

The complexity of the security indicators, due to the plurality of data that must be taken into consideration, has entailed the setting up of several crime and security observatories that aim to offer reliable indicators on the status and development of security from a broader, more plural and independent perspective. In some cases, these observatories have been established nationally (France and Ireland), even though they are normally regional or local (Toulouse, Grenoble, Porto, some South American cities like Quito and Medellín, etc.). Very recently, the European Union has echoed this need and included, among the objectives of the Stockholm Programme, the creation of a European Observatory for the Prevention of Crime, committing the Commission to present a concrete proposal before the end of 2013⁴³.

The lifespan of the existing observatories is still generally very short, and therefore we do not have enough data to perform a serious evaluation. In any case, what is clear is that doing consistent evaluations of the status of security entails a need to work with indicators from different sources and to try to cross-reference them suitably to take maximum advantage of their potentials. An example of this is the attempt by the British Home Office in the last years when, in its annual report⁴⁵, it carries out a joint interpretation of the data from the police records and from the British Crime Survey, with regard to England and Wales⁴⁶.

representing a 52% increase in a short period of time (Source: http://www20.gencat.cat/docs/Justicia/Documents/ARXIU/butlleti_serveis_penitenciaris_desembre2009.pdf).

7 Vid. Beck (2008).

8 Vid. Curbet (2009), p. 15 and ff.

9 Vid. for example Waller (2006).

10 On the origins and functions of Interpol, *vid.* Anderson (1989).

11 On the origins, functions and development of the Trevi Group, *vid.* Benyon et al (1993).

12 Framework Decision 2002/475/JAI by the Council dated 13 June 2002, modified by Framework Decision 2008/919/JAI, published in the OJ on 9 December 2008.

13 Vid. for example, Framework Decision 2008/841/JAI published in the OJ on 12 November 2008, whose objective is to standardise legislations of the member states on organised crime.

14 Vid. Framework Decision 2002/584/JAI by the Council dated 13 June 2002, with entry into force in member states on 1 January 2004 (Official Journal L 190 of 18-7-2002).

15 For a clear overview of the changes in Europol functions, *vid.* DEN BOER (2007).

16 Vid. the Council Decision of 6 April 2009 (2009/371/JHA) on the creation of the European Police Office as a European Union body since 1 January 2010 (published in the Official Gazette on 15 May 2009).

17 The version in English can be viewed at <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2010:115:0001:0038:EN:PDF>

18 Clearly and highly renowned in the Stockholm Programme, currently in its execution phase.

19 With the exception of the one cited in Germany and, to some degree, that in the United Kingdom.

20 Vid. Carrer (2003).

21 Vid. Wilson and Kelling (1982)

22 For a more detailed explanation of the entire construction of the broken windows theory and its transfer to the Zero Tolerance policies, *vid.* Guillen Lasierra (2009).

23 Some authors have argued that the large and underlying objective of Wilson's and Kelling's theory is to undermine the trend on individual rights that has developed in the United States in the years prior to the publication of the article (*vid.* Bertaccini (2009)).

24 In this area, detainments leaped from 3000 in 1994 to 50,000 in 2000, without marijuana consumption reducing more than with other alternative policies (*vid.* Johnson, Golub and Dunlap, 2008).

25 As pointed out, among others, Waller (2006), p. 17 and ff.

26 An extremely paradigmatic case of this controversial trend was the civic ordinance approved by the Barcelona City Council (*vid.* Borja, 2006).

27 Vid. Guillen Lasierra (2009).

28 Defining the policy from the police, we could say, following Sir Robert Peel, that community police employ the basic principle of '*the police are the people and the people are the police*'.

29 Even through police policies aimed at problem resolution, originating in Goldstein's works (*vid.* for example, Goldstein, 1990), are sometimes handled on the fringes of community strategies, they have an absolutely undeniable relation there.

30 Martín López (2009). In the framework of dealing with juvenile violence that we could assess as 'commentary', the author verifies that police action in corrupt situations can contribute to making youth realise that their groups are not as invulnerable as they think and show them the need to select other alternatives.

31 In Belgium, some police zones (Leuven) now use Facebook to uphold communication channels with local university students. In Helsinki, the police is active on Facebook and YouTube.

32 In issue 11 of the Catalan Public Security Magazine (December 2002), there are articles explaining the parameters of prevention policies in surrounding countries.

33 This is still within reasonable limits in Catalonia. Between 2007 and 2009, a total of 209 video-surveillance devices were authorised (including both landlines and mobiles) that were operated

by public police bodies (local police forces and Generalitat Police/Mossos d'Esquadra) (Source: Citizen Security Protection Service, Secretariat of Security, Ministry of the Interior, Institutional Relations and Participation).

34 Vid. Guillen Lasierra (2006).

35 According to data from the British authority on data protection (Information Commissioner's Office), 4.2 million video cameras had been installed in the United Kingdom by 2007, many of these in London.

36 Vid. *Público* newspaper dated 28 August 2009.

37 In this regard, *vid.* Van Soomeren (2001).

38 Jane Jacobs was one of the pioneers. Her book *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, outlined the need to conceive of cities so that there were public figures in public spaces who could carry out the lost social controls.

