

***“Magdeburger Declaration“
of the 21st German Congress on Crime Prevention***

**German Congress on Crime Prevention and Congress
Partners**

From: Claudia Heinzemann and Erich Marks (Eds.):
International Perspectives of Crime Prevention 9
Contributions from the 10th Annual International Forum 2016
within the German Congress on Crime Prevention
Forum Verlag Godesberg GmbH 2017

978-3-942865-73-9 (Printausgabe)
978-3-942865-74-6 (eBook)

German Congress on Crime Prevention (GCOCP) and Congress Partners

“Magdeburger Declaration“ of the 21st German Congress on Crime Prevention

Since the 12th German Congress on Crime Prevention in Wiesbaden in 2007, the GCOCP and its event partners have published statements on the criminal and political consequences deriving from the congress' annual central topic and its accompanying discussions on the current development and tendencies in crime prevention in its Declaration at the end of the congress. In line with this tradition, the “Magdeburger Erklärung” [Magdeburg Declaration] of the 21st German Congress on Crime Prevention is primarily aimed at the persons, authorities and institutions that are politically responsible for (crime) prevention in the communities, the federal states, the federal government and in Europe.

The GCOCP already stressed in previous years that crime prevention can have risky aspects to it. Particularly alarming are those developments in crime prevention that may seriously restrict the human freedom of action. The GCOCP therefore considered a discussion on the topic of “Präventionsethik” [the ethics of prevention] as pressingly necessary, pointed to the fact in its “Frankfurter Erklärung” [Frankfurt Declaration] of the 20th GCOCP and finally made the topic “Prävention und Freiheit. Zur Notwendigkeit eines Ethik-Diskurses” [Prevention and liberty. On the necessity of an ethical discourse] its priority.

Prior to the congress, Prof. Dr. Regina Ammicht Quinn, spokeswoman of the “Internationales Zentrum für Ethik in den Wissenschaften (IZEW)” [International Centre for Ethics in the Sciences] of the Eberhard Karls University of Tübingen, together with a number of employees drafted the expert report “Prävention und Freiheit. Zur Notwendigkeit eines Ethik-Diskurses” [Prevention and liberty. On the necessity of an ethical discourse].

On the grounds of this report and the negotiations of the 21st GCOCP, the GCOCP and its event partners

- das Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend (BMFSFJ) [The Federal Ministry for Families, Senior Citizens, Women and Youths],
- der Fachverband für Soziale Arbeit, Strafrecht und Kriminalpolitik (DBH) [The Association for Social Work, Criminal Law and Criminal Policy],

- The Federal State of Saxony-Anhalt,
- die Polizeiliche Kriminalprävention der Länder und des Bundes (ProPK) [The Commission for Crime Prevention of the Federal States and Federal Government],
- The City of Magdeburg,
- die Stiftung Deutsches Forum für Kriminalprävention (DFK) [The foundation German Crime Prevention Centre] and
- WEISSER RING [The White Ring]

provide this “Magdeburger Erklärung” [Magdeburg Declaration].

Ethics as a perspective on security and prevention: In what society do we want to live?

The *report* places the diverse questions of security and prevention in the context of ethical perspectives. “Ethics is the critical reflection and analysis of prevalent lived morality ... Ethics is a perspective on security among other perspectives but it is a decisive perspective: it places security in the context of rightful acting and a good life.” It poses “a twofold question: on the one hand, the question of rightful acting, especially in conflict situations, on the other hand, the question of ‘good life,’ which is always the same: in what society do we want to live?”

“In the last years, we could observe a shift in values towards security ... Security as a core value determining political debates takes an influence on the individual’s way of life.”

From an ethical perspective, security is “ambivalent: on the one hand, security is a high value. Therefore the establishment of security is ethically imperative. Without a basic level of security, a planning of actions, a fundamental cultural development and justice are impossible.

On the other hand pursuing ‘security’ as an objective is often connected to restrictions in other fields,” especially with respect to the values of freedom, justice and privacy. “Trying to establish more security ... these values may be harmed or restricted. A weighing of options raises the question of the price – in the form of money, freedom, justice or privacy – we are ready to pay for the value of ‘security.’”

“Establishing security often causes side effects, which have a negative influence” on the ‘good life’ “and thereby make the society ... less worthy to live (but therefore, paradoxically enough, presumably more secure) ... Security policy and security awareness, security technologies and security practices – they all have the potential ... to endanger those values, which should have actually been saved.”

