

**Василенко В'ячеслав Сергійович,**  
курсант 2-го курсу ННІ № 3  
Національної академії внутрішніх справ  
Науковий керівник: **Козубенко І. В.**  
викладач кафедри правничої лінгвістики

**DELIVERING EFFECTIVE LOCAL CRIME PREVENTION: WHY  
UNDERSTANDING VARIATIONS IN MUNICIPAL GOVERNANCE  
ARRANGEMENTS MATTERS**

For more than a quarter of a century the prevailing logic for local crime prevention has been that since most crime of immediate concern to communities is local (i.e. property crime, antisocial behaviour, vandalism, etc.) then the primary focus for preventive action should also be local. In practice this has meant that those promoting crime prevention action have generally turned to municipal governments as the principal resource for coordinating the delivery of the local preventive responses. This has been based on the assumption that municipal authorities are best placed to understand and reflect the particular needs and problems of their local community and are therefore also best placed to generate and/or deliver the most appropriate prevention interventions for their local communities.

In some countries such as in the United Kingdom and New Zealand, this logic has found its way into nationally mandated legislative measures to support local crime prevention action. In others countries such as the USA, Canada, Australia, parts of Europe and South America, it has simply been picked up and implemented as a strategy that best suits local circumstances. In those sorts of locations, crime prevention action as a locally organized and delivered initiative simply reflects the fact that the relevant policies and necessary services are more directly within the control of local or regional authorities rather than those at the national level. In other words, how local crime prevention action is organized will be a function of the prevailing local governance arrangements.

The development of local crime prevention action in France in the early 1980s is a good illustration of this. This was the period that led to what became known as the Bonnemaïson model of local crime prevention, an approach that would eventually be emulated in many places around the world. Gilbert Bonnemaïson, a deputy in the French national parliament and mayor of a town near Paris is generally credited with designing the first approach squarely focused on providing a central role for the delivery of crime prevention through local government authorities. The Bonnemaïson approach grew out of the work of a committee he chaired comprising the mayors of major towns and cities from throughout France as well as representatives of key national agencies. The committee's final report emphasized three themes: solidarity, integration and locality. The Bonnemaïson model stressed that prevention strategies should focus on addressing the problems experienced by disaffected community members (e.g.

young people, immigrants, unemployed, etc.) by striving to integrate them in to their local communities thereby reducing the potential risk of them participating in crime.

The governance arrangements for the Bonnemaison model involved an 80-member National Council for the Prevention of Crime chaired by the Prime Minister, Departmental Councils for the Prevention of Crime at the regional level, and at the local level all cities and large towns were encouraged to set up a Local Council for the Prevention of Crime. Local crime prevention activity was organized through the development of detailed local plans that emphasized agencybased prevention involving institutions such as schools, housing authorities and employment and youth support services working together with police and other groups. Crime prevention action itself was funded through a series of contractual arrangements between the national government and the local crime prevention committees that also incorporated the need for close interagency cooperation.

The Bonnemaison model soon became a prototype, albeit a flexible and malleable one, for local crime prevention action in many other countries across the world. Clear links can be found with specific crime prevention approaches developed over the next decades in Canada, Australia, New Zealand and some other parts of Europe such as Germany and Ireland. Echoes of this approach can also be found in the crime prevention work of the US Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities and more directly in the National Crime Prevention Council in the USA and through the creation of Local Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships in the UK and the UK's Crime Reduction Program. More recently elements can be found in the new Mexican approach to crime prevention as well as other countries [1].

In practice the international experience of crime prevention initiatives that have relied on strong links with and the support of municipal government is extremely varied. The reasons for this are also varied and quite complex, however one of the key ones is a function of the different powers and responsibilities of different municipal authorities across the world. There are several ways to look at this, but they all point to the need for local crime prevention governance arrangements to adequately reflect the wider social, economic and political context in which they are being implemented.

Municipal governments across the world have different levels of responsibility, power and access to resources. These factors are not just a function of whether the municipality is located in a developed country or a developing one. For example, France, Canada, United States of America, India, Germany, Italy, Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, Indonesia, Malaysia and Australia are all examples of nation states that operate under some form of federal system. In other words, these countries have a national government but constitutionally are a confederation of internal states all of which will retain a level of power in relation to human, social

and economic factors, including some taxation power. Municipal government in these countries is effectively a third tier of government.

