

JOHN STEVENS

People do seem to have an almost innately pessimistic view of crime. Indeed we're now told by an American TV journalist that ours is one of the most dangerous societies in the developed world, and that crime has turned our shopping streets into 'battlegrounds'. This perception is damaging and does not meet with the reality. It is so anti-intellectual, so ill-informed, that I do need to set the record straight. More importantly, if we get the impression that we're being swamped by a tidal wave of crime, our responses are going to be emotional, reactive and positively ill conceived.

International crime comparisons are unreliable, as are historical comparisons. Ironically, the more successful my officers are in encouraging victims to report

crime, and the more diligent we are in responding to crimes like domestic violence, the worse the figures get. The result is more pressure on us to be less proactive, and an atmosphere not conducive to sensible decision making. We need to think more laterally.

Let me give you an example. London has experienced a significant rise in street crime – which, when analysed, reveals that 80% is being committed by first time offenders – often of a young age. This is a phenomenon new to modern society where violence and street crime dominate. At a recent meeting with the Prime Minister we were quick to suggest that this type of crime requires well thought out strategies. These involve intervention, the community, the use of technology and a need for Government support. Creating 'Safer Streets' is not just a role for police – it's about people working together to solve problems. When people work together they are stronger and of course come up with more effective solutions.

Let's be clear. We are a multiple service provider, pulled in several directions by what I call the three 'M's' - The demands of the moment, the demands of performance measures and the demands of the media. For too long we have simply accepted the growing demands placed upon us. We must 'front end' the business and not be a slave to the symptoms.

NICK ROSS

If you want to see the 3 M's in action, just watch when the new crime figures come out. The Home Office recorded crime statistics are simply a collection of what the Home Office chooses to write down. They hugely under-represent crime, and because they're so unreliable, they push us in the wrong directions. They are a disgrace to serious crime analysis, and the media should campaign for them to be downgraded. Public policy needs more reliable data, like hospital and victim surveys. If we want to find solutions, politicians and the media ought to be more thoughtful and less excitable.

Whatever the reality, society now believes that it faces what Sir John calls a "tidal wave" of lawlessness. In response people have retreated to their favourite dogmas and policing prescriptions.

The political right calls for deterrence, the left for redemption, and everyone's reached for slogans. "Tough on crime and the causes of crime" makes even rehabilitation sound vindictive. I suspect the harder the slogan the weaker the intellectual basis of the policy. Anyway, take your pick; "short sharp shock"; "if they do the crime they can do the time"; "zero tolerance". It's mostly meaningless, or at best ambiguous.

The trouble with most public debate about crime is that it concentrates on (*to use your words John*) the symptoms not the causes.

Governments may espouse long term philosophical shifts in society's values, yet again and again come back to symptom chasing. One only has to reflect on the headlines last week to see how crime promotes knee jerk reactions rather than lateral thinking.

Whether it's on-the-spot fines, or 'short sharp shocks', longer sentences, or hanging and flogging, the old model is too often trapped downstream of crime. In fact, perhaps contrary to common sense and intuition, there is precious little evidence that deterrence works in a straightforward way.

The truth is, by and large, people don't divide into criminals and law-abiding folk. This is not just a philosophical nicety. It has concrete, tangible, practical implications. Once we see crime as something anyone can be tempted into, we can begin to understand how to organise life better so that temptations can be curbed. Yes of course there are psychopaths, genuine social misfits, and villains brought up to villainy by their villainous parents. Very probably there is some inheritance in criminality. But the idea of defining the world in terms of goodies and baddies is rather naïve. Who in this room has not broken criminal law: at least fiddled tax on your cleaner or VAT for building work? Maybe in your social milieu you haven't robbed a bank, but let those without sin cast the first stone.

Research has shown that 34% of men have a criminal conviction by their 40th birthday. When a third of us are deviant the word 'deviant' begins to lose its meaning. If we want to understand how to control the bulk of crime we need to grasp the fact that normal crime is normally committed by normal people.

