FROM DETECTION TO DISRUPTION: INTELLIGENCE AND THE CHANGING LOGIC OF POLICE CRIME CONTROL IN THE UNITED KINGDOM*

Martin Innes and James W. E. Sheptycki

This article identifies an important contemporary shift in the governing logic of police crime control strategies in the United Kingdom. It is observed that organized crime has become more central to police work and that, with regard to this type of crime, police interventions are increasingly designed to "disrupt" ongoing criminal activity. Drawing on qualitative data from two separate studies conducted in the U.K., the article connects this shift to an increasing reliance on the use of intelligence data in police organizations. The article looks at how "intelligence" has been conceived, considers some of the limitations of the changes that are taking place, and examines the wider ethical and social implications that might follow from these shifts. It is concluded that, although there are a number of currents of change occurring in the contemporary U.K. police sector, the accenting of intelligence-led policing, and the accompanying shift to disruption as a tactical or strategic intervention, is one of the more dramatic changes. Finally, the article calls for further study of the consequences of this shift, especially because it may be associated with transnational effects.

In the Anglo-American system, police responses to criminal behavior have traditionally been organized around a reactive mode of investigation, where the primary objective is to identify offenders and subject them to legal censure in respect of past criminal acts. Studies of this dimension of police work have repeatedly found that the most significant determinant of investigative success is the quality and quantity of information provided to the police by members of the public (Ericson, 1993; Greenwood, Chaiken, & Petersilia, 1977; Innes, 2003). If the police have sufficient information to allow them to easily identify a prime suspect, the case is more likely to be cleared. In the absence of such information the potential for the police to identify and construct a case against a suspect is highly constrained, although the routinized use of such administrative techniques as "taking offences into consideration" and "prison write offs" may partially mask the overall impact of any such inhibitors (Ericson, 1993; Fielding, 1995; Hobbs, 1998; Skolnick, 1966). In this article, we label this the "prosecution-directed mode" of police crime control.
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In Britain particularly, but also to a lesser extent in several other European countries, there has been increasing interest in configuring a more "proactive" and "intelligence-led" style of policing, especially but not exclusively with regard to serious and organized criminality. In the United Kingdom, this can be dated with reference to the publication of the Audit Commission's report *Helping With Enquiries: Tackling Crime Effectively* (1993; see also Maguire & John, 1995). Oriented to the logic of the "New Public Management," which foregrounds efficiency, effectiveness, and economy in public service delivery, the Audit Commission report identified a number of inefficiencies in the police's reliance upon a fundamentally reactive approach to crime control. Purportedly, the aim of the report was to maximize the efficiency, effectiveness, and economy (the "three Es") of publicly provided policing in the U.K. by encouraging greater use of intelligence.1 Stimulated by general criticisms about the "three Es" of police performance, in tandem with recent debates concerning the practical utility of probabilistic risk prediction, a number of European policing organizations have developed new and innovative ways of responding to crime (Maguire, 2000), including a focus on developing intelligence to direct and target interventions with enhanced precision. This is part of a trend that Ericson and Shearing (1986) labeled "the scientification of policing" and has become well known in U.K. policing quarters under the rubric of "intelligence-led policing." Broadly, these terms signify how the technological and social organization of policing increasingly gravitates around a future-oriented mode of social control.

As part of these movements toward a more "intelligence-led" style of working, there is an emergent, and as yet little remarked upon, shift in the governing logic of policing. Instead of aiming at the detection of crimes that have already occurred, police strategies and tactics increasingly aim to disrupt criminality in such a way as to prevent crime from occurring or to reduce its gravity if it does occur. Disruption has joined the list of quantitative performance indicators of agency success, alongside more traditional indicators such as arrest figures and other, new indicators such as assets seized.2 The emerging emphasis on disrupting criminal enterprises can be contrasted with the older prosecutorial focus, and we label this new approach the "disruption-directed mode."

In this article we focus upon the increasing deployment of the disruption mode in contemporary police crime control strategies, arguing that these changes are connected to, and at least partly explainable by, police attempts to make their
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1The New Public Management (NPM) drive has affected policing in the U.K. in general ways that are outside the interests of this article. For a discussion of the impact of NPM on policing see Hough (in press).

2The National Service Plan for the National Crime Squad for 1999/2000 listed "disruptions" as a "key performance indicator" and called for a 5 percent increase in the number of criminal organizations disrupted (NCS, n.d.). Subsequently, disruption has become a primary method of tackling drug markets in the U.K., but it has also been aimed at a variety of other types of illicit markets, especially markets in stolen goods and bootleg tobacco and liquor.
activities more intelligence-led. Changes in police organization under the rubric of being "intelligence-led" have produced a situation where police crime control strategy no longer pivots around the identification of a suspect and the subsequent construction of a prosecution case. Police objectives are increasingly more pragmatic, aiming to disrupt and disorganize criminal networks and markets. It should be emphasized that we do not suggest that the prosecutorial mode has been completely replaced, or even overtaken, by the disruption mode. Rather, disruption supplements, and to an (as yet) unmeasured extent partially eclipses, the traditional prosecution-directed mode.3

This article begins with an extended discussion of the concept of intelligence and its application to policing. This provides a framework for thinking about the turn to disruption in police practice, which is the focus of the body of the article. We conclude by considering some of the limitations of the ongoing changes, together with their wider theoretical and ethical ramifications.

**DATA AND METHOD**

The data reported in this article are the product of two separate research projects, both funded by the United Kingdom Home Office. Study One was an examination of strategic criminal intelligence processes across the police sector in the U.K. (Ratcliffe & Sheptycki, 2004; Sheptycki, 2004a; Sheptycki, 2004b). Study Two (Innes, Fielding, & Cope, in press) was a more focused exploration of intelligence-led policing in two U.K. police forces. Both studies were conducted using multiple-method approaches, including observational fieldwork, qualitative interviews, and analysis of key documents. The projects were carried out independently of each other; indeed, the research teams involved in the two projects were each unaware of the activities of the other. The present article was written on the basis of common themes that emerged from both studies, particularly having to do with the nature and definition of policing intelligence, the consequences of the new rubric of intelligence-led policing for the division of labor within the U.K. police sector, and, most importantly, our shared understandings about the implications of the use of disruption as a tactic and key strategic performance indicator. By pooling our understanding in the process of analysis, a form of convergent and non-convergent triangulation was facilitated that serves to increase confidence in the reliability of the findings and improves their generalizability.