Thus – according to the *report* – “a rule of thumb for every action of security is: *The solution of a problem should not cause greater problems than there were before.*”

Security and Prevention Are No Deviating Concepts

“The establishment of security is always necessarily preventive since it is aimed at preventing future threats” ... “Security is the prediction of future insecurity and prevention is the resulting action aimed at inhibiting this future insecurity” ... “Therefore, prevention virtually is a necessary condition of security ... The question is not whether prevention is right or wrong but the question is how prevention ... may be realized in such a way that it causes minimal negative (side) effects.”

“In that sense, preventive practices must” – according to the report – “be analyzed for their social consequences and (side) effects: with respect to an infringement of human and civil rights, suppression of ethical and economic minorities, violence and discrimination.” The “tension between security and prevention (always shows itself) when based on the premise of a prevention of undesired futures, actions restricting the people in their privacy and in their freedom are legitimized in the present.”

However, “most concepts of security are not in competition with a civil rights conception of freedom, but are cornerstones of a social structure with defined roles, competencies and rules that eventually ensure the security of social institutions and of the individual.”

Actions restricting freedom “with the aim of establishing security (refer to) a specifically defined but really dominant field”: “the field of prevention and the protection against criminal and terrorist threats.”

A counterweight to this and at the same time “a decisive contribution to the establishment of a secure society” may “be democratic processes and the set of values connected herewith ... A democratic participation establishes connections to communities, persons and values, which can make a major contribution to the prevention of crime – and terror.”

With the concept of local crime prevention, the “strengthening of communal and civic elements”, “crime prevention integrates reflections upon the realization of democracy into its own concepts ... Participation in democratic responsibility always means integration into social communities.”

“Participation creates security.” Even if the “participatory prevention of security in the true sense of the term is always burdened with an insecurity of political and social conflicts”, it will be worth “taking the risk.”

Contribution of Prevention to Integration

These statements from the report confirm the **German Congress on Crime Prevention** in its assessment of local crime prevention as an “idea of impressive rationality.” Therefore, it cherishes its vision (see “Karlsruher Erklärung” [Karlsruhe Declaration] of the 19th GCOCP) that politics and practice are asked to set up advisory boards that should be geared to comprehensive and institutionalized security prevention. Examples are “Stabsstellen für Kriminalprävention” [executive departments of crime prevention] and inter-agency and interdisciplinary centers for prevention.

This demand becomes even more important against the backdrop of the increase in numbers of persons requesting protection since the beginning of 2015. On the one hand, it is mainly the communities that have to handle the integration of the more than one million people because the communal life of the people takes place in the cities and communities. On the other hand, prevention can – and therefore must – make an important contribution to this task.

The reason for this has already been identified by the “Hannoveraner Erklärung” [Hanover Declaration] of the 12th **GCOCP** on the main topic of “Solidarität leben – Vielfalt sichern” [Live Solidarity – Ensure Diversity] in 2009:

“If crime prevention is geared to inclusion and social participation, secures the public sphere and improves the feeling of security, it is and creates social capital: an atmosphere of solidarity, of belonging and social trust, of a reliability of common rules, norms and values and last but not least trust in the state institutions.

Thereby, crime prevention makes a contribution not to be underestimated to the guarantee of diversity, especially in ‘insecure times.’ What is important is to secure a plurality of social as well as ethical and cultural groups, ways of life, conducts, norms and values.”

Considering the current development with its formidable challenges, the appeal of the 12th GCOCP “to the representatives in politics, in the media as well as in civic groups on a local, state and federal level” is genuinely topical too. That is “to be aware of the contribution crime prevention makes to social participation, integration and solidarity, to appreciate it and to support and facilitate this proven way of a clarification of socially binding norms and values.”

Apart from these essential, for the integration relevant traits of prevention, part of their efficiency is that prevention work – at least on a local level – has been inter-agency and interdisciplinary for decades, relating to society as a whole, being able to draw on proven concepts and practices.

There already are a number of projects and initiatives throughout Germany with the objective of integrating refugees, also and particularly on a local level. On the one hand, they are aimed at providing refugees with direct help – via language acquisition, access to the labor market, education etc. On the other hand – and that is particularly important at the interface between prevention and integration – as universal strategies of prevention, they are targeted at reducing prejudices, anxieties, concerns, or rejection and hostility, trying to establish a social cohesion.