The important consequence of that is that if you stop someone cheating on their bus fare they won't go out and burgle a house. If you make it hard to break into a phone box they won't dash out and mug an old lady. Studies in the UK, in Germany, and in the United States suggest about 10% of crime is displaced. That means that if robbing banks becomes too difficult some people will look actively for alternative forms of criminal enrichment. But 90% of crime is not displaced.

Making crime harder really does have a big impact on cutting it. So what we would like to do now is to present a strategy for cutting crime – or rather three linked strategies. They are practical and entirely apolitical, and they mostly get ahead of crime, but they work.

Note that two of the three strategies are largely upstream of crime. In other words they get ahead of crime. Note also, that the strategies do not necessarily involve increasing the numbers of police officers. First lets use the existing police properly.

SIR JOHN STEVENS

I fully accept the need to make efficient use of the officers I have. But make no mistake if I am to police London with confidence I need more officers coming in through the door. Demand is rising and supply of staff falling – the worst case scenario. More of that later.

Before outlining our three strategies, I must spell out something that underpins everything we propose. In crime, as with public order, it can not be left to police alone. I've spoken about the reasons that conspire to make us reactive, but there is a compelling need for; coherent policy, collaborative partnerships and collective action – the three C's of 21st Century Service provision. In other words, the operating practices between the public, private, voluntary and government sectors **must change**. Police need to offer advice and guidance to other agencies - facilitate innovation - but not actually undertake agency specific activity. For example we may make suggestions about how best to design out crime on a new housing estate - but not, actually provide technical blue prints. There are new relationships here that still need to be developed.

We must encourage Councils, Educationalists, Health Practitioners, and others, to make 'Community Safety' an ever present backcloth to their decisions and

activities. We already have the means to do it. Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act requires crime reduction activity to be woven through every piece of policy in the public services. In my view this shows great foresight by the Government and I doubt, in many cases, the full significance of this has been grasped. The Act demands that every agency must consider how any of its actions will affect crime and disorder, and then do all that is reasonable to prevent it. This is powerful stuff. Yet the fact is, many agencies simply do not subscribe to this approach – many see crime and disorder as a separate issue - an adjunct to primary activity. This naivety and lack of vision has to be reversed.

The Cabinet Office is at one with us on this. Policy Action Teams on Neighbourhood Renewal and Social Exclusion have been working towards a cohesive strategy – not a new bolt on which sounds good in the annual report. Crime will only be massively reduced when public service silos are dismantled and replaced by locally delivered, joined up, preventative action.

It isn't just formal agencies which need to work in partnership. As Nick has pointed out, one of the distinguishing factors in success with public order is that it is consensual. In crime prevention too we must embrace the whole of society. We must take every opportunity to access the harder to reach sections of our communities. Diversity is about so much more than race issues alone. We need to be more aware of our emerging interest groups, like those seeking refuge or asylum.

The Police service must go beyond the requirements of existing law and become positively anti racist in its approach. I will make us leaders in this field – across the entire spectrum of policing. Over the last two years particularly, we have demonstrated that significant advances can be made – an example for others to follow.

Furthermore I believe it is time to embrace the notion of community patrol – an extension of Neighbourhood Wardens. Properly managed, with appropriate safeguards, this will work. There is no doubt citizens have a role to play as part of overall community safety strategies. We must not miss the opportunity to get fully involved **NOW** - and help shape the future. This is the future - we must not resist it. People are increasingly using services which we must ensure complement, not conflict with mainstream police activity. If commentators choose to label this approach 'two tier policing' or 'policing on the cheap', so be it. We will rise above such claims and ensure that this holistic approach to crime reduction and safety really works.

NICK ROSS

So that's the backcloth: what John calls the 3 'C's: coherent policy, collaborative partnerships, and collective action.

Now our three strategies.