Study One was designed as a national overview of the information processes that underlie strategic criminal intelligence analysis. The aim was to examine the

3The Service Plan for the U.K. National Crime Squad 1999/2000 included two key performance indicators with respect to the agency's crime control objectives. The first was to "improve the quality of arrests by increasing the number of arrests of criminals of core nominal and current nominal status" (i.e., in the vernacular, criminals listed as "most wanted"). The second was to "increase the number of criminal enterprises which are dismantled or disrupted" (NCS, n.d.).
production of strategic intelligence analysis in the context of the U.K. National Intelligence Model (henceforth, N1M), from the ground up. The research team that undertook this project conducted interviews with a variety of professionals who contribute to the criminal intelligence process. The majority of these interviews were conducted in situ in the operational environment, which helped interviewees to talk in greater detail about their work routines. Field observation was conducted over five continuous working days in each of two constabularies and over three working days in a third constabulary. Eight working days were spent with intelligence personnel at Custom House during the lifetime of the project, which, although it did not constitute sustained field observation, did allow for observation of the intelligence division of labor and its relationship to the work routines of that agency. Researchers attended several tasking and coordinating meetings at regional, county, and divisional levels, and a number of ad hoc focus group interviews were conducted. These group interviews were particularly revealing of the interplay between different forms of professional expertise and sharpened appreciation of different perspectives on the criminal intelligence process. Subsequently, a variety of personnel in different sections at the National Criminal Intelligence Service (NCIS), the National Crime Squad (NCS), Her Majesty's Immigration Service (HMIS), Her Majesty's Customs and Excise (HMCE), as well as the Environment Agency and the Security Service, were interviewed. Personnel from the following constabularies participated in the research, either in interview or as part of the field observation: Kent, Merseyside, The Metropolitan Police, Lothian and Borders, Warwickshire, West Mercia, West Midlands, and Staffordshire. A variety of documents were also collected in the field. These included materials that ranged from the tailored end-products of the criminal intelligence process to raw criminal intelligence reports (with nominal data and other highly sensitive information suitably censored) and various points in between, as well as a variety of operations manuals and other documents. These materials came from disparate sources during the conduct of the fieldwork and were invaluable in the further elucidation of the interview and observational data.

Study Two was based on observational fieldwork in four police intelligence units in two police forces (referred to anonymously as "County Force" and "Urban Force") and semi-structured interviews with 30 police officers and civilian crime analysts. In total, two weeks of observational fieldwork were undertaken in each of the four intelligence units. In "County Force," observations pertained to an intelligence unit at basic command unit level and in the Force Intelligence Bureau. This produced an account of tactical and strategic intelligence production, analysis, and use for the force as a whole. In "Urban Force," the units observed were somewhat different. Observational fieldwork was also conducted in an intelligence
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4During the research period this was the headquarters of Her Majesty's Customs and Excise (HMCE).
unit at the basic command level. However, the second intelligence group studied constituted a special task force targeting specific crime problems. Data collection for Study Two took place between autumn 2000 and spring 2001. Data were analyzed using the basic principles of analytic induction.

Studies of police intelligence processes are rare and researchers are well aware that care has to be taken so that reported findings are not detrimental to the operational interests of participating organizations. However, these limitations do not preclude full disclosure of data relevant to the questions being asked here. We are not so much concerned here with the modus operandi of specialist police units conducting sensitive operations (for example undercover operations) as we are with explaining the ways in which the organizational logic of policing has been reinvented as a consequence of intelligence-led, future-oriented policing aimed at producing quantitative measures of criminal groups disrupted. To this end, the data presented here draw fully and exclusively on the results of the two U.K. studies described above.

THINKING ABOUT INTELLIGENCE

As Gary Marx (1988; see also Fijnaut & Marx, 1995) has noted, police practice has always made use of strategies involving deceptive and undercover methods to uncover "intelligence." But Marx emphasized that, whereas such strategies were formerly often glossed over and seen as a necessary part of "the dirty work" of policing liberal democratic societies, contemporary discourses of policing place such methods at center stage. Intelligence is increasingly identified as pivotal to the conduct of effective and efficient policing.

The emphasis placed on the importance and significance of intelligence in contemporary conceptions of policing belies the conceptual complexity that attends a well rounded understanding of the term. In general, intelligence is an informational construct. It can be defined as information that is organizationally encoded in such a way as to make evident the need for, or to enable the conduct of, acts of social control at some point in the future. This generic definition, though, can be further subdivided.

Following Marx (1988), there is a sense in which police have always used intelligence, although it may not have been discursively constructed in such terms. Indeed, Willmer's (1970) classic application of information theory to the problems of police patrol recognized the importance of intelligence in the age of unit beat policing. Willmer noted the great variety of information that comes to the attention of police officers and observed that, as the territory being policed becomes more densely populated, or the geographical remit more widely spread, it becomes increasingly difficult to translate it into intelligence (pp. 24-34). As Willmer described it, the intelligence function essentially consists in the acquisition of knowledge and its processing into meaningful "bits" that lead to action. A product
of his time, he focused on the role of the "collators" (a precursor to today's crime analysts) and their function in interpreting and communicating information within the police organization so that non-optimum performance would be avoided and the full potential of information in police hands would be realized. He noted that several countries were experimenting with various computer applications to criminal records, *modus operandi* searches, personal description searches, and vehicle registration searches, as well as routine administrative tasks, but that "Great Britain appears to be alone in considering the application of computers to intelligence information" (p. 33).

Thirty years later, British studies revealed "the use of a growing armoury of information-gathering, analytical and investigative tools and techniques, including undercover officers, tasked criminal informants, 'bugging' and visual surveillance devices, closed circuit television, financial tracking capabilities, and of course a vast range of computer facilities, packages, and databases, most of them rare or non-existent 20 years ago" (Maguire, 2000, p. 316; see also Maguire & John, 1995). What is more, by the year 2000 information-based policing and the manufacture of intelligence were increasingly well established internationally. Thus the report of Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC, 1997) entitled *Policing With Intelligence* noted that "the ideal intelligence configuration has often been likened to a pyramid structure, extending from a broad based local policing tier through a force and inter-force level to upper echelons composed of national and international work" (p. 7). The HMIC report also pointed out that government forms a strategic view of serious crime problems on the basis of information flowing upward in a number of agencies. (Her Majesty's Customs and Excise was mentioned specifically in this regard.) In general, the report of the HMIC emphasized that "for this model to work effectively, intelligence has to flow freely on and between all the levels and interchange smoothly between agencies" (p. 7).

