

## JOURNAL OF SECURITY AND SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES

ISSN 2029-7017 print/ISSN 2029-7025 online

2017 March Volume 6 Number 3

[http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2017.6.3\(7\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2017.6.3(7))

### ISSUES OF THE STATE AND SOCIETY SECURITY (PART I): ENSURING PUBLIC SECURITY IN THE FIGHT AGAINST CRIME

Vladas Tumulavičius<sup>1</sup>, Ingrīda Veikša<sup>2</sup>, Jānis Načisčionis<sup>3</sup>, Vitolds Zahars<sup>4</sup>, Veselin Draskovic<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The General Jonas Žemaitis Military Academy of Lithuania, Šilo Str. 5A, Vilnius LT-10322, Lithuania

<sup>2,3</sup>Turība University, Graudu Str. 68, Rīga LV-1058, Latvia

<sup>4</sup>Daugavpils University, Parades Str. 1, Daugavpils LV-5401, Latvia,

<sup>5</sup>University of Montenegro, Maritime Faculty of Kotor, Montenegro

E-mails: <sup>1</sup>[vladas.tumulavicius@gmail.com](mailto:vladas.tumulavicius@gmail.com); <sup>2</sup>[ingrida.veiksa@turiba.lv](mailto:ingrida.veiksa@turiba.lv);  
<sup>3</sup>[janis.naciscionis@turiba.lv](mailto:janis.naciscionis@turiba.lv); <sup>4</sup>[vitolds.zahars@inbox.lv](mailto:vitolds.zahars@inbox.lv); <sup>5</sup>[veso-mimo@t-com.me](mailto:veso-mimo@t-com.me)

Received 16 March 2016; accepted 27 June 2016

**Abstract.** The Part I of article presents the current issues and latest trends of one of the public security policy one of priority – ensuring public security in combating crime. In article covers the main quantitative and qualitative indicators of the present-day crime in Lithuania and in the world; the key problems of crime prevention optimization and legal regulation and institutional problems of criminal process control are elucidated. This research focuses in particular on the importance of creating models for control and prevention of new crime acts. Also, the problems of prevention and control of some conditionally distinguished criminal processes – shadow economy, corruption, fight against human trafficking and violence in family environment – are scrutinized. As a result in this research is emphasised the importance of decentralisation in combating crime; the main guidelines of optimization and modernisation in this field are presented. The authors applied general scientific methods of studying objective reality, peculiar to legal sciences: systematic document analysis, meta-analysis, structural-functional analysis, teleological, comparative, critical approach, generalisation and prediction.

**Keywords:** public security, ensuring, crime, prevention and control, optimization, modernization.

**Reference** to this paper should be made as follows: Tumulavičius, V.; Veikša, I.; Načisčionis, J.; Zahars, V.; Draskovic V. 2017. Issues of State and Society Security (Part I): Ensuring Public Security in the Fight against Crime, *Sustainability Issues, Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues* 6(3): 401–418. [http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2017.6.3\(7\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2017.6.3(7))

**JEL Classifications:** K1, K14, F52

## 1. Introduction

In the opinion of the average EU citizen, “seeking to strengthen the European Union, priority should be given primarily to the fight against crime” (Analysis of the Situation...2008). According to the data of research conducted in 2011, the Lithuanian population among the most important public security problems indicated violent crimes, corruption, juvenile delinquency, and crimes against property. The analogous problems have been also referred to as important in the earlier years, their order of priority somewhat differing (Vileikiene 2012). It is, however, evident that crime remains the most relevant problem of public security. In the residents’ opinion, utmost attention by the police should be devoted to the investigation of grave crimes, patrolling in public places, and immediate response to the received reports on crimes (Vileikiene 2012). It witnesses of the fight against crime being a priority in ensuring public security.

*Crime* is a regular and inevitable phenomenon, predetermined by the specificities of social conditions, while

criminal behavior and some criminal acts (*crimes* and *criminal offences*) are conditioned by certain individual circumstances (Babachinaite 2010). Hence, even though separate criminal acts are of occasional type, individually they may be avoided; crime in the society is an unavoidable socially regressive phenomenon. *Crime* is noted for its stability, social conventionality, unacceptability, historical changeability, latency, systematization, and self-creation (Kiskis 2015).