- First, and the great priority, is to reduce the opportunities for offending and remove the temptations that promote crime. This is a whole new role for the police – not chasing around after crime has happened.
- Next we need to reform the police to cope with the new demands of a new century. We must give them the skills to get ahead of crime, as well as solve crime more effectively once it has taken place.

- And third, it means re-thinking the Criminal Justice System. The system is at the moment haphazard and has surprisingly little relevance to crime reduction.

There is nothing radically new about these components. It is because some of them have been partially applied that some crime rates are improving. What will be new in this century is the determination to apply them all systematically.

We've chosen three examples – they include reckless corporate policy; ill-conceived government policy, and sometimes both. Each has left a trail of crime in its wake – and while the police sometimes get the blame they have no power to influence the key decisions.

Mobile phones are a prime illustration. There are now 30 million in circulation. They've spawned a whole new industry of crime. Car break-ins, muggings, handbag thefts, and a whole galaxy of new opportunities for fraud. They are ideal for property crime – highly portable, valuable, easy to reconfigure, and easy to sell on.

Who, in the early stages of mobile telephony, thought through the crime implications? It would be so easy to design technology that could make a stolen phone unusable – especially with the new generation digital phones. Who consulted the police about product and service design – indeed, on last century's policing model, why would they? Even if they had consulted, what skills did the police have to help them come up with products that were more secure?

Perhaps more significant is the question of motives. Manufacturers can actually gain through phone theft, for once your mobile's stolen you go out and buy another. The air time providers can protect their own profits with pre-paid phones – but predictably with their anonymity this marketing approach has spawned a whole new crime wave.

Of course the shareholders of Nokia or Orange are "decent" law-abiding people, as are their managers and employees. Yet, it is hard to resist the conclusion that the results of legitimate well intentioned actions are that their industry is pimping for crime. They lead to misery, injury and death, unintentionally but as inevitably as drug peddlers or the Mafia.

SIR JOHN STEVENS

Understanding incentives is key to solving the problem.

In many industries an arbitrary minimum for acceptable levels of crime is set. This decision is subject to market forces. For example, a firm delivering money must be competitive – balancing risk against probability of attack. Clearly they could not employ 20 guards on each drop off, so an invariably sensible compromise position is established. Much is the same in shop thefts where a certain low amount of theft is considered tolerable. **There is no incentive to do otherwise.** So to prevent crime and the opportunities for it we must create incentives. These could be tax benefits, grants, funding partnerships, licensing, and most probably legislation to drive home the message and provide an opportunity for sanction. This philosophy can be extended to many current problems. For example, the supply of alcohol to young people, or even the responsibilities of football clubs in relation to their fans.

Some good progress has already been made with the British Retail Consortium and various car manufacturers. Whilst these contributions are a very good start few people would argue there is still much work to be done.

At the moment we all pay for crime and it's consequences. The criminal justice system costs the tax-payer nearly 13 billion pounds a year. But as well as financial costs, such as rising insurance premiums there are hidden costs too - such as loss of freedoms and anxiety.

Safety in the work place is an area in which passing laws has proved very successful. Until all the Health and Safety at Work legislation and a statutory Executive came into being - deaths and serious injury were common place in factories - until fear of penalty pushed the matter onto the boardroom agenda. Fatal injury rates in the late 1980's and 90's were generally less than one quarter of those at the beginning of the 1960's and less than half of those at the beginning of the 1970's.

Companies may say this is harsh and unfair but there is a need for a public body to promote safety, on similar lines to the Health and Safety Executive. After all, if there's a statutory and proactive agency to promote safety from accidents, why not one to protect people from crime?

NICK ROSS

Commerce must face up to its responsibilities. My motto is simple, and clear: "Let those who lead us into temptation deliver us from evil". Whatever your product, whatever service you provide, if you inadvertently foster crime then you should pay the price. In crime, just as much as in environmental protection, polluters can be made to pay. It should become more profitable to avert crime than to promote it.