The distinction between *information* and *intelligence* is well established, but it can be difficult to grasp. Information consists of bits of data that, when combined and viewed together with relevant background knowledge, may be used to produce intelligence, which informs the actions and decisions of policing organizations. According to Whitaker (1999), intelligence is "the systematic and purposeful acquisition, sorting, retrieval, analysis interpretation and protection of information" (p. 5). Regarding the information/intelligence distinction, another permutation is prevalent in the context of undercover policing. As the work of Marx has amply demonstrated (Fijnaut & Marx, 1995; Marx, 1988), it is not uncommon to refer to any information that comes into police hands by covert means as intelligence. In this context, there is a distinction made between covert intelligence (information obtained by covert means) and intelligence product, which is intelligence in the classic sense that Willmer described. This elasticity of terminology should serve as a warning. As the practices of intelligence-led policing have spread internationally and across a variety of policing-type institutions, the terms
associated with it have become subject to some looseness of definition. This is evident with regard to distinctions drawn between different levels of intelligence.

For example, in the U.K. circa 2002, agents working for Her Majesty's Customs and Excise made a three-tier distinction between operational, tactical, and strategic intelligence (cf. Ratcliffe, 2004, especially pp. 4-5). The first type is defined as intelligence product supporting front line units in taking case-specific action to achieve compliance or enforcement objectives. An example is information suggesting that a specific aircraft is at high risk for drug mules (i.e., likely to have persons on board who are in possession of quantities of drugs). Tactical intelligence is understood to be intelligence product that supports national and local managers of front line units in planning activities and deploying resources to achieve operational objectives. An example is intelligence analysis indicating that a specific airport, airline, or route is being systematically used for importing drugs. Strategic intelligence is broader still and entails looking at the national picture—at an industry, or at problems presented by illicit trafficking from a particular country, or at national problems caused by a particular piece of legislation or other new development. As an example of the latter, we can cite references to a strategic assessment on tax compliance problems arising in the context of Internet-based business (e-commerce) during early 2001.

In contrast, during this same period the U.K. National Crime Squad (NCS) was operating a basic two-tier distinction. Tactical intelligence was directed toward case-specific criminal activity and targets, directly contributing to the enforcement objectives of the NCS. Strategic intelligence, however, aimed to provide a predictive assessment of current and emerging trends (Ratcliffe & Sheptycki, 2004), delivering an overview of criminal capabilities, threats, trends, and intentions, in accordance with the organization's strategic aims and principles.

Like the NCS, the National Criminal Intelligence Service (NCIS) also viewed tactical intelligence as being directed toward specific criminal activity and targets. To this end the NCIS aimed to produce tactical products for use by law enforcement teams to mount operations against major criminals operating at the national and international levels. Tactical intelligence was set against strategic intelligence, which involved assessing the scale and nature of the threats from serious and organized crime, identifying potential areas for new legislation, recommending prevention techniques, and forecasting future threats.

In common with undercover police, the Security Service views intelligence as any information that has been covertly obtained. From the perspective of this organization, all intelligence is intrinsically secret. Strategic intelligence is seen as a tool that aids in decision-making and the formulation of policy. Tactical intelligence is any information that aids an area of serious crime in which the Security Service has been tasked. In the U.K. it is also possible to track the
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5 During the period in which these studies were undertaken, the Security Services did not have
development of this kind of vocabulary in the Benefits Agency, Her Majesty's Immigration Service, and the Financial Services Authority. However, because the spread of this terminology to the farther reaches of the police sector is relatively recent, it is difficult currently to locate practitioners who use the concepts with the kind of assurance that attests to the organizational entrenchment of intelligence routines.

Each of these agencies employs a slightly different intelligence nomenclature. Although it is certainly not impossible for agents to think outside their own institutional terminology, such differences are symptomatic of different ways of doing business. Further, because different terminology implies different expectations of intelligence analysis, these differences may also be symptomatic of interagency tension. For instance, HMCE operational intelligence aimed at the compliance and enforcement objectives of HMCE is not wholly commensurate with the objectives inherent in police tactical intelligence requirements. In interviews undertaken in Study One, one example of this disjunction that was often cited pertained to firearms, which featured prominently in police strategic thinking but were much less prominent in the frame of reference for HMCE.

Differences in nomenclature could also be located by reference to positioning in the hierarchy of intelligence processing:

The intelligence that we pass to a patrol officer is intended to task him so that his work is directed, efficient and effective. To a sergeant in charge of a particular area, that looks like tactical intelligence, and the knowledge that he uses to organize all of the officers on the shift so that the whole area is properly covered is strategic. But to me, in charge of a whole division, what the sergeant is working with looks more like strategic intelligence, since I am in overall strategic charge of the division. And on it goes up to the top at NCIS where what I am doing is down to basic tactical decisions, (quoted in Sheptycki, 2004a, Study One)

In addition to reflecting the structured hierarchy of institutions in the policing sector, the distinction between tactical and strategic intelligence may also be a temporal one. On this view tactical intelligence is intended to assist in the conduct of operations in the here and now, whereas strategic intelligence is predictive and future-oriented. Although there are differences in the terminology employed across the police sector, there is some general agreement that tactical intelligence refers to the use of data to inform specific, bounded, and targeted interventions against a nominated problem, whereas strategic intelligence consists of data providing a longer-term vision of the contexts and problems relevant to police practice.

In the NIM definition, the distinction between tactical and strategic modes of intelligence is portrayed in an unproblematic manner. The different forms of any formal power to initiate criminal operations. In accordance with Home Office Circular 46/1996 and Scottish Office Circular 13/1996, Chief Officers of Police and the NCS could submit tasking proposals through the Director General of NCIS. NCIS might itself initiate tasking of the Security Service, and a separate memorandum of understanding was in place to facilitate tasking from HMCE. (See Sheptycki, 2004a, for more detailed discussion of these circulars.)
intelligence are understood as being quite separate. Based upon the observational work conducted across the two studies, it would seem that this unproblematic and dichotomized portrayal fails to capture the important interdependencies and overlapping connections that routinely exist between strategic and tactical forms of intelligence. In defining the context for more targeted forms of action and analysis, strategic intelligence "frames" the production of more tactical modes. Thus strategic intelligence provides a sense of what problems can be identified and how they are to be addressed. Consequently, it strongly guides the conditions of existence for the production of any tactical intelligence. In a similar fashion, though, tactical modes of intelligence, in being framed by more strategic modes, effectively serve as warrants for their credibility and produce specific evidence that indicates the validity and reliability of the strategic orientation taken. Thus, in practice, tactical and strategic intelligence is frequently intertwined, interleaved, and interdependent.