39 Vid., among others, LAUB (2010) clearly highlights the problems posed by present-day urban planning.

40 Such as the security plans promoted by the Scottish government, Belgium's national security plan and the autonomous community security plans that are proliferating in Spain, after Law 4/2003 was introduced in Catalonia (already two editions) (*vid.* Guillen Lasierra, 2006).

41 SILVERMAN (1999) provides an excellent description of the system. More recently and in a joint work with John A. Eterno, the author questioned the reliability of the system (*vid.* Eterno and Silverman, 2010).

42 It is available for open consultation at <http://www.inhesj.fr/articles/accueil/ondrp/publications/bulletin-mensuel-h151.html>

43 Vid. section 4.3.2 of the Stockholm Programme.

44 The most recent of the reports published, *Crime in England and Wales 2008/2009*, is available at <http://rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/crimeew0809.html>.

45 On the need and possibility of growth of different indicators on security, *vid.* Nadal Gelada (2010).

DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE OF SAFETY IN CITIES

Josep Maria Pascual i Esteve

1. Democratic governance: the new way of governing the complex network society

1.1. Characteristics of democratic governance

Democratic governance is a new way of governing contemporary societies, especially cities and metropolitan areas, which is characterised by managing the interdependencies between all of the agents involved in tackling the urban challenge and in seeking the greatest degree of collaboration and public responsibility in treating it.

Democratic governance differs from the mere corporative management between government and the large agents for developing and managing specific services, facilities and infrastructure projects. Governance is based on the consideration that the city is a collective construction. The city is the total set of relations and interactions between the different public sectors. Depending on each issue or challenge, the public agents and sectors which must be considered will be different and their level

1 The original article was written in Catalan. In this language, like in Spanish, "security" includes not only what in English is also named "security", but also what in English is named "safety". Since "security" is sometimes used in this article as "security" and sometimes as "safety" (actually the argument in it is that "security" became "safety", at least in some sense) and it would be extremely confusing for the reader to change the name every time, the author decided to translate it as "security" in all cases.

2 Vid., among others, Freixes Sanjuan (1992) and Brodat (2009).

3 As we will see in greater detail in the last chapter of this article, those originally known as National Crime Victimization Surveys, which started in the United States in the seventies and in the following decade in the United Kingdom, the most influential, the British Crime Survey.

4 The most recent publications include Wacquant (2010).

5 In Spain, crimes registered by the Ministry of the Interior jumped from 154,170 in 1972 to 1,029,996 in 1989, with constant overall increases. The sole exceptions were 1973 and 1988, in which there were slight drops with respect to the previous years (Source: 2004 *Ministry of the Interior Statistics Annual Report*, p. 29, consultable at <http://www.mir.es/MIR/PublicacionesArchivo/publicaciones/catalogo/anuarios/anuarios04/onlinea/ii1seguridadciudadana.pdf>). If we look at other neighbouring countries, there are similar, or even more pronounced, tendencies. Thus, for example, there were 2262 homicides/murders registered for the city of New York in 1990, almost triple those registered in Spain (Source: http://www.nyc.gov/html/nypd/downloads/pdf/crime_statistics/cscity.pdf).

6 Inmates in Catalan prisons increased from 6924 on 31 December 2002 to 10,525 on 31 December 2009. In other words, an increase of 3601 inmates in a seven-year period,

of influence in the matter will, logically, be asymmetrical. The development of a city depends on the action and organisational ability of its whole; namely, on the ability to collaborate on shared objectives. The purpose of democratic governance is to strengthen the city's shared response and organisational ability in order to achieve objectives based on human development.¹ The following is the definition of governance provided by AERYC (America, Europe: Regions and Cities), the intercontinental movement between cities and regions for the promotion of territorial democratic governance:

"New art of governing territories (the method of governing specific to relational governing), whose object is society's action and organisational ability, its means is network or relations management, and its purpose is human development"¹.

In other words, a way of governing which involves steering economic and technological development according to the values of social equity, territorial unity, sustainability, ethics and the widening and deepening of democracy and political participation.

Following on from the definition outlined above, democratic governance is characterised by:

- Involvement of the public for tackling social challenges. Good governance needs citizens who are active and committed to public matters, i.e., matters concerning everyone. Therefore responsibility and participation channels are needed for all citizens because the city is a collective construction and, therefore, its result depends on the actions and interactions between all of its inhabitants. Public participation is understood to be the cooperation of citizens in overcoming the challenges that a society sets itself, and that has two implications of great importance: it generates a greater force for social transformation and it influences the assessment of the quality of political representation of those who are able to generate spaces for meeting, discussion and public collaboration.
- *Strengthening of public and civic values.* A city's progress and ability to innovate depends on the density and diversity of the interactions between the entire population. The values of respect, co-existence, trust, solidarity and collaboration are essential for building a city for everyone. Democratic governance is an option because of its democratic and civic values.
- *Re-evaluation of democratic politics and the role of the representative government.* Governance represents a change in the government's role with regard to society. The government does not simply appear as the supplier of resources and services, but fundamentally as the representative of the city, its needs and challenges.

The government does not just have competencies, but also duties. It is in charge of everything that concerns the public and therefore is the backbone of the city's action and organisational ability and of the relations between different government levels. Therefore, in democratic governance, the government's function as representative of the public acquires a more central role than in previous phases of governing.