*Crime* is not only one of the key factors, exerting an effect on national security, but also a common human problem. Commission of a crime violates both a victim's and public interest (Teivans-Treinovskis, Jefimovs 2012). According to A. Jatkevicius (2003), crime is an overall and comprehensive phenomenon; therefore, it should be studied in a complex way.

*Contemporary crime* is not a final outcome of crime development but rather a part thereof, reflecting the political, economic, social and demographic tendencies of a particular period. The effectiveness of the contemporary methods in the fight against crime is dependent on the above said.

*Crime* also affects other social processes, it is self-creating as well – this is “a regular process, characterized by internal order, regularity, and recurrence” (Babachinaite 2010). A high dynamics of criminality, fluctuations in crime numbers “primarily show their variability, sensitivity to most diverse situational factors” (Justickis *et al.* 2008).

Variation in *crime* indicators is specific of stochastic processes, processes where “the magnitude of the observed phenomenon in each particular case depends on a great many of accidental and mutually independent factors” (Kiskis 2014).

In Lithuania, alike in other states, crime indicators are subject to variation, since penal policy, recording procedures of criminal acts, attitudes of residents to crime and committers of criminal acts undergo changes, and, in general, demographic, economic, and social situation is prone to vary.

*Upon surveying* the crime development in the Republic of Lithuania after the reestablishment of independence, an obvious interaction of crime and political, economic and social situation in the state and society becomes revealed. After regaining of the independence, crime has augmented substantially. The National Program for Crime Prevention and Control 2003 by the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania emphasizes that the number of the recorded crimes in Lithuania over the period of 11 years since the recreation of the independence has increased by more than twice. In addition, during 11 years the number of grave crimes went up noticeably and the most dangerous violent crimes – homicide and serious bodily injuries – have augmented as well. The number of crimes committed in public places increased three times; crimes related to the illicit traffic of narcotic and psychotropic substances went up very fast. Already in 2003, it was fixed that the scale of trafficking in human beings and cybercrimes, organized crimes went on increasing (Republic of Lithuania Seimas Resolution No. IX-1383).

*Obviously*, with the legal framework still in the process of formation and organizational capacity and coordination building and efficient administrative experience lacking, the effective crime control was impossible. Later statistical data witness that in the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century crime became stabilized though increment tendencies have retained. *For example*, in 2013, 84715 criminal acts were recorded in Lithuania, this making by 5.6 percent less than in 2005. However, due to the decline of the population, the rate of criminal acts per 100 000 inhabitants was highest in 2013 throughout the period of 2005–2013 (2866). Such increase, however, is also related to amendments in legal acts, in particular, with the enforcement of the Republic of Lithuania Law on Protection against Family Violence in 2011. From 2005 onwards the rate of recorded violent crimes – intentional homicide, minor health impairments, robberies, thefts and crimes committed in public places – has been decreasing. The opposite tendency has become prevalent due to the cases of fraud, their number augmenting every year since 2009 (Republic of Lithuania Seimas Resolution No. XII-1537). In 2014, crimes against property in Lithuania accounted for 54 percent (thefts 38 percent), crimes against health 14 percent, financial crimes 7 percent, criminal offences against public order 4 percent, crimes against government order 3 percent,

and acts related to possession of narcotic substances 3 percent (Kiskis 2015).

Changes in the constituent elements of *crime* have also evidenced societal changes. Lithuania's society and state by its social, economic and other indicators approaching the average in the EU states, crime-related indicators in terms of their quality also are becoming similar to those in West Europe.