Yet another way of defining intelligence is to distinguish between the types of source from which it is gleaned. This approach has its roots in the traditions of military intelligence, differentiating between "open source" and "closed source" intelligence. The latter term refers to data where there are access restrictions that have to be negotiated, in contrast to open sources where there are no such restrictions upon accessing the data. As with the tactical and strategic distinction, this dichotomous definition is also problematic. To argue that intelligence is derived from one of two alternative sources tells us nothing about how it informs practice, which is the more interesting and vital question in terms of understanding the role of intelligence in contemporary policing systems.

A further problem with the approaches taken to defining intelligence reviewed above is their neglect of one of the most important qualities of intelligence—its potential to be reconfigured and reused in respect of a range of different situations. Theorists of information have long explained that one of the most important properties of information, compared with more material forms of resource, is that information can be used without being used up. This is a property shared with intelligence, and indeed it is central to the way intelligence is increasingly being used in policing systems, where it is repeatedly recycled, refigured, and reworked in an effort to address current problems. Thus the same piece of intelligence can be used to support the arrest of a suspected criminal and then on a different occasion to inform an intervention designed to disrupt the activities of a criminal network. This is analogous to a quality captured in Manning and Hawkins' conceptualization (1989) of the difference between primary, secondary, and tertiary forms of information in policing. As a reflection of this system-level dynamic, increasing attention is being directed to the capacity of police organizations to extend their "organizational memory" across time and through space (Marx, 1988). That is, they seek to routinely collect, analyze, store, and disseminate large amounts
of information, through the use of increasingly sophisticated information and communication technologies (Ericson & Haggerty, 1997).

Consequently, instead of seeking to define different modes of intelligence according to differences in content, it may be more analytically insightful to establish classifications according to how intelligence is used. Such an approach adopts and adapts Goffman's notion of framing (1974) to describe how people organize experience. In a similar manner, we refer to the concept of "encoding frames" in order to capture the ways in which police organizations organize intelligence in respect of a particular problem. The important point is that, just because a unit of information is encoded in a particular way at one point in time, this does not inhibit it being reframed (or in Goffman's terms "re-keyed") so as to be relevant and useful in respect of a different problem.

Our empirical data suggest that there are four key encoding frames pertaining to policing intelligence systems. Criminal intelligence is data that provide some understanding about the identity and activities of a particular nominated individual or group of individuals. This can be contrasted with crime intelligence, which provides insight in relation to particular types of crime, crime hot spots, or crime series. Typically, criminal intelligence is derived from police informants who are themselves involved in some way in the criminal milieux (although it can be provided by "ordinary" members of the public as well). This can be counterposed with the crime intelligence encoding frame, which is most often based upon analysis of police and partner agency data. Third, the community intelligence encoding frame is derived from information provided by "ordinary" members of the public and tends to refer to the "local" problems that they view as significant. Finally, there is contextual intelligence, which is concerned with the meso- and macro-structures of social organization and with predicting how changes at this level shape the environment for policing. This intelligence is derived from encoding data that are in turn derived from large-scale local and central government data sets.

It is evident that the concept of intelligence is fluid, and different definitions prevail in different parts of the police sector. For our purposes here, we will define intelligence as information that has been subjected to some form of analysis and evaluation with the intention of informing future acts of social control. In the process of constructing intelligence, the data are rendered meaningful for policing organizations through the use of encoding frames. It is emphasized that the same piece of intelligence can be encoded through more than one frame at the same time. Thus, bits of intelligence can concurrently function as crime and criminal intelligence or as community and contextual intelligence. The point is that the meaning of intelligence does not inhere in the information itself but is dependent upon how it is interpreted and defined by its users, who are themselves situated in an organizational context. Having discussed the theoretical vocabulary relating to intelligence-led policing, it is now useful to move to the level of practical detail in
order to understand how the notion of intelligence gains coherence within the division of policing labor.

**INTELLIGENCE WORK**

The somewhat arcane and technical concern with defining the meanings of intelligence is necessary because, without it, it becomes harder to understand how the move to intelligence-led policing has been translated into practice. Indeed it is the contested organizational meanings associated with it that prefigure the construction of disruption as a legitimate objective of police interventions.

The key feature of intelligence-oriented forms of policing in the U.K. has been the ways in which intelligence work has been increasingly positioned at the center of the police division of labor. In terms of the social organization of policing, it has induced the establishment of a number of specialist roles for the performance of different aspects of intelligence work. Embedded within traditional police organizational systems, autonomous and largely independent police constables would manage their own work, taking responsibility for collecting information from complainants, witnesses, and suspects, developing this information, analyzing its credibility and usefulness, and acting upon it (Reiner, 2000; Skolnick, 1966). In contrast, intelligence-led approaches create a system-level division of labor, wherein each of these tasks is assigned to a specialist unit. In this sense, then, the emergence of a set of discourses and strategies of intelligence-led policing is coherent with the more general trend toward the rationalization of policing, remarked upon by Manning (2001). This notion of rationalizing the police function captures a broader set of changes. There are in fact a number of co-occurring influences, including the New Public Management ethos and developments in information and communication technologies, by which the various "means" and "ends" of policing, and the connections between them, are becoming increasingly clearly delineated—the overall impact being to exhibit a transformational capacity in terms of how policing is conceived, practiced, and evaluated.

Although these broader transformational processes are important, what is emphasized here is how intelligence-led policing systems tend to disaggregate the police role and to establish units that specialize in the performance of particular functions for the organization. Our analyses suggest that four key functional specialisms can be identified within this division of intelligence labor: acquisition, analysis, assay, and acting (Innes et al., in press).

The acquisition role is concerned with collecting data that can potentially be encoded as intelligence. The following quotation from a research and development officer in County Force gives a sense of this work: "Your job is to collect the intelligence ... that could be tied altogether and given as a problem that's backed up by the intelligence... .Then you have to try to sell that product to an investigative body to take that product and run with it and finish it. The actions are that this
person's going to be arrested . . . and property is going to be seized. But that's outside our intelligence remit" (taped interview, County Force, Study Two).