- *Shared construction and strengthening of general interest.* In governance, general interest is not attributed to a group of civil servants or to the political class. General interest is a collective construction which must be led by the politicians elected as the people's representatives, based on the legitimate interests and needs of all citizen sectors. Democratic governance means a specific action of governing so that all of the citizens' needs and challenges are present both when deliberating on and implementing policies, especially those which affect the most vulnerable sectors.
- *Transparency and accountability* are other essential conditions of democratic governance. Without them, the city government will have difficulty receiving the support and involvement of the public when articulating the various agents in a common action.

Democratic governance corresponds to a way of exercising government in which the fundamental is not just effectively managing public funds in order to produce services and facilities for social consumption or use, but to articulate these funds through agreements and action commitments between the agents involved, which subscribe to a strategy or shared programmes devised from the identification of the challenges and needs of the different citizen sectors involved.

1.2. Governance, governability and good governing: three different concepts

The term governance² is often used quite imprecisely as a synonym of either governability or good governing. Governance, as has been pointed out, is a new way or art of governing whose main government instrument is found in managing the interdependencies between agents and in involving the public. It is therefore a non-qualifying term in the sense that it refers to a way of governing or, in other words, a way of exercising government action.

Good governing does qualify a government's action, but this government which governs well may act through the governing method or a different one; that is to say, it may govern well by using the managerial form or it may do so through governance. If this way of governing is governance, we could qualify its action as "good governance", or also as "bad governance", if it uses this way of governing badly or it does not result in governability.

By governability, in a restricted sense, we mean the acceptance of and compliance with legislation, institutional processes and conflict settlements, as well as public sector policies, by civil society and especially by its main agents. Ungovernability, on the other hand, is widespread civil disobedience, institutional mechanisms' inability to resolve social conflicts and the refusal of large sectors of society to accept the institutional rules of the games. Governability is an attribute or classification of a social situation and, in any event, may be a result of government action, of good governing, of good governance, or of any other way of governing which is well exercised in a given situation. It is important, however, not to confuse an attribute or result with the objective method of governing.

On some occasions it has also been put on a par, according to a previous conception, with the English political term 'governance', which referred to the impact on the development of a society of territory that the management of public sector resources and policies had. Thus, for example, the autonomous community of Cantabria has a good system of indicators for measuring the impact of government action on its community, which it calls governance indicators.

1.3. Emergence of democratic governance

Democratic governance is an innovative way of governing which emerges, by being generally or sectorally adopted, through a specific policy, which is increasingly in favour of local or regional governments, yet it still does not constitute the usual or "normal" way of governing. The latter is what is known as public managerialism, which consists in producing services by imitating the management techniques and values of commercial companies. Democratic governance is here to stay, for the previous forms of governing (bureaucracy and managerialism) have been made obsolete by social transformations which call for governance to be implemented, such as:

- *The increasing social complexity of the population and its needs,* due to its greater generational diversity, to the various cultural and geographical origins, to the emergence of various home and family structures, to the presence of very varied socialisation plans, to the large presence of territorial and social segmentation processes and to the development of social individuation processes.
- *The increasing vulnerability or social risk,* namely, the greater chances of being cut off, breaking away or being blocked from participating, at the levels considered socially appropriate, in one or more of the social areas established as basic: work, income, health, education, housing and social and family ties.

- *Social inequality becoming polyhedral in shape.* Traditional inequality, measured in terms of income and access to services, has had new forms of social inequality added to it, such as access to cultural and educational capital and to social ties which generate social capital.
- *The greater distribution of people's knowledge and training.* Knowledge and information society means, among other things, that people gain more knowledge, training and know how in policy development; therefore public sector knowledge is no longer exclusive to administration and is being increasingly distributed into a broad social network.
- *The stagnation of public spending in the face of rising social needs and its complexity.* When public spending accounts for 50% or more of the GDP, it cannot increase significantly when faced with new social needs.

All of this leads us to conclude that traditional forms of governing have expired due to the facts that:

- It is not possible to respond to new social challenges using public resources only, all agents need to be involved and the public need to given responsibility for their own challenges, just as public and private resources and the social initiative must be articulated into networks.
- The distribution of knowledge and social legitimacy render a top-to-bottom hierarchical way of exercising authority or of defining general interest unfeasible.
- The public cannot simply be considered as passive; i.e., as a client or user.

Democratic governance needs to be exercised as a way of managing the complexity through the effective management of interdependencies and social interactions, and the people elected, the politicians, need to fully exercise their role of democratic representatives in order to build general interest based on the legitimate interests of all agents and sectors present, and articulate strategies, programmes and projects by sharing knowledge and challenges, but also resources and action commitments.

2. Public safety calls for democratic governance

The complexity of factors which influence public safety in a city or metropolis entails intervention requiring, on the one hand, transversal action, in the sense that various policies coincide: education, health, urban, social welfare, and on the other hand, the articulation of public and private agents at different territorial levels. In other words, an effective policy on democratic public safety needs democratic governance.