Prevention through directly and indirectly acting (crime) prevention strategies, programs and practices

Prevention can make this contribution to integration in particular when questions of security are deliberately separated from social questions. As the **German Congress on Crime Prevention** repeatedly demanded, a difference should be made between directly and indirectly acting (crime) prevention strategies, programs and practices:

With their behavior-oriented and safety-directed measures, *direct crime prevention strategies, programs and practices* are targeted at influencing persons and situations with the aim of minimizing the risk that criminal acts are committed (again) and people become (once more) perpetrators or victims of crime. The prevention or reduction of domestic burglaries via the encouragement of rightful – security-conscious – behavior and the implementation of (even simple) safety-directed measures is an example for this.

Indirect preventive strategies, programs and practices for instance in youth, family, health, social, education and labor market policy do not have the aim and motivation to have an effect on crime prevention and yet they are indispensable for it. Social security regarding diverse social risks can help to counteract crime and the fear of it. Crime prevention work can only be successful when it is embedded in a just social policy – a policy for all social situations.

Due to these strong relationships and interconnections between indirectly and directly acting prevention practices, the **GCOPC** repeats its claim for a development of integrative prevention strategies, for a cooperation of all actors in the field of prevention: civil society institutions, youth welfare, police and justice, education and social institutions, public health, media, economy etc. According to the **GCOPC**, these tasks and aims should facilitate the establishment of prevention centers on all political levels, in the communities, the federal states and on a state level. In the context of these prevention centers, all areas of prevention could effectively work together and lay the foundation for a systematic and most importantly sustainable prevention strategy and prevention policy for the whole society. The **GCOPC** encourages appropriate pilot projects and – for instance on a local level – a provision of funding.

Magdeburg, June 7, 2016.

Content

Introduction	5
 REGINA AMMICHT QUINN	
Prevention and freedom: On the necessity of an ethical discourse	9
 ERICH MARKS	
German Congress on Crime Prevention 2016 in Magdeburg – Welcome to the annual prevention surveying in troubled times	21
 DEUTSCHE GESELLSCHAFT FÜR INTERNATIONALE ZUSAMMENARBEIT (GIZ) GMBH	
Social Cohesion and Integration - A presentation of methods for violence prevention and conflict transformation in development cooperation as a possible contribution to the integration of refugees.....	27
 EUROPEAN FORUM FOR URBAN SECURITY (EFUS)	
European Forum for Urban Security (Efus) in Exchange with the German Congress on Crime Prevention (GCOCP).....	75
 KOREAN INSTITUTE OF CRIMINOLOGY (KIC)	
Korean Institute of Criminology (KIC) in Exchange with the DPT (GCOCP)	85
 RAN CENTRE OF EXCELLENCE	
Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN): Prevention of radicalisation in Germany – EX POST PAPER, RAN Study visit DPT, Magdeburg 6 and 7 June 2016	91
 ALEXANDRE CHITOV	
Buddhism within the walls of Thai Juvenile Justice	97
 JEE-YOUNG YUN	
Legal Issues of Drones used by Law Enforcement Agencies	121
 ALLAN Y. JIAO / JEFFRY R. PHILLIPS	
Police Auditing, Police Reform, and the Federal Consent Decree	129
 PATRICIA M. MARTIN	
IV. JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM FORUM – “Prevention and Ethics” Panel Discussion.....	139

MELISSA H. SICKMUND

The New Juvenile Justice Model Data Project:
Better Information to Advance Prevention and
Juvenile Justice System Reform..... 145

JEFFREY G. GREGRO

United States Juvenile Justice Reform – The Pennsylvania Story &
The Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP™) 159

CAROLINE L. DAVEY / ANDREW B. WOOTTON

Prospects for EU-funded security research –
The ethics of impact outside the EU discourse 171

SVENJA KIRBIS

Preventive support for successful integration – www.pufii.de –..... 197

STEPHAN VOß / ERICH MARKS

Violence Prevention in Germany - Experts' evaluation and perspectives203

GERMAN CONGRESS ON CRIME PREVENTION
AND CONGRESS PARTNERS

“Magdeburger Declaration“ of the 21st German Congress on Crime Prevention 211

Programme of the 10th Annual International Forum.....217

Authors221