But it needn't be all stick; there are carrots too. Companies that can protect their customers from crime will increasingly gain market advantage. The police need to see their role as pivotal in this, exploring where things are going wrong, horizon-scanning to head off new crime dangers, creating new incentives, lobbying and - if need be - threatening. Sometimes they'll need to work on Government too, in the area of public policy.

Let us give you an example where public policy actually fosters crime. Sadly, the UK is a world-leader in car crime. Once again industry is partly to blame, but car crime is instructive because of an additional scandal: the lax way in which cars are registered. In Britain you can go into a garage and order any registration plate you like. In practice you can sell your car in the street without a receipt and without notifying anyone. It is a system which cultivates all the crimes made possible where a vehicle's apparent and real identities differ.

Contrast that with, for example, the Swedish approach, or many others come to that. Registration plates, like banknotes, should be made by only one high security company. They should hold details of ownership, tax and insurance, which cannot be lapsed without return of the plates. They should incorporate a camera readable bar-code and, crucially, they should contain the vehicle's VIN - the chassis number. All these details (and more) should be checked at MoT, to guard against offences such as 'clocking'.

At last Her Majesty's Government is moving. Their Vehicle Crime Reduction Task Force has come up with some measures that could go some way towards reform - though not enough in our view - the Home Office has earmarked £5m to meet the costs. Contrast that with the £3.5 billion a year that car crime costs the nation - quite apart from the distress it causes for victims. Things are moving in the right direction, but too little, too slow, and too compartmentalised.

SIR JOHN STEVENS

This century will see a huge emphasis on designing out crime. The Government has a "forward look" programme but still, generally, the crime created by new goods and services remains unrecognised. Our response is often too late, and can be described as 'retro-fit'. We need to bring together the work of the Police Scientific Development Branch, the Police Foundation and other recognised research bodies, within and outside the Home Office, to ensure that criminology and science are not divorced.

I am delighted to welcome plans for the new Jill Dando Institute for Crime Science which will be central in researching new solutions. I hope it will look at civil liberty implications too. For example, when we mentioned camera readable bar codes on car registration plates - we must not overlook people's freedom and privacy and the need for appropriate controls. Society must decide how much it really cares about cutting crime. None of these solutions will be a panacea. Some crime will displace. Crime is always evolving, so new solutions have to be found. We believe that crime could be cut radically if our proposals were to be adopted.

The Jill Dando Institute is a fine example of cross discipline collaboration. It will bring together economists, psychologists, physicists, geographers, architects and others to invent new solutions to crime. But up to now funding for this sort of work has sometimes fallen between several different stools. Crime reduction initiatives, because they are normally complicated and 'multi-agency', do not neatly sit with the remit of current Research Councils. I think it is high time that we establish a National Institute for Criminal Justice.

I want to emphasise that we are not seeking to abrogate responsibilities to others. On the contrary - we must be navigators on this voyage. If not we will find ourselves increasingly marginalized. We will be in the "old" industry of shutting stable doors, not the new one of designing better stables.

Which brings us to the question of reforming the police themselves. We must consider how to turn policing around from reactive to proactive, from old to new, from chasing crime to preventing it. I have been saying it for years - **we need to professionalise the modern day service**, giving it comparable status to others.

We really must accelerate the development of crime science and the emerging technologies available to us. The use of DNA and advanced forensic techniques have revolutionised the way we investigate crime. CCTV is becoming more commonplace and plays an important part in detecting and deterring crime - despite what you may have read recently in the newspapers. We must be at the cutting edge - pushing back the frontiers - and always looking for new ways to help us do the job.

This is not a rejection of traditional policing. Society is changing at a dramatic rate, and as with transforming any large organisation, change programmes will

involve difficult decisions. Some people will find it hard to make the transition. But it has to be done, and in London we are adapting and moving already.

NICK ROSS

Just as in a public company facing restructuring, where shareholders may need patience if they're to reap the benefits in years to come, so with policing the public, the media and the politicians will have to face some painful dilemmas. If we're to shift upstream of crime, what will happen to cases like the Jill Dando investigation? We shall have to accept that if we put 40 officers on a murder inquiry that means 40 fewer working on proactive crime prevention.