2.1. Two concepts of public safety: broad and strict

In order to understand the complexity of public safety we must begin by conceptually clarifying that there are two views on public safety which influence each other reciprocally:

- *Public safety in the broad sense* refers to a multidimensional policy for reducing risk situations (U. Back, 2008) and social vulnerability, or as we pointed out above, it aims at reducing the possibilities of an individual or group becoming cut off, or that its possibilities of participating in a social area that it deems suitable are blocked. Our societies have been characterised as societies of vulnerability and risk because of their intense processes of change, which furthermore are taking place on a global scale, with more unpredictability and, therefore, less ability to anticipate or foresee.
- *Public (un)safety in the strict sense*, in which we identify two dimensions: one that we will call objective and another known as subjective (J. Curbet, 2010). By objective dimension we mean the statistical probability of a person being the victim of any type of crime, especially an attack on them personally or their family members or property. The subjective dimension is the fear of being a victim of delinquency. In other words, one issue is the objective situation experienced by citizens and another is how some citizens perceive or represent that situation.

These two dimensions don't always coincide. It is usual for situations of subjective insecurity or insecurity to experience a rise while the objective situation remains stable, as a result of the treatment a piece of news is given by the media or the establishment of urban policies based on generating fear. On the other hand, the rise in subjective insecurity, at the same time, causes objective insecurity, as the feeling of being unsafe is generally associated with stigmatising social attitudes towards groups of people or neighbourhoods, which are attributed the scapegoat role and are the object of social segregation. This segregation destroys their social opportunities and encourages them to use illegal means to guarantee their existence.

Furthermore, public safety in the broad sense influences public insecurity in both dimensions, objective and subjective, of safety in the restricted sense. In fact, the situation of risk or widespread social vulnerability always gives rise to higher levels of widespread fear or liquid fear in our society (Z. Bauman, 2007). This insecurity is aggravated in situations of social and economic crisis, due to the rise in probabilities of being cut off or marginalised, and a greater fear is generated which, when not properly channelled (generally it is not), it easily becomes social insecurity, a hunt

for scapegoats, social exclusion and deterioration of democratic values.

The policy for strengthening public safety in the broader sense has a large common denominator with the policy for making cities more socially inclusive. The policy which requires greater specificity, however, is the policy on safety in the stricter sense, especially a safety policy whose purpose is to strengthen the public's democratic and civic values.

2.2. Dimensions of the public safety policy

Policies on public safety, and more specifically on social prevention, have two large fundamental dimensions from the same policy:

1. Those which are directed at the urban environment, i.e., for changing the social and physical conditions which influence attacks between people and their private or public property.
2. Those which are aimed at the public perception-reaction system (PPRS) for reducing stigmatising social reactions and strengthening co-existence and solidarity relations.

In order to show the large variety of components intelligibly and as a summary, we have devised the interpretative diagram in figure 1.

Whether a public safety policy depends more on one dimension than the other will be governed just as much by the social and cultural set-up of the particular city as by the government's ideology and relationship with the people.

The type of relationship between the government and the people is very important for setting up urban safety. A relationship in which citizens appear as a passive entity, namely as mere public services users or clients, including protection services, will demand police action and control measures for the alleged offending population whenever a rise in insecurity is perceived. In other words, a passive population to a large extent demands repressive safety or social exclusion. The opposite is also true: repressive and authoritarian governments bring out public passiveness in order to gain authoritarian control over public spaces, since, as J. Borja (Borja, 2003) points out, over-explicit means or very urgent demands for order make freedom disappear.

On the contrary, active citizens who are civically committed feel responsible and important in the way they develop their city, and therefore, will demand a communitarian and multi-dimensional safety policy which is based on protecting public space so that it is not just a space for meeting and co-existing, but also a space of prevention as well as social promotion for offenders in order

to positively channel explicit and latent social unrest which is at the root of situations of violence. A socially active public calls for democratic safety, safety which is constructed in a shared way amongst the different agents and citizen sectors (J. Prats, 2010)³, and inclusive safety, i.e., that its action becomes processes for improving social inclusion.

2.3. Areas and purposes of the policy for inclusive and democratic safety⁴

The socially inclusive and democratic safety policy will concentrate on five major areas. The first is in reference to safety in the broad sense and the rest refer to safety in its reduced sense and its meaning of prevention⁵ for inclusive safety:

Area 1. Structural or general. This area should serve as a referential and strategic framework for all urban policies, and particularly for safety. It constitutes the action criteria which the policies should foster in order to generate new opportunities for all people and reduce social vulnerability, as well as improved integration of spaces and people.

It contains the measures for accessibility, new central areas in the peripheral neighbourhoods, public spaces for meeting and co-existence, the development of new productive and vocational activities, provision of social, cultural and education facilities, etc. In other words, measures for:

- Building a quality urban environment for everyone.
- Generate new opportunities with positive action criteria for the most disadvantaged people and neighbourhoods.
- Strengthen a culture of co-existence and trust amongst the public.
- Make the preventative policies more social in the metropolitan and regional area.

The general or structural area, which is for strengthening safety in the broad sense, is essential so that programmes or measures related to safety in the strict sense have a chance of succeeding. If the city progresses towards a model which segregates spaces and neighbours, social investments and investments in protection will only serve to justify urban development which is socially and environmentally unsustainable. The option of a sustainable and integrative city model is essential for developing inclusive public safety.