Broadly speaking, information acquisition takes place both internally and externally to the organization. The latter activity involves sourcing information either from informants or from more open sources, or indeed from other, non-police agencies and organizations. Particularly with reference to the use of informants, there has been a move within many organizations to make informant management a more specialized and professionalized role, subject to systemic and interactional controls and oversight (Innes, 2000). In addition, crime analysts are routinely tasked to source information from within the organization itself (and increasingly from across the policing sector writ large), researching the increasing number of databases that store information and intelligence resulting from the activities of other officers (Sheptycki, 2003b, 2004a).

Once the information is acquired, in order for it to be encoded as intelligence it has to be subjected to some form of analysis. A range of analytic methods are currently utilized by police organizations (see, for example, National Criminal Intelligence Service, 2000; Ratcliffe, 2004; Ratcliffe & Sheptycki, 2004), which are involved in the framing of information as intelligence and in demonstrating its potential for operationalization. One particular example of the manufacturing of crime intelligence that was observed during the fieldwork illustrates the ways in which it can feed into disruption: One "analyst said that there appeared to be some specialization in crime, especially with more organized crimes such as car 'ringing.' . . . She was conducting some form of criminal business analysis in order to highlight the effective points of intervention to achieve disruption" (fieldnote, Urban Force, Study Two).

The application of intelligence encoding frames to information through analysis can occur either pre- or post-assay. By assay we mean the evaluation of the relative seriousness of a problem vis-a-vis the quality of intelligence that the organization has in relation to it. Thus, if a problem is assayed and the decision is taken that it is of sufficient gravity that action needs to be taken, but there is an insufficient quality or quantity of intelligence to impact an operation, then work will be conducted to improve the intelligence base in respect of the problem concerned. In contrast, post-analysis assays reveal the nature and scope of a problem through the manufacture of intelligence, as a consequence of which it is decided to mount an operation against the problem concerned.

The fourth component of the rationalized organizational system is acting. Two basic kinds of acting are identifiable in an intelligence-led framework. Collecting actions are performed to increase the intelligence base of the organization, either

---

6At its broadest, the U.K. "policing sector" can be taken to include not only the police constabularies, the NCIS, the NCS, and the Security Services but also other government agencies that include the Immigration Service, the Benefits Agency, Customs, the Inland Revenue, the Financial Services Authority, and the Environment Agency.
generally or in respect of a targeted problem, individual, or issue. "Enforcement actions" involve an operation against a nominated target as a result of the performance of the other three functions. Our data indicate that an important form of action in intelligence-led policing systems is in fact no action. It was observed in both studies that the number of nominated targets frequently outstripped the resources that were available to take action against them.

In an intelligence-led framework, these different specialist roles occur in different orders and combinations, and they can occur more or less simultaneously. Thus, the processes of work involved in conducting intelligence-led policing differ, according to the disposition of the organization, the issue being addressed, and the amount of intelligence available. In what follows, we will examine how, in certain circumstances, these stages in the manufacture of intelligence serve to direct police organizations to actions that aim to disrupt criminal activities.

**BEING DISRUPTIVE**

As a strategy of intervention, disruption is essentially based upon the idea that law enforcement agencies can engage in actions that make it difficult for individuals participating in a criminal network or market to continue with their illegal activities. As Johnston (2000, p. 61) defines it, "the rationale [of disruption] is to circumvent the formal justice system in order, more easily, to effect the speedy closure of a given problem." This logic was explained by a research and development officer within County Force:

You might have a situation where you have got a larger than life lifestyle criminal who is a major or principal criminal in a network, and your intelligence collection focus is to collect the intelligence around his criminal activities to dismantle his network and take him away from the problem, thereby getting the problem dealt with. But because we can't sell it onto an investigator because of their workload etcetera, etcetera, you might find that that particular individual, who is the principal, could be targeted and could be successfully dealt with by a smaller matter that would take him out of the way for a year or eighteen months. Your major drug importer who you can't get to is disqualified from driving... Then that opens up other avenues to see who takes that person's place... It is the Al Capone situation, it is typically that. Where you cannot get the individual for what his core business is, so you'll get them on other things, (taped interview, Study Two)

As this quotation summarizes, disruption is a way of overcoming some of the problems encountered by police organizations in coping with heavy workloads. It is therefore not surprising to find that, as both field studies observed, as the supply of information encoded as criminal or crime intelligence frequently outstrips the organizational capacity to act upon it, advocates of intelligence-led policing exhibit a marked preference for disruption. Disrupting criminal activities was often justified on the basis that it was thought to require less police time and to create more inconvenience to criminal entrepreneurs. Looked at this way, aiming to disrupt crime networks, markets, and organizations becomes a pragmatic alternative
to doing nothing. Moreover, official recourse to disruption (and its acceptability within police culture) may, at least in part, be attributable to the high volumes of crime that are routinely being reported and that cannot be investigated properly because of resource limitations. This is further intimated in the comments of another research and development officer in the same force:

They have to look at what is their capability? How much man-power they've got to deal with that new problem that you've given, [that] you've identified as well as dealing with the stuff you've already given them... .To some extent people [are] working off conveyor belts... .The packages go round and round and round. We get it to an investigative stage and if nobody's got the capability to take that on and deal with that as an evidential investigation, then consequently what is today's news, tomorrow is history. (taped interview, County Force, Study Two)

The concluding sentence of this quotation is important because it indicates the extent to which police officers understand that information encoded as tactical intelligence has a "limited shelf-life" in terms of its usefulness. This frequently establishes an imperative to act quickly in respect of the use of tactical intelligence products. This belief in the need for rapid reaction can have system-level ramifications, as was observed in some of the fieldwork where information was being organized through the application of a crime intelligence encoding frame: A crime analyst "was asked to put together a time chart for racial incidents over the year. The time frame was short meaning she was not really able to explore lots of the areas in any detail—she explained this was frustrating as she knew there were other questions to ask" (fieldnote, Urban Force, Study Two).