According to 2014 data, by the number of crimes recorded per 100 000 inhabitants, a criminogenic situation in Lithuania was similar to that in Estonia (data, correspondingly, 2827.6 and 2872). Meanwhile, in Latvia this indicator is lower (2386.1 crimes per the same number of the population) (Report on Public Security...2015). Comparing crime indicators of Lithuania and other Baltic States in the recent years, it should be stated that the total reported crime number in Latvia and Estonia in 2014, as compared to 2013, decreased (-2.2 percent in Lithuania and -4.7 percent in Estonia), and in Latvia increased by 1.9 percent. Comparing the 2015 data, crime has declined in all Baltic States (-12.7 percent in Lithuania, -2.2 percent in Latvia, -14 percent in Estonia) (Data on Crime...2014). However, these data should not be estimated unambiguously. As indicated in the report by the Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Lithuania (further the MiI), while comparing crime data in different states, a problem of correctness arises since penal laws differ and the qualification of criminal acts and the procedure of recording thereof vary (Vileikiene 2015). The mutual similarity of the Baltic States is predetermined by the same geopolitical position and similar history – political, social, economic, and demographic situation in these countries differ slightly; therefore, it is probable that crime-related data will be similar as well. However, the fact that statistical data pertaining to criminal acts differ quite considerably (*for example*, in 2015, in Lithuania, 3187 public order disturbances were recorded, and in Latvia and Estonia, correspondingly, 225 and 432) (Data on Crime...2014) witnesses the differences in legal regulation and crime recording, as a result of which, unfortunately, it is impossible to obtain quite precise data on the real quantitative and qualitative crime-related data differences in the Baltic States, thus not enabling to identify weaknesses and strengths of each state and to share their best experience. *Attention should be also focused on crime latency.*

According to the 2011 exploratory data, the recorded crime statistics evidence that 1.4 percent of the population suffered from criminal offences. Nevertheless, on the basis of the victimological research data, conducted in 2012, even 28 percent of the respondents indicated that they had become victims of crime. These figures reveal that those offences, referred to by the population, aged 15–74 years, as criminal, were recorded by law enforcement institutions at just some 3 percent–4 percent (Kiskis 2015).

*Certainly*, victimological research data are not very explicit as well since the residents evaluate their experience subjectively. On the other hand, such big difference between victimological research data and recorded crime statistics evidences, nonetheless, that crime latency remains a big problem. In addition to other important factors, one of the key factors determining crime latency is the level of trust in law enforcement institutions.

*For example*, in Estonia, of 10 residents even 8 have trust in the police; therefore, it is probable that the number of latent crimes here is less than in Lithuania where of 10 residents less than 7 trust the police (69 percent of the population) (Police Department Data).

The recent crime tendencies and perspectives in the Baltic States, however, are determined by “objective conventionality, characteristic of economic, political and social development of this region.” In the science of criminology, nevertheless, several groups of factors are distinguished and their objective expression is more or less characteristic of any state worldwide: social disorganization (social injustice, social inequality, social exclusion, religious (confessional) contradictions, transnational contradictions), gaps in the education (family, school (didactic), religious, social) system; low effectiveness of positive informative and ideological impact; shortcomings in the functioning of the law enforcement and penitentiary system” (Babachinaite 2010).

In the last decade of the 20th century the theory of creation of a safe environment was based on the exclusive need to “to fight against crime,” and the most important measures of such fight was deemed to be the “expeditious detection of crimes” and “imposition of “solid” penalties” (Laurinavicius 2001).

*The key task* in combating crime belongs to law enforcement institutions. It is notable, however, that another understanding has been prevailing gradually in the society as to it being the sphere of responsibility of the civic society as a whole (Vileikiene 2015). Upon such ineffective measures of impact being faced, still more attention has been accorded to crime prevention. In the Law on the Basics of National Security, the fight against crime, the ensuring of public order, and personal security within the state are deemed to be one of the main priorities in ensuring the national security of the country. It is stipulated in this Law that “the state must join efforts for a determined and efficient fight against crime, especially organized crime, shadow business, corruption, and drug addiction and thus ensure an appropriate domestic security of the country” (Law on the Basics of National Security 1997). The Law also emphasizes that it is necessary to strengthen the activities of law enforcement institutions and to create new models in the system of control and prevention of criminal acts. It should be underlined, however, that even in the Law on the Basics of National Security, crime prevention, nevertheless, is at the end of the list – only after the necessity “for a determined and resolute” fight against crime. It is by a coincidence or not, but in Lithuania it is crime prevention that remains the weakest link in crime control. Seeking to control crime and exercise its control, the biggest problem is the complexity of the reasons for crime.

*The main reasons and conditions for crime* are considered to be such factors as *unemployment, lack of education, dependence on or intoxication with psychotropic substances, social exclusion and vulnerability, ineffectiveness of the social security system*. In addition, crime is also affected by some positive processes, for instance, the strengthening international relations, growing societal mobility, urbanization, economic development, etc. (Republic of Lithuania Seimas Resolution No. IX-1383, 2003). This serves as an evidence that crime situation is predetermined by the total complex of the processes taking place in the country; therefore, crime prevention is not solely the task of the law enforcement institutions. Meanwhile, certain indicators signalize that crime prevention and control mechanisms in Lithuania are operating far from how they should.