Area 2. Inclusive action. These are the programmes containing measures aimed particularly at people in situations of major social vulnerability, or who are in a state of severance from society or marginality. In general, they are specific culture, sports, health, education and social services measures which constitute important prevention from the public safety perspective.

Area 3. Reduction of social reaction. The purpose of these programmes is to reduce social rejection of offenders, and in particular to prevent the rejection of offenders from spreading to groups of people and neighbourhoods, as well as to prevent territorial and social stigmas which channel social unrest towards mutual segregation and violence from spreading. These are policies which concentrate on values, social communication and on positive channelling and relational reinforcement of conflicts.

Area 4. Activating citizens and civic commitment. These are programmes to make citizens civically responsible for and committed to building a city, fighting for violence prevention and against vulnerability and social severance. They are very related to Area 3 and refer to programmes of community action, to the promotion and organisation of social volunteerism, to programmes of responsibility and active, civic commitment of the public in relation to their fellow citizens, city and neighbourhood. What is especially important is introducing values and transferring knowledge in all projects and actions carried out by the local government which deal with social and territorial safety and unity.

Area 5. Dissuasion. This is about making offending difficult. This area incorporates measures on the lighting and surveillance of public spaces, urban design, police presence and deployment, neighbourhood police, etc. These police surveillance and protection measures take a very different direction in the inclusive and democratic safety policy. They do not involve using the police to control urban space or segregating public spaces, but guaranteeing the broader and more intense use of these spaces by the public. This means that there is no private appropriation of space by violent groups or by those who isolate and privatise the city with their gated urban developments. It involves providing safety in order to guarantee that everyone living or working in the city will make the city their own.

3. Inclusive and democratic safety requires governance

Tackling the complexity of inclusive and democratic safety requires a government approach based on democratic governance, and particularly through the integral articulation of the different projects and public policies, the articulation of public and private cooperation and the strengthening of active civic commitment from the public. In other words, the transversality or integralness of policies and improvement of the city's action and organisational ability.

3.1. Transversality or integralness of city policies

Responding to the complexity of contemporary needs, and particularly to public safety, means, as we have pointed out, a clear methodological option for the integralness of action, aware that responding to safety challenges increasingly requires co-ordinated, multi-level actions (between the different levels of public administration), horizontal actions (between public administration and social and business initiatives), transversal or integral actions (which tackle different dimensions of the territory's policies: health, social services, employment, police, etc.)

In order to progress with the methodology of integralness, it is necessary to consider two dimensions of any public policy's objectives. The objectives connected to the implementation of services and public facilities, such as places in homes, home help, the number of schools or hospitals in existence, the number of police officers and police services, etc., and the population served by these services or facilities. These are the objectives related to developing various services systems: social services, local police service, healthcare, education and housing amongst others, which are fundamentally measured by coverage indicators (percentage of places per population, school-going population, population assisted by home help, etc.).

There is, however, a much more important dimension, which are the objectives that we will term the objectives of impact, i.e., of impacting on the public's abilities for development or human potential. In other words, the objectives which seek to improve the levels of safety, health, social inclusion, education, and which are measured by indicators termed result indicators (life expectancy, population with successful or failed schooling, percentage of poor people among the total population, victimisation rate, etc.).

It is clear that the services and facilities systems (protection, health, social services, education, sports, etc.) are for reaching objectives of impacting on human development. Each services system mostly influences one or two objectives which impact on the development of human abilities, but it is not the only factor which affects the objective. As we have seen in the case of inclusive safety, there are many other influencing factors.

There is a frequent misunderstanding in public policies in general, which is seeing the impact objectives for the public's human development abilities as related to a system of specific facilities. Thus, education is the specific and practically exclusive aim of the system for learning, the other systems can only

help or contribute to the system for learning, which furthermore is designated education system. The same occurs with reducing poverty or social inclusion in relation to social services.

This conception, combined with the usual way of governing, which concentrates on the provision of services financed with public funds, assumes that the organisation of territorial governments is mainly based on the services and facilities systems. In this organisational structure, the provision and direct or indirect management of these services is the basis of political power in public administration. Structured organisation by services and facilities systems involves:

- Fragmentation of government action, since public impact objectives are diluted, and it is also prone to interdepartmental conflict of competencies, which always leads to nothing, in order to obtain greater resources which have limited competency with other departments and to gain competence in actions aimed especially at certain segments of the population (women, children, old people, drug-dependent population, etc.).
- At the same time, this organisation weakens public cooperation with private and citizen initiatives by considering the main political priority to be the management of public resources and not the coordination of actions for obtaining greater impact on the public.
- All this hampers achieving results in terms of human development of the territory and quality of life.

Nowadays, given the complexity of urban challenges, it is very difficult to maintain, in practice, the self-sufficiency of departments centred on services and facilities systems, yet this view or zombie approach (living dead) and the lack of creativity and ability to innovate which is associated with reproducing such powerful and out-of-date government habits, make it difficult to integrally manage facilities organised according to impact objectives on the public .

In figure 1 we summarise this powerful and obsolete approach or view which makes integral, or simply transversal action an illusion, i.e., unfeasible.