Drawing upon the data, two principal kinds of disruption can be identified. The first involves the entrepreneurial use of legal powers to affect criminal networks and markets. The importance of entrepreneurialism in crime control work has previously been identified by Hobbs (1989, 1998) and Ericson (1993). In the context of intelligence-led modes of operating, the police's powers of arrest are used to extract key players from the market or network. Individuals are targeted by police in order to effect a legal censure against them, but also because of the predicted impact that this will have on the network or market. An example of this was described to the researchers in Study Two:

There was a certain person who was a predominant person within a network, but there was no way that an investigation could get close enough for him to be arrested on the criminality he was involved in. But the research of the intelligence unit found that actually on a driving front, on a mundane driving front, he was picking up tickets for speeding, parking on double yellow lines, things like that. So obviously, he wasn't that clean with regard to his driving situation. So it was assessed that possibly traffic could tackle him. So we had a main person involved in importations of all types of drugs, he had his own network for dealing the stuff. He was also able to provide other items, stolen items for other crime groups, involved in other crimes and none of that we could touch him on. So a week was done by the motorcycle unit, the traffic department, looking at him, stopping him, checking his documents. Unfortunately he's got a short fuse and a temper and he lashed out. He was
dealt with for assault on police and criminal damage to a motorcycle and put away for three years. That was him out of the network, a main player, a main problem for this county anyway. But he wasn't dealt with on what his core business was. (taped interview, Detective Inspector, County Force, Study Two)

Such an approach makes use of the discretionary potential embedded within law and the extent to which the formulation of the law allows it to be used by officers as an investigative resource (Dixon, 1997; Innes, 2003). The example above also illuminates how the use of a criminal intelligence encoding frame involved analyzing information that was already possessed by the organization.

Another description of this entrepreneurial approach was provided in Study Two:

There was a car handler. We did all the usual deployment to see if we could evidence that he was dealing and we couldn't. But through research with [another agency] we found that he wasn't paying his business rates and he had a workshop that he hadn't got planning permission for . . . and he was employing someone in his workshop that was on unemployment benefit... so it was decided that we could possibly look at getting an inter-agency warrant on him. And he was totally disrupted, he even had his workshop demolished. . .They looked at his stock and Inland Revenue came in at the end of it and looked at his paperwork and he was totally disrupted, (taped interview, Detective Sergeant, County Force, Study Two)

Occasionally disruption is combined with more traditional prosecution-based strategies and even the general police social service role (Punch & Naylor, 1973). One case encountered in Study One originally came to the attention of police as a report of young truanting boys causing disturbances in a neighborhood. Intelligence acquisition showed that the boys were purchasing bootleg liquor and tobacco. Intelligence analysis showed that a criminal network was smuggling alcohol and cigarettes and selling the products to consumers from a number of commercial and residential addresses. The assay stage showed a number of "vulnerabilities" of this network of criminal entrepreneurs. In this instance, police action included the coordination of a number of arrests, as well as actions to affect business licenses (on health and safety grounds), residential addresses (for false claims for income support), and vehicle licenses (for unpaid road tax and other unpaid fines). Importantly, police action was a multiagency effort that extended to include the Health and Safety Directorate, the Benefits Agency, and the Driver Vehicle Licensing Authority in order to impact on the criminal network itself. But it also included the local education authority in order to answer the original complaints about the activities of the truanting boys. It must be emphasized that such a well coordinated and comprehensive operation is rare. More often, we were told of disruption tactics as a simpler and less time-consuming way to show that "at least something had been done."

In addition to the entrepreneurial mode of disruption, there is a more extralegal form of disruption used by police, where agents do not even attempt to effect an arrest or submit the suspect to due process. Instead, they design actions intended
to prevent or at least make it more difficult for the suspected person or persons to continue to engage in unlawful activity. One simple way to achieve this is to intensify overt surveillance of a criminal target, but there are obvious limitations to the duration of this tactic.

**DISRUPTING WHAT?**

An important issue in understanding the turn to disruption in police practice relates to the ways in which the problems to be addressed have been constructed. Indeed, the whole movement toward enhancing the intelligence function within policing is implicitly justified by a particular construction of the problem of criminality. Whereas the prosecution-directed mode of crime control is based upon a notion of individual offenders, who can and should be identified and have a case constructed against them, intelligence-led forms of policing tend to understand criminals as being embedded within criminal networks and markets. Disruption is therefore justified on the basis that the removal or "neutralization" of a target occupying a key position is an effective way of destabilizing the social organization of the rest of the market or network. This informs a second expectation, which may or may not be warranted, that any given disruption will curtail, or at least limit, the activities of the other actors in the network. Furthermore, in comparison to the investigation of such matters with a view to enacting a prosecution, the objectives of disruption appear to provide a comparatively cost-effective mode of intervention. Compared with the financial costs involved in preparing for a full criminal trial, disrupting a "known" criminal seems comparatively inexpensive, and it is still measured by performance indicators.

These practices are justified and legitimated by the implicit criminology maintained by crime analysts. This is perhaps best illustrated by reference to the criminal intelligence products that they aim to produce. The most common analytical products are network charts, which map relations between known offenders and market profiles (Innes et al., in press; Ratcliffe, 2004). Such charts can be very detailed, for example showing the connections of exchange between individuals dealing in particular illicit commodities. The unstated orthodoxy underpinning such forms of analysis is a vision of criminal behavior that is situated in a context of relatively stable (or indeed even static) social networks and markets; the criminal activities of the individual offender are supported and made possible through the offender's social relationships, allowing illicit commodities to be acquired, distributed, and valued. However, social networks are much more fluid than the objectified vision of them constructed in analysts' network charts (Innes et al., in press). In view of this, it becomes less certain that any given action will disrupt a network. It may, in fact, create a vacuum in a criminal market for more dangerous offenders to step into.
This potential for such unintended consequences was recognized by a respondent in Study One, discussing the example of a mid-level drug dealer who had had monetary assets confiscated. Dealers frequently owe money to others, and in some instances the pressure to pay off debts leads criminal entrepreneurs to engage in more violent forms of crime (the example cited was armed robbery) in order to ward off the threats of criminal creditors. As a result, what law enforcement officials classify as a group disrupted may in fact, over the longer term, function to exacerbate the criminal activities of others participating in such networks. Furthermore, network charts do not take account of the quality of the relationship between individuals in a criminal milieu. By quality we mean, are cooperating criminals enjoined through fear, debt, or trust? The answers to such questions are probably more interesting and significant than quantifications regarding the numbers of telephone calls placed to and by a given criminal actor. These points are crucial to our understanding of the limitations of the increasing turn to strategies of disruption. It is this limited, although apparently pragmatic, criminology that creates a premise for trying to disrupt and disorganize networks, rather than arresting and prosecuting individuals.