The government will have to accept a new single-mindedness. In the old model ministers have a vague aspiration on crime reduction, which they undermine with a culture of financial dependency, political interference and a plethora of what are called "KPIs" – key performance indicators, like the speed of answering 999 calls.

We all want 999 calls answered quickly, just as we all want improved detection rates. But our priorities should be unambiguous. The Police Service nationally is bound up in so much red tape it is almost a prisoner. The linking of KPI's to funding arrangements is divisive, unfair, and above all has lost touch with the overriding need for prevention and safety. Everything can not be a priority.

Police must have a clear remit, and we suggest it should be this: "through consensual policing to maintain public order and to reduce crime, however it is measured."

This represents a substantial change. The original mandate for the Metropolitan Police Service in 1829 placed crime prevention as the first function of the new public force. But in the past century the Met' and other forces paid lip service to prevention: it says much that ACPO's crime prevention committee is a sub-committee of the Crime Committee, not vice versa. This must change.

Proactive policing, heading off crime, calls for substantially new skills. This renewed emphasis on reduction through prevention will need sweeping new working practices. In reactive policing community relations are useful but not a core part of the job; that has to be instilled separately. Officers need to be good at carrying out instructions.

Crime prevention needs lateral thinking rather than compliance, greater expertise, and above all partnerships.

SIR JOHN STEVENS

I think the Police Service needs an even more radical approach. We must explore the notion of role being a critical success factor, not simply rank. We are bogged down in a legacy of outdated rules, regulations, and redundant practice which is difficult to dismantle without destabilising the organisation. We have to find a new confidence and a new culture that sees change as an opportunity rather than a threat.

At present we have a single point of entry into the police, and a fast track scheme for our most able officers. We must open up to a wider range of talent. Our methods of progression are wasteful. Staff who are now perhaps Managers or Detectives have acquired dozens of skills in their careers, many of which are rendered practically useless in their current role. Whether its operating a speed

gun, being a highly trained riot officer - we've wasted millions. We cannot in the 21st century retain this 'rites of passage' system.

Currently our only tangible reward for excellence is promotion, which will often take the individual away from his or her field of expertise. We need the freedom to reward staff more appropriately - only then will we be able to compete in the market place.

We must preserve the best of what we have now. We must never overlook the fact that we have some of the bravest, committed, and hard working people currently doing all they can for the safety of Londoners - achieving incredible successes day in day out. We must modernise but not forget what we're good at.

Pay, conditions and career pathways are all factors which need to be addressed. In London we have a new Human Resource strategy which will really move our profession forward. We will recruit the right people and develop them to their maximum potential. We will provide staff with the new skills they need to ensure the safety of Londoners. We will be alert to succession planning and the health and well being of our people. There is much more to the strategy than I have touched on here, but it all leads to **better service delivery**.

We have to become a more modern employer. In today's world surely it is unrealistic to expect automatically 30 years 'of service' in one job. We can't ignore the needs of the family, parenting, and the greater mobility of a dynamic workforce.

NICK ROSS

John has been pointing out how far the police have fallen behind good employment practice compared to the rest of industry. I want to take this even further. I believe the police must be generally less insular and more like the rest of us.

They need to embrace many more civilian skills: in computing and statistics, scientific and technical literacy, pattern recognition, interview techniques, behavioural analysis, geographic profiling, and much besides.

Most controversial will be the opening up of detection. I believe there is no reason for crime investigation to be the sole preserve of the police. Air crash investigators, auditors and many other professions, call for cleverness, good organisation and discretion. Crime investigation should draw from a much wider reservoir of talent. In particular they need to borrow from industry a coherent system for learning from successes and mistakes.

One product of this change will be less reliance on military rank. Individuals will need more initiative, and, as with the SAS as opposed to the old infantry, traditional hierarchies will just, get in the way. The police will discover that, when staff are of high calibre and well trained, old class-based ranks are not as necessary.