Relational management opts for an approach that is both simple and obvious in order to overcome this method (see graphic 2). Public policy's main objectives are considered to be those which impact on the public's human development abilities. These objectives would be shared out among different services systems. Therefore, public policy would be based on the development of projects whose objectives impact on the public and, in order to achieve them, it would articulate the deployment of various facilities and services coordinated for this purpose.

The public impact objective of diminishing the chances of people or territories

becoming the victim of an attack on themselves or their property is, as we have pointed out, an objective shared among employment, education, social services, transport, urbanism, sports, cultural services, etc., in other words, shared among all of the facilities which are related to vulnerability reduction, public reaction and civic commitment.

For this reason, the progress or regression of projects would be measured by social impact indicators or indicators of results in public safety, in the broad or restricted sense of safety, and would complement the indicators measuring the deployment of services or their activity.

3.2. The city's action and organisational ability as a way to achieve greater inclusive and democratic safety

Improving public safety requires a rise in the city's action and organisational ability in order to tackle the challenges of safety and civic commitment in a shared way. By action and organisational ability we mean the public's abilities to associate and to commit actively and civilly as well as the ability of agents to cooperate. In other words, public-private and interinstitutional collaboration in order to establish shared strategies and develop integral or network projects for the purpose of, in our case, improving public safety.

What are the structuring factors of action and organisational ability or, to express it differently, of the collective construction of socially inclusive and democratic safety?

To my mind, given the experience in developing public policies which generate social capital in European and Latin American cities, the main factors are:

1. *A shared strategy on public safety* among the main agents whose interdependence public safety depends on. In other words, it means having a frame of reference for all policies and agents as a basis from which they develop their own policies and actions, as well as key projects which they jointly commit to developing and carrying out. An integral and integrative strategy with clear commitments of action to improve public safety in the broad or restricted sense. A strategy which is being updated permanently, rooted in the challenges of safety and the social inclusion of people and based on the main agents' legitimate interests and competencies.
2. *A meeting and interaction model between the main agents*, adapted to:
 - a) The challenges and demands of contemporary development, enabling unavoidable conflicts to be tackled with flexibility and confidence in finding agreements of mutual benefit.
 - b) The correlations of strength or balances of power between them.
- c) Organisational practices which promote mutual knowledge and respect and which aim for action based on reciprocal commitments. The interaction model between political, social and economic agents is a key element for establishing a city's safety. Inflexibility of the model and relations between some agents can cause distrust and, hence, a lack of strategy in the medium- and long-term. An open and flexible model encourages trust along with social and business investment, which translates into major social and economic development.
3. *Presence of agent networks for the development of integral projects which are key or give structure in order to make progress on safety.* Network projects enable the various public and private agents' tasks to be articulated due to their ability to combine interests and challenges and make them common objectives which are socially useful.
4. *A culture of action and civic commitment* removed from both the culture of satisfaction the culture of complaints, bureaucracy and nihilism. The culture of action must provide:
 - a) A feeling of belonging and identification with the city or region. Have an open collective sense, not closed.
 - b) An attitude which is open both to innovation and to the social and cultural integration of new people as well as to insertion into territorial strategies which are broader than the municipality, region or nation itself.
 - c) Realistic hopes for the future, which enable people to look beyond the realities, if these are negative, and which generate rational expectations for collaboration and commitment.
 - d) Respect and confidence in other agents' actions, which is the basis for generating social capital.
5. *Social support and public participation.* The strategies for safety and the main safety projects which give structure must have an important social support and this will be more effective if it boosts and guarantees public participation as understood in two ways: as a guarantee that their main challenges and expectations in strategies are moderate and as a condition for them becoming socially responsible and involved in producing social capital.
6. *Formal and informal leaderships* between key institutional agents which are able to come together and represent most of the interests, with an ability to reach agreements and earn institutional respect for their decisions. The main leadership must, as we have pointed out, come from the most democratic institution, i.e., the one chosen by the entire public; otherwise, we would have corporate leadership,

from which it is not possible to build general interest, as it is reduced by the corporate. The degree of the representative institutions' leadership in the governance of communities will stem from its ability to involve the rest of the agents and people present in society in the building of a shared future model⁶.

7. *Articulation of local and regional policies.* This is about conceiving the region or metropolitan area as a system of interdependent cities and municipalities which are not self-sufficient, with the ability to:
 - a) Combine local and regional policies, which have objectives and instruments in the whole territory, with local safety strategies, which are able to bring specificity and integrity to the set of actions thus strengthening interinstitutional and public cooperation as well as public collaboration.
 - b) Articulate municipalities not from a set territorial organisation, but in a flexible and adaptable way depending on the network-project, i.e., from the territories that the project development covers.
 - c) Have formal and informal participation rules which determine interaction between regional and municipal authorities, as well as interaction between the various municipal authorities.

3.3. Democratic governance is based on a set of techniques and instruments

Governance and its specific management method (relational management or management of interdependencies) are based on techniques and instruments which make it an effective tool for improving organisational ability.

In a publication of the Section for Economic Promotion of the Barcelona Provincial Council⁷, I specified and explained the characteristics of a series of techniques which have proven their effectiveness in relational management. I will now list these, without explaining them, so that the reader knows that there is a wide range of them:

1. *Strategic plans*, developed in territories from private and public-public cooperation as well as from public participation, constitute a good start for governance-specific relational management by giving territories a strategy which is shared among the main agents and has broad social support. Strategic planning, as understood in this way, actually constitutes the initial phase or the planning per se of interdependency management or strategic management⁸. The strategic plans methodology is a good instrument for kick-starting territorial governance⁹.