Without being wholly dismissive of what can be achieved by targeting police resources to disrupt criminogenic networks and markets, it is important to recognize that the actual strength of markets and networks, as forms of social organization, is that they are fairly robust and rather fluid. Criminal markets are better understood as recursive and adaptive networks of hierarchical and horizontal relations, rather than established, reified, vertical structures of command and control. As such they display a capacity for continual change, and the persons who participate in them are capable of innovation and themselves have the ability to overcome problems to doing business. This was recognized by some of the officers encountered during the fieldwork. A research and development officer from County Force said, "The markets will reform, 'cause their business is, whatever the criminality is. So if your business is stealing cars then you need someone to take those cars off you. If we take out main player A, it may take you a couple of months but you will find Mr. B. Within a very short space of time there will be someone within that organisation who can step into that person's shoes" (taped interview, Study Two).

INTELLIGENCE vs. EVIDENCE

Many of the key changes taking place in modern British policing are founded upon a belief that enhancing the intelligence function will result in improved performance in dealing with crime. However, as has already been signaled above, in practice, the increased use of intelligence seems to result in a form of "drift" in the objectives of law enforcement interventions. The explanation for the causes of this drift toward disruption and away from prosecution centers upon the distinction between intelligence and evidence.
Traditionally, disruptive techniques have been used as a "fall-back" position in policing when a successful prosecution was unlikely to be a viable outcome. As one officer described it, "We've probably always done disruption. ... I mean I can remember back 20 years where, if you knew that someone was going to do a bank, but you didn't have sufficient details to take them out beforehand, and you thought there was a risk to the public then you would position a marked car outside the bank. ... I mean ... . I guess that's a kind of disruption" (fieldnote, Detective Inspector, Urban Force, Study Two). Such comments recognize that disruption has always been an available option in terms of how the police respond to crime, and this aspect of detective lore has been well described (Hobbs, 1995). However, with the move to an enhanced role for intelligence in police work, disruption has become established as a de facto (and almost a preferred) strategy. From the interviews and fieldwork it was established that police officers perceive a clear separation between intelligence and evidence. One analyst said, "There's a different standard to driving an investigation and presenting it in court. And I don't think very many people here have realised that" (fieldnote, Urban Force, Study Two).

Similar sentiments were expressed by an area intelligence coordinator in County Force:

You need to be very clinical. I'm certainly aware over the last few weeks that I need to be far more clinical in saying we have done our intelligence collection, this is the intelligence, over to you as the investigator, you now take this forward, we are going to move on with the next intelligence collection package. Sometimes we have got too involved, we have got a really good feel for something we are working on, the other parts of the police station have felt that it isn't right for them to take that forward on our behalf and we have then said we'll push it forward and we then get into areas of policing that we shouldn't be doing. I need to be more robust in saying this is no longer intelligence gathering, when you get into that area of activity you are not intelligence gathering and that is the role of the investigation and that is a difficult decision to make sometimes, (taped interview, Study Two)

For intelligence practitioners, a particular advantage of the disruption-directed mode of crime control is that it can be used to avoid the often onerous requirement on the police to collect the substantial amounts of detailed evidence that is needed to construct a reliable case in law against a suspect. More importantly, though, this signals some of the tensions that exist in terms of the ability of police to translate intelligence into evidence. Particularly where intelligence has been gleaned from covert sources (both human and technological), police are often reluctant to reveal a source for fear that it will contaminate its future utility or its safety. Perhaps more profoundly, as Maguire and John (1995) have intimated in their study of how police officers manage informants, acquiring enough evidence of a sufficiently high standard to support a prosecution through covert techniques is often extremely difficult. The effectiveness of informants is based upon their often very close connections or involvement in the criminal milieu. Consequently, the reliability and validity of any evidence that they present is often legally tainted. There are also
obvious dangers in being identified as a police informant, and, as a result, few of
them are actually willing to appear in court. Indeed, one precondition that is usually
attached to informants' continued willingness to supply information to the police
is that the police handler should zealously protect their anonymity.\(^7\)

In sum, therefore, the environment of policing and the criminal justice process
are structured in such a way as to subtly encourage certain forms of police practice.
In certain circumstances, police may decide to forego the prosecution of an
individual suspect in order to preserve the effectiveness of an informant or of
surveillance technology for the future. As an alternative line of action, aiming to
disrupt the conditions and forms of organization that support crime allows the
police to intervene without having to reveal the source of their intelligence. The
shift toward the disorganization and disruption of criminal networks is in part, then,
a response to the intrinsic and inherent problems of manufacturing evidence from
intelligence sources.

Ashworth (1994) has argued persuasively that there have been a number of
legislative changes in the U.K. that have been influential in shaping police practice
and in encouraging the move to an increased use of intelligence. As he documents,
throughout the 1980s there were a number of reforms that effectively tightened the
regulation of police conduct, both through changes in the law and through more
administrative forms of internally based organizational regulation (Reiner, 2000).
In Britain, the management and conduct of police investigative work have been
subject to increasing levels of scrutiny as a result of a number of miscarriages of
justice.\(^8\) As part of these changes, the use of a number of established police investi-
gative tactics and strategies has been increasingly limited and constrained. Conse-
quently, the increased use of disruption may be understood as a reaction to changes
in the legal framing of policing. Police perceptions of an increasing number of due
process controls and the development of more effective forms of oversight over
some of their activities have played a part in encouraging officers to develop modes
of working that effectively circumvent the due process restrictions upon their
conduct. Developing a case for the prosecution is frequently an involved and costly
undertaking. Compared with such requirements, operations designed to disrupt
criminality have the appearance of being far more cost-effective and easier to carry
out. There are, then, a number of overlapping and interconnected factors that

\(^7\)Possible future developments in witness immunity and witness protection programs (especially
where they involve the construction of new false identities) provide one possible answer to these
problems. But there are moral hazards associated with the immunity and anonymity that such legal
innovations imply (Fyfe & Sheptycki, in press).

\(^8\)This is clearly evident in Ericson and Haggerty's analysis of policing and risk (1997). In
particular, their analysis of the effects of the Stitchcombe decision (pp. 324-331) shows how the
burden of paperwork in Canadian police agencies increased as a result of new rules of disclosure. As
a result of this decision, fine-grained documentation has been increasingly required, as a way of risk-
managing police knowledge and work that may, or may not, come to light as a result of disclosure rules
employed prior to or during the trial process.
explain why, when operating in an intelligence-led mode, policing agencies may drift toward disruption.