*According to the Eurostat data*, in 2009, *Lithuania* was fourth in Europe by the number of incarcerated persons and the first by the number of homicides (Ustinaviciute 2012). The latter is prominent even in comparison with other Baltic States: in 2015, 204 criminal acts against the human life were recorded, whereas *in Latvia* 87, and *in Estonia* 50 (Data on Crime in the Baltic States in January–December 2015). As L. Ustinaviciute (2012) indicates rightly that even though crime is often interpreted as the individual’s incapacity to adapt to the society or inability to solve one’s own problems constructively, the repeat crime “shows not only the individual’s but also the society’s failure.”

*Aiming* to reduce the risk of repeat crime, effective strategies for crime reduction, based on the efficient principles of correction, should be implemented. Correction shall be applied in respect of the offenders causing the highest risk of damage; the criminogenic needs of the offenders of law, relevant to crime, shall be identified, and with account taken thereof interventions should be applied; it is obligatory to apply interventions only in a manner acceptable to the offender, they should comply with the capacities and training style of the offender (Ustinaviciute 2012). Only upon having implemented such systems, it is possible to ensure crime control.

*Contemporary crime*, under the action of globalization processes, is not solely the problem related to the domestic security of states.

According to the *United Nations Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention*, economic globalization in the last decades has made an impact on crime globalization as well. A free and open market as never before incited an economic growth and simultaneously opened unlimited opportunities for incidence of shadow business. Organized crime itself is being diversified and globalized, and organized crime groups are becoming a problem and a threat to international security.

*Transnational organized crime* at the same time instigates corruption and becomes infiltrated into business and politics, thus impeding the sustainable development of economy (The Globalization of Crime...2010).

*Lithuania*, owing to her geopolitical position, is subject to being influenced by these processes. *For example*, as

concerns drug-related crimes, the major amount of amphetamine is produced in Belgium, the Netherlands, Poland and the Baltic countries, and methamphetamine in the Baltic countries and Central Europe. The production of methamphetamine, whose primary precursor is BMK (benzylmethylketone), is concentrated in Lithuania, and from here it is exported mostly to the North European countries (European Drug Consumption...2015).

*This witnesses* the need for the qualitatively new crime prevention and control mechanisms. However, previously it is expedient to make a survey of the existing crime prevention and control systems.

## 2. Crime prevention and control

The National Program for Crime Prevention and Control 2003 defines *crime prevention* as “a measure of effect on crime aiming to prevent offences by identifying and eliminating the general causes and conditions of offences, as well as by making an individual influence on persons who tend to commit offences or who may become offenders or victims of offences in the future” (Republic of Lithuania Seimas Resolution No. IX-1383, 2003).

Meanwhile, *crime control* is specified as “a measure of effect on crime aiming to reduce crime and prevent the exceeding of its socially acceptable level by active actions of law-enforcement institutions and penal sanctions, as well as by active administrative, economical, social, and other measures”. It is also notable that these measures are complementing one another and making “an all-encompassing complex of modes, methods, and measures aiming to make a destructive effect on crime” (Republic of Lithuania Seimas Resolution No. IX-1383, 2003).

*The aim of crime prevention* is the overcoming of crime causes and conditions, and crime control is the regulation of on-going criminal processes, the emergence whereof was failed to be prevented. In the National Crime Prevention and Control Program for 2003, the main principles are indicated to be followed during crime control and prevention: respect to the rights and freedoms of each legal entity, legality, unavoidability of liability, systematic approach, guaranteeing of maintenance, effectiveness and economical reasonability, complexity, involvement of all society members, systematic activities, flexibility and innovation of activities, continuity, priority to the promotion of positive behavior, reducing of possibilities to commit an offence and increasing of a probability to detect an offence and scientific reasonability.

*Attention should be devoted* to the fact that even though the identification of such principles in essence should be assessed positively, it is not expedient to distinguish all of them. For example, guaranteeing the maintenance of crime control and prevention is not the principle of such activities but rather the condition of guaranteeing, which is the duty of the state. Likewise, reducing the opportunities for commission of an offence and increasing the probability to detect an offence is not the principle of crime control and prevention, but the goal of such activity. The principle of involvement of all society members in these activities is also subject to criticism, though it is not disputable that crime control and prevention should involve not only law enforcement institutions but also residents; however, it is hardly possible and expedient to ensure the involvement of each member of the society.