2. *Relational negotiation of public conflicts.* Relational negotiation techniques constitute

a good instrument for developing interdependency management or relational management. Relational negotiation is a type of negotiation which takes shape because the result that one of the negotiators is seeking is primarily to consolidate and improve the relationship between those involved in the negotiation, in order to obtain greater mutual trust and be able to develop projects on the basis of cooperation.

3. *Mediation techniques.* Within the governance framework, in which local and regional governments assume leadership in the collective construction of the territory, mediation is undoubtedly one of the resources of professionals working in politics and administration. In mediation, the administration's role is to intervene so that a conflict situation between social agents can find a solution and, in the process, improve the mutual image of the parties and the trust between them. Government action means being the catalyst of an agreement without becoming a part of the agreement.

4. *Techniques for public participation and social support for public policies.* One should move from participation strategies on to participation as a strategy for strengthening action and organisational ability. Of the numerous participation techniques, the techniques that are particularly useful in relational management are those which:

- a) Are based on clear and simple procedures with precise purposes which facilitate expressing ideas and challenges concerning an issue, and of course prevent debates from becoming endless. Participation is method and organisation. Otherwise, participation is reduced to few participants who are not very reflexive, as their interest is not so much to convince as to impose by exhaustion.
- b) Help to generate trust, collaboration and public responsibility in the resulting agreements.
- c) Enable city projects and objectives to be legitimised while enabling important public support for these to be obtained.

5. *Methods and techniques for network project management.* There are fundamentally two types of techniques for managing networks:

- Management of the network's dynamics, which covers everything from the inclusion of key agents to the promotion of projects which consolidate common interests.
- Techniques for managing structures in order to adapt them to the objectives through which they were created and which enable a culture and common perspective to be strengthened.

It is particularly useful for network management to use agent models within the framework of objective-based systematic management¹⁰.

6. *Management of public entrepreneurial and civic culture.* The technology for strengthening the characteristics of an action and entrepreneurial culture among the public is very recent. Nevertheless, there are instruments which make important impacts that can be noticed in the short term. We are referring to the internal city or regional marketing techniques; i.e., that which is aimed at the public's own identification with their territory.¹¹

7. *"Coaching" for leadership which enables.* In governance, what is strengthened is the representational value of the politician and what is required is an ability to listen, discuss, understand, convince, move and motivate for the cause of group action and the public accepting responsibility and becoming socially committed.

Furthermore, in governance, the results of action taken are no longer so much the services than the general level of social and economic development reached in the territory during its mandate and the degree of social unity achieved with the public. An evaluation of its relational management is needed and new forms, new attitudes and new skills are needed for this.

8. *Techniques for building consensus.* It is not necessary to insist on the importance of these techniques in governance. In fact, those previously mentioned on relational negotiation and public participation necessarily have an influence on the consensus. However, there is a great plurality of methodologies and techniques, apart from those mentioned and widely contrasted, in order to be able to use them, by adapting them appropriately, in the different areas in which this new art of governing is being developed.

9. *Comprehensive approach within social sciences.* In governance it is necessary to understand what each agent says in its social context and understand not just what is being expressed, but how and why it is being said. Understanding agents and analysing conflicts from the parties' different perspectives is a completely necessary, albeit obviously insufficient, condition for the proper development of governance. It involves making the subjective base on which social phenomena rest intelligible. Objective analysis of social phenomena is perfectly possible and compatible with the fact that human actions have a subjective nature.

This approach, also called the interpretative approach to social action, finds its most classic author in Max Weber¹² and aims at understanding the meaning an action has for its agent while making the reasons between the objectively observed activity and the meaning it has for the agent known.

10. *Objective-based System Management*¹³. Objective-based management techniques are a good

instrument for relational management, and not management based on formalised procedures to achieve a result, as it involves establishing objectives which are common to a set of agents which make up a social system and, in accordance with these, innovatively specify these objectives in projects that should be managed in a network.

1 See www.aeryc.org

2 Governance is a term which has been defined by the dictionary of the Real Academia Española since 2001 with a very generic definition but whose basis is correct. It defines governance as the "art or way of governing whose aim is achieving long-term institutional, social and economic development, while promoting a healthy balance between state, civil society and the economy market".

3 Joan Prats i Catalá pointed out in an excellent piece of writing (*Liberalismo y democracia*) that historically democrats have not only defended the rule of law and protection of individual freedom, but that since Aristotle they have conceived democracy as the shared construction of the *res publica*; that is, the city as the creation of all those who live in it.

4 This chapter is based on a paper written in 2005 with J.M. Lahosa and under whose name it is published: *City and Prevention: Elements for its Assessment*, for the Directorate of Prevention Services of Barcelona City Council.

5 Prevention for inclusive safety means: "Anticipatory actions (non-prosecutorial measures and actions) which aim to specifically reduce or positively channel (explicit or latent) social unrest which is at the root of attacks between people and their private and public property, and which generates public insecurity and segregative social reactions" (J.M. Lahosa and J.M. Pascual Esteve for the Spanish Urban Safety and Prevention Forum. 2008).