THE LIMITS OF DISRUPTION

Disruption is based on an assumption that police interventions will destabilize the social organization that supports ongoing criminal enterprise. Several problems can be identified with the application of this notion to routine policing, some of which have already been noted. In addition, though, several other problems are deserving of consideration.

First, the ability of police to effectively disrupt a "criminal organization" (itself a problematic term in that it tends to reify criminal affiliations as strongly structured institutions) is dependent upon the accuracy of their intelligence manufactured through the intelligence analysis process. Data from the fieldwork, in conjunction with the academic literature, suggest a potential for a "refracted image" of the market or network to result from such work. Indeed, this was recognized by one of the analysts interviewed: "Because a lot of these people are being targeted, it means that you're going to get a lot more information on them . . . because they're on the chart, they're going to stay on the chart because the information's coming in" (taped interview, County Force, Study Two). Inherently, this leads to the production of an inaccurate understanding of the constitution of the market or network, but of course the police do not "know what they don't know."

A Detective Sergeant identified a similar problem:

The whole intelligence led process can be corrupted by the banter that goes on and the gut feeling that goes on and the self-fulfilling prophecy, you know that someone can become a Cat B (second-tier criminals) because everybody talks about them and then we start targeting and because we target them they become something that they are not. It is the same with informants—if we think Mr. Smith is doing something and the informant keeps telling us that, unless it is actually checked out and corroborated, you know the whole department could be going in the wrong direction because we believe something rather than know something . . .It is the failing of the Intel unit. When I was first here there was a few incidents where as a result of speculation in here resources were sent here there and everywhere, in my department, (taped interview, County Force, Study Two)

Gill (2000) characterizes this disposition within intelligence-led policing as "rounding up the usual suspects." There is, then, a fundamental epistemological weakness that haunts the criminal intelligence encoding frame, whereby the encoding of data functions to valorize the status of the person whose activities are the focus of the analysis, turning relatively minor criminal players into "Cat Bs" (second-tier criminals) and secondary players into "Cat As" (primary targets) and singling either out for disruption. In effect, the practices of intelligence-led policing may have the paradoxical impact of increasing systemic myopia by focusing police efforts on what is easily knowable at the expense of what is knowable with
difficulty (and is therefore costly in terms of time and effort). The problem is that, because the targets are "the usual suspects," and action taken can be easily accounted for under the key performance indicator of disruption, questions of effectiveness are sidelined.

Research also suggests that crime is not as neatly organized as representations of hot spots and criminal networks might suggest. Hobbs (1998) notes that offenders are highly flexible, usually operating as individuals or with groups across local boundaries. Ruggiero (1996), in comparing organization theory to criminal syndicates, noted that a fundamental element of organized crime was its disorganization and that, in reality, criminal groups were far more haphazard (Sheptycki, 2003a).

Embedded within the tacit criminology underpinning intelligence-based policing strategies and the integral market-based models of criminal behavior is a reconfigured discourse of the criminal as rational actor, whose participation in different forms of criminality is motivated by forces of economic supply and demand. This raises a question that is hardly addressed under the rubric of intelligence-led policing, about offenders whose activities are less structured by the rationality of market systems or networks, and how intelligence can be collected on them.

Finally, it is worth noting the wider implications of this shift from detection to disruption. The use of disruption as a de facto organizational strategy signals a tension within contemporary police work. These assumedly effective crime reduction strategies are not necessarily in accord with the principles of due process. In Packer's two models of justice (1968), due process is based upon the assumption of innocence, emphasizing the protection of the individual against unnecessary punishment. Arguably, disruption prioritizes the ends of police action (the curtailment of criminal behavior), rather than the means of accomplishing this result. As one interviewee described it, "arrests and crime reduction don't necessarily go hand in glove" (fieldnote, Urban Force, Study Two). Therefore, disruption partially aligns police practice with an ethic of crime control, where the principal objective is to repress crime, a consequence of a performance culture that now measures success partly in terms of crime disruption but never in terms of harm reduction (Ratcliffe & Sheptycki, 2004). Although disruption may appear to offer a convenient solution to crime problems, a potential lack of consistency and visibility might be expected to have an eventual negative impact on public perceptions of the police as a legitimate institution of social control, at a time when such perceptions are increasingly fragile and contested.

**CONCLUSION**

In this article it has been argued that the governing logic of police crime control strategy in the U.K. (and possibly elsewhere) is changing. Symptomatic of this shift is the move from detection to disruption. There is no singular cause of this shift, but rather it is the result of a combination of forces and factors, including the nature
of intelligence work, continuing changes in the legal frame of policing and efforts
to circumvent evidential requirements, and demands for policing to become based
upon a principle of cost-effectiveness demonstrating "disproportionate impacts"
upon problems. This article has mainly been concerned to show how the new
practices of intelligence-led policing have contributed to these shifts. Central to
these changes has been a particular construction of the nature of criminality,
wherein the activities of suspects are increasingly understood as being structured
by forms of criminogenic organization. We do not want to argue that the practices
of intelligence-led policing are entirely without benefit, or that the tactic of
disruption is entirely without utility. On the contrary, intelligence-led policing,
broadly conceived, suggests significant benefits for the organization of policing
labor, and disruption can be a useful part of the police armory. However, our
empirical studies make it equally evident that the shift from detection to disruption
brings problems of its own.

In outlining a movement from detection to a more disruptive logic of crime
control, it is important to be aware that there are changes both in the practices of
policing and also in terms of how such practice is symbolically constructed. Put
simply, the tactics of disruption are pragmatic tactics that may well elide the
symbolic business of doing justice. Consequently, there is a need for further
research to look at the effectiveness criteria by which disruption is judged. Because
the notion of disruption can be used to signify a wide range of acts, and can be
applied to a variety of criminal actors, it is not at all clear how the effects of a
specific disruption contribute to the overall systemic measure. Still less clear is
how an annual increase in the number of criminal enterprises disrupted is a measure
of the increasing effectiveness of the criminal justice system. One question that we
would like to emphasize for future research is that of harm minimization: To what
extent does disruption minimize the amount of social harm due to criminal activity
and to what extent do the unintended consequences of such actions increase the
amount of social harm? These are important issues that are likely to gather force
as the result of a range of factors, including debates about the policing of risk and
the recent heightening of concern about terrorist threats. For students of policing,
such transformative logic presents new research challenges.
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