*It is assumptive* that in the system of principles under study it would be more expedient to emphasize the importance of inter-institutional cooperation.

*On the other hand*, a definite advantage of the Program for 2003 was quite exhaustive state regulation in the field of crime prevention and control. The Program also underlines the necessity to apply the principles of systematic activities and complexity, to tackle crime prevention and control tasks by identifying different socio-economic and legal policy trends. Such trends cover economic, employment, family, youth, education, legislation, criminal and penitentiary, resocialization of previously convicted persons and social legal protection of crime victim policy.

*Nevertheless, it is possible to state* that the Program for 2003 was in good compliance with the real situation of the period, whereas provisions thereof today are insufficient. Therefore, the new legal acts have been adopted whereby this gap is aimed to be filled.

*Primarily*, mention should be made of the Inter-institutional Action Plan for Implementation of the National Program for Crime Prevention and Control, adopted by Resolution of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania in 2012 (No. 1381), its designation being to reduce and stabilize the incidence of socially unacceptable criminogenic processes.

*The Resolution* highlights the possible enhancement of cases of threatened trafficking in human beings and a threat for spreading of new forms of trafficking in human beings. It is pointed out that an inter-institutional action plan is designed *to ensure* the efficient program implementation, *to retain* its continuity, *to improve* consistently and effectively the system of crime prevention and control, *to increase* the residents' safety through inter-institutional cooperation, *to use* effectively financial and human resources, and to enhance the effectiveness of crime prevention and control.

*The Resolution* also identifies the priority trends of the Inter-institutional Action Plan: improvement of the crime prevention and control system (including prevention of involvement of minors in a criminal act; more effective expropriation by the state of illegally acquired property, improvement of the property recovery and seizure system and pre-trial investigation effectiveness assessment methods; organization of strengthening the prevention measures intended for protecting the residents' property; stimulation of scientific research by improving the crime prevention system; training of crime prevention subjects, development of international cooperation; improvement of the system for prevention and control of convicted persons' behavior at the places of imprisonment); as well as strengthening of the fight against trafficking in human beings.

The coordination in implementing the Inter-Institutional Action Plan is delegated to the Ministry of the Interior. As concerns the Inter-Institutional Action Plan, it is evident that it has been adopted after noticing certain imperfections in the Program 2003. Of prime importance for the Inter-Institutional Action Plan is to improve mutual institutional cooperation in combating crime. Another trait, however, is noticed, namely, the problem of trafficking in human beings is distinguished here.

*It is possible to state* that prominence given to this problem pertains to the intention to put forward the growing problem of globalization and in order to tackle it the institutional efforts for coordination of actions is necessary at a national and international level.

*On the other hand*, in the Inter-Institutional Action Plan the emphasis being exclusively placed on human trafficking rather than on transnational organized crime is hardly reasonable. It is also noteworthy that the Inter-Institutional Action Plan, rather wide in scope though, was a mall-sized document where problem-tackling strategies, omitted in the Program 2003, could be hardly laid out comprehensively. Thus, this document already reflects the perception of non-compliance of the Program 2003 to the real situation of the period.

*It is natural* that this was the reason to adopt the new Public Security Development Program for 2015–2025 (Republic of Lithuania Seimas Resolution No. XII-1682, 2015). Here it is also stated that the aim of the National Program for Crime Prevention and Control, being implemented since 2003, to create a new model of the crime prevention and control system (principles, priorities, entities, methods of organization and management) has not been implemented. However, certain anticipated program implementation results have been achieved, *for example*, increase in the number of criminal acts was stabilized; according to the poll data, the subjective sense of security became enhanced; and trust in law enforcement institutions increased, the measures, implemented under the program, also made “premises for expanding the prevention activities of state institutions and agencies and propagating the importance of these activities; increasing the active involvement of municipalities in tackling issues relating to ensuring public security and a safe residential environment; enhancing the capacities of competent state institutions and agencies in the field of crime prevention and control and also increasing the effectiveness of the crime prevention and control system” (Republic of Lithuania Seimas Resolution No. XII-1682, 2015).

*Irrespective of the positive qualities* of the Program 2003, evidently, the adoption of the Public Security Development Program for 2015–2025 was due to the lack of the timely strategic instrument.