6 See Subirats (2003).

7 Pascual (2007).

8 For a development of this thesis see Pascual (2001).

9 Pascual (1990). In this book I put forward a set of methods and techniques which are useful for preparing territorial strategic plans which serve to kick-start territorial governance.

10 See Pascual (1999), pgs.157-162.

11 See Puig (2003).

12 We find the methodological presentation of comprehensive sociology in his work *Sobre la teoría de las ciencias sociales* (Barcelona: Península, 1971) and also in *Economy and Society*, in which he supports the importance of the subjective for sociological analysis.

13 Recommended reading on the systemic approach is L. Bertalanffy, *General System Theory*.

de Montréal) which has a population of about 3.7 million people spread over 82 municipalities.¹ The territory of the Urban Agglomeration of Montreal, with a population of 1.85 million inhabitants, covers the island and includes 15 towns in addition to the City of Montreal. The latter is made up of 19 boroughs which house 1.62 million people.

Following the successive reorganisation of 2002 and 2005, municipal responsibilities and authority are shared out among the Agglomeration, the towns and, in the case of Montreal, the boroughs. Thus, public safety and the fight against poverty come under the Agglomeration, finances and the coordination of municipal files are the towns' responsibilities, while services directly aimed at the population, such as leisure and snow clearance, come under the borough councils for Montreal or each of the councils of the 15 other towns.

Like all major cities, Montreal faces social problems such as homelessness and drug addiction. Other problems arise from the difficulties marginalised groups have regarding co-existing with residents or other users of public spaces. These problems are particularly intense in summertime. In fact, Montreal, which is a festival and tourist city (around 6.7 million tourists in 2009²), offers numerous events, such as the Jazz Festival which attracts a very large number of attendees coming from the city, the region, other areas of the country and abroad. Among the festival goers and visitors are the young as well as the not so young who, having few or no resources at all, develop various survival strategies during their stay in the heart of the city. Some become part of groups which settle and sleep in parks, which tends to irritate the people who live, work or travel through those areas.

Montreal also has to deal with a situation which is specific to it: the huge mobility of its population. In fact, 44.9% of its population moves house or neighbourhood within a 5-year period, over a third of which move to the city outskirts.³ This situation can be explained by the combination of two phenomena. On the one hand, 65.5% of Montreal's accommodation is rented housing whose occupants can easily change their place of residence and, on the other hand, a share of the population leaves the City over a five-year period to be replaced by an almost equal number of new arrivals. The moves are mostly accounted for by young people who come to Montreal for their studies, people seeking employment there or immigrants. The latter, who represent 30.7% of the population of Montreal, move around during their period of integration into the country. Often, those who do manage to successfully integrate move to the suburbs, just like many young families of the host society.

The population's average annual income is \$30,132, which is higher for men (\$34,525) than for women (\$26,044). The City's population in employment for 15 years or more comes to 853,975 people, 407,165 of which are women. The unemployment rate hovers around 9.1% while 14% of families receive government benefits to subsidise their needs. The rate of low income among people living in private households is 31.2% and 29.2% for people aged 65 years and over. This rate is 32.7% for single parent families with a female parent and 15.1% for those with a male parent. 38.3% of rented households allocate 30% or more of their income to gross rent payments while this figure is 22% for homeowners.

Since 2002, together with the Ministry of Employment and Social Solidarity (MESS, ministère de l'Emploi et de la solidarité sociale), the Health and Social Services Agency of Montreal and other partners, Montreal City Council has established a map of the priority areas requiring intervention⁴. This map indicates the areas where there is a concentration of social and economic factors, such as single parenting and low income. These priority areas are taken into account at the time of distributing budgets, particularly under the MESS and City Council agreement for the fight against poverty and social exclusion, for urban regeneration or for the setting up of pilot projects. Through periodical reviews, this data can be updated and other factors which have become significant, such as elderly people, can be considered. Several partners have agreed to use this map for grant distribution without however applying it to universal projects such as support for local consultation.

2. Crime and victimization

Overall, crime is in constant decline in the territory of the Urban Agglomeration of Montreal. In fact, offences in 2009 were 4.3% below the average of the previous 5 years and had dropped by 15.4% over the previous 10 years.⁵ For their part, the offences and breaches of the Criminal Code in 2009 had fallen by 6.5% since 2005 and by 15.4% over the previous 10 years.

In 2009, 24,682 crimes against the person were reported, which had fallen by 7.6% since 2005 and was 11.3% lower than in 1999. More specifically,

- The number of homicides increased slightly in 2009, remaining below the average of 44 for the past 10 years and that of 56 for the past 20 years.
- Murder attempts increased by 53.6% in 2009, after falling by 32.5% in 2007 and 34.9% in 2008, remaining below the average of 122 for the past ten years.
- Assaults have decreased by 6.9% in 2009, remaining close to the average

PUBLIC SAFETY IN SOME METROPOLIS OF EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

SAFETY IN MONTREAL, A GROUP RESULT

Marcel Cajelait

1. The city of Montreal and its population

Montreal is located on the island of the same name, surrounded by the Saint Lawrence river and lying at the heart of the Montreal Metropolitan Community (CMM, Communauté métropolitaine