I spoke earlier about how police officers must be used a great deal more efficiently before a case is made for increasing their numbers. In years to come intelligence led policing will be the norm. I also believe that 'beat officers' will patrol singly rather than in pairs, which in some areas will have the effect of immediately doubling the conspicuous presence of police on the streets, something the public is very keen to see. Patrols are largely about public

confidence and visibility, not derring-do confrontations. Lone patrols are also likely to be more vigilant and more inclined to talk to passers by rather than companionable colleagues.

In time vehicles will also move to more single staffing. While other industries have hugely increased manpower efficiency in recent years the police have, in my mind, made little progress. In fact the number of offences cleared per officer has stayed roughly constant across time. Any company in car manufacturing or telephony or retail insurance with so lamentable a record would have gone out of business.

Police will also become more systematic in encouraging and working with informal guardians, such as receptionists, station staff, park gardeners and doorkeepers.

As Sir John says, police must scrap the rites of passage system for intake and promotion. A Chief Constable no more needs to know how to arrest someone or interrogate them than the BBC's Director General needs to know how to operate a camera or direct a live studio debate.

Training itself will be moved progressively from the confines of police buildings to colleges and universities. Police will share office space with ordinary companies and share places to eat with ordinary people. A canteen culture cannot easily exist if there isn't a staff canteen.

There must be a huge new emphasis on data analysis and computers. This is even more important than more bobbies on the beat – though I concede it doesn't have quite the same ring to it. But we waste so much of the time and energy of the officers we have. Compared to many industries the police have primitive IT – there needs to be more successful analysis of crime patterns; and a far greater sophistication of data management; in fact there isn't yet even a system for matching dead bodies with missing people, let alone a national database matching lost and found.

SIR JOHN STEVENS

As with so many things we must be balanced in our approach. Whilst the greater use of consultants has much value, many officers have acquired considerable professional knowledge over a range of subjects including 'crisis management', and 'command' through real personal experiences. Hard won practical knowledge of specialisms, such as terrorism, must not be overlooked.

So far we've covered the need to get upstream of crime and the need to change the police accordingly. The third issue we want to tackle is wholesale reform of the criminal justice system. A lack of time precludes any proper discussion on what is an enormous subject. We will return to this on another day. There are just a couple of points I need to make to complete our lecture.

It is fruitless to re-engineer policing and the other linked elements of public service if the Courts, Judiciary, and the Prisons are not complementary to that process.

Crime and punishment tend to be lumped together, but in our view, at present, the courts and the prisons have only some relevance to crime reduction. The existing system is wasteful, unnecessarily costly, and does not give sufficient attention to victims.

Locking people up is only part of the solution to rising crime. Police and partners need to work together for 'whole solutions'. If society is going to seriously prevent or deter

offending, court must always be a last resort. For effective learning or rehabilitation we must explore the alternative disposal and diversion options available to us. It's not all bad news. As Youth Offending Teams mature we are now seeing traditional sentencing being replaced with a more effective mix and match of options, which give the offender a real opportunity for rehabilitation and the community real ownership of the process also. This is a good start. But it does deserve a lecture in its own right.

It is pointless to embark upon long term partnership options to prevent crime at the front end of society, whilst at the other, systems prevail which are out of date, and out of kilter with modern needs.

NICK ROSS

We have suggested that policing is substantially out of step with the beat of the new century. We have outlined a radical shift in the way we measure crime, get ahead of it, and tackle it.

We firmly predict that shift will happen. The revolution has already begun, and growing intolerance of crime and disorder will propel an acceleration in change. The transformation in policing will be at least as big as the innovations seen in manufacturing and in other areas of commerce.

Yet we do not observe these issues being widely discussed by the media or politicians. Sadly, what passes for debate on law and order is generally conducted as though we simply need more of what we did in the past. We need to be smarter – and we need to act together.

Thank you