Typically municipal governments within federal countries will have the authority to raise some level of taxes but their capacity and responsibility for service delivery will vary considerably. For example, municipal government in the USA will generally have significant responsibility for police, justice, education, housing and health services, while in a country like Australia responsibility for these services will be the responsibility of the state or second tier of government.

The other common model of national government is known as a unitary model. A unitary model is a system of government in which the powers of the separate constituent parts are vested in the national government. Examples of unitary government systems are the United Kingdom, Japan, New Zealand, Norway and Russia. Arguably China is a unitary government system as well, although the complexity of the systems of governance in China mean it is better described as a hybrid of a federal and unitary system. Israel also has its own variation on the unitary government system. Municipal governments also exist as a part of all unitary systems as a second tier of government. However, once again their levels of responsibility, power and access to resources will vary significantly. For example, within the UK local government will provide education but not health services while also being responsible for a wide range of social services. At the same time, police services are also organized on a regional basis with a level of autonomy from central government but without any significant linkage to local government except through designated processes. By contrast, local government in New Zealand, like in Australia, has very little direct responsibility for the provision of significant human or social services and very limited control over any major economic issues.

Understanding how the organization, powers and responsibilities of municipal government varies within different forms of government in different countries across the world is critical to understanding how to go about implementing the appropriate type of crime prevention governance arrangements.

Crime prevention is a sophisticated shared management enterprise. The process for establishing an optimal management arrangement for any shared enterprise is known as governance and the achievement of good governance is a key goal for delivering effective crime prevention programs. Properly placing municipal government into this framework has to be guided by an understanding of what is possible and what is not.

### **References:**

1. Bonnemaison, Gilbert Face à la délinquance: Prévention, répression, solidarité. Rapport au Premier ministre, 1982. Paris: Premier ministre: Documentation française.
2. Homel P. Lessons for Canadian crime prevention from recent international experience. Institute for the Prevention of Crime Review. 2009. Volume 3: 13-39.

3. Homel P., Nutley S., Tilley N. & Webb B. Investing to deliver. Reviewing the implementation of the UK Crime Reduction Programme. Home Office Research Study no. 281. 2004. London: Home Office.

4. Sutton A., Cherney A. & White R. Crime prevention: principles, perspectives and practices. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press. 2008.

**Гезет Ірина,**

студентка 1-го курсу Інституту №1  
Національної академії внутрішніх справ  
Науковий керівник: **Ялова О. В.**  
доцент кафедри правничої лінгвістики,  
кандидат юридичних наук

### **ЗАКОН УКРАЇНИ «ПРО ЗАБЕЗПЕЧЕННЯ ФУНКЦІОНУВАННЯ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ МОВИ ЯК ДЕРЖАВНОЇ» ЯК ОДИН ІЗ ПРЕДМЕТІВ УРЕГУЛЮВАННЯ МОВНОГО ПИТАННЯ**

Актуальність теми проблеми забезпечення мовного законодавства в Україні, можна віднести до постійних, з моменту здобуття нею незалежності. Зараз постала необхідність врегулювання та наукового дослідження функціонування та розвитку державної мови. На сьогодні не має належної реалізації положень чинного закону про мову.

Метою мого дослідження є висвітлення проблеми забезпечення мовного законодавства та проведення короткої характеристики Закону України «Про забезпечення функціонування української мови як державної» та законів про мову минулих років. За допомогою аналізу даних матеріалів, визначити направленість чинного закону та його переваги у контексті розв'язання мовного питання.

Для досягнення даної мети я ставила перед собою за завдання: окреслити мовне питання в Україні; висвітлити проблему забезпечення мовного законодавства; за допомогою характеристики, виявити кроки до врегулювання мовного питання за допомогою чинного законодавства в Україні;

Від початку незалежності «мовне» питання було одним з найболючіших. З того часу ситуація не покращилася. Зараз вже сформувалося нове покоління громадян України, змінювалися президенти, партії, політичні уподобання громадян, але у сфері мовної політики й забезпечення функціонування української мови як державної суттєвих змін не відбулося. Головна причина цього полягала в невиконанні чи неналежному виконанні прийнятих законів, постанов, указів, малої кількості проведених наукових досліджень присвячених даній проблемі. У своїй статті Ялова О. В. говорить, що якщо в державі й суспільстві не виконуватимуть положень чинного мовного закону, то нове покоління матиме наступний мовний закон зі схожими до нинішнього нормами і розв'язання даної