*On the other hand*, a problem faced is such that even though a special emphasis in the new program is placed on the present-day social processes, impacting variations in crime; the new program is not exclusively designed to modernize the measures for combating crime – on the contrary, some other issues relevant to ensuring public security are also discussed in the program. Moreover, crime control and prevention measures are not so comprehensively regulated as in the Program 2003. The Program for 2015–2025 remains rather a general instrument of strategic type, specifying thereof but not elaborating in too much detail the priority development of public security, *inter alia* trends in crime control and prevention.

*This presupposes a conclusion to be made* that a stimulus for a strategic document, analogous to the National Program for Crime Prevention and Control 2003, nonetheless exists, and it should contain the elaborate crime prevention and control measures, with allowance for contemporary tendencies and already achieved results of the previous program.

*It is assumptive* that utmost attention in the new National Program for Crime Prevention and Control should be devoted to overcoming repeat crime since the present situation, when the number of persons who committed repeat crimes is high, “may be one of the indicators of insufficiently effective criminal justice and prevention activities” (Justickaja 2009). Hence, very special attention should be focused on reforming the penal system. Substantial attention should be also devoted to crime prevention optimization.

*In summary*, the National Program for Crime Prevention and Control 2003 encompasses the reinforced crime prevention and control measures, the elaborated main principle of this activity, the underlined necessity to apply the principles of systematic approach and complexity, crime prevention and control tasks while identifying different socio-economic and legal policy trends.

*Substantial results have been achieved in implementing this program*: crime situation has been balanced, and trust in law enforcement institutions has increased.

*On the other hand*, the need for modernization conditioned the approval of the Inter-Institutional Action Plan for Implementation of the National Crime Prevention and Control Program 2012. This document, while quite narrow in scope, is aimed not only at improving the inter-institutional cooperation but also at starting to focus on the globalization-related problems, especially a threat of human trafficking.

*Necessity to take into account* the period tendencies predetermined the adoption of the Public Security Development Program for 2015–2025. However, the fact that in this program, contrary to the National Program for Crime Prevention and Control 2003, crime prevention and control measures were not exhaustively detailed presupposes the conclusion to be made that the need for a program targeted exactly towards crime prevention and control measures exists, the key attention whereof would be devoted to solving the problems of optimizing the reduction of crime prevention and repeat crime by reforming the penal system in compliance with contemporary tendencies.

## **2.1. Crime prevention optimization problems**

Priority of crime prevention primarily is related to the Western values of democracy. Therefore, no wonder, that special attention is devoted to this area at the EU level. Crime prevention in the Lisbon Treaty is referred to “among the key building blocks to establish and maintain an area of freedom, security and justice” (Report from the Commission...2012).

Also, the Stockholm Program reiterated the importance of crime prevention, and by Council Decision 2001/427/TVR, which was repealed by Council Decision 2009/902/TVR, the European Crime Prevention Network was set up aiming at facilitating cooperation, maintaining contacts and exchange of information and experience in the field of crime prevention

However, the declarative reiteration of prevention importance is not enough to achieve the targeted results. In Eastern Europe, in difference from West European countries, possessing long-term democracy traditions, crime prevention was accorded traditionally less attention. Accordingly, penal policy by the duration of imprisonment and the number of prisoners is somewhat stricter than in Western Europe since it is traditionally deemed to be a proper reaction to crimes.

The below-given figure shows that in Lithuania and other Baltic States a level of imprisonment is one of the highest in Europe – it is higher just in two states – Russia and Belarus (see Fig. 1).

*It is evident* that the existing situation is not compatible with the priorities of Lithuania as an integral part of the EU. As noted by Latvian researchers V. Zahars and M. Stivrenieks (2012), in the contemporary doctrine and practice it is still more acknowledged that application of the penalty of imprisonment is not only ineffective but also has a negative impact on the individuality of convicts, and it is difficult to neutralize such impact both by the internal procedures established in the imprisonment facilities and by resocialization programs.



Fig. 1. Level of imprisonment in the European states.

Source: author created by Kiskis, 2015.

A high level of imprisonment witnesses not only the high recidivism of crimes but first of all the inadequate reaction to crime when focus is towards fighting consequences rather than causes. What is more, a high level of imprisonment reflects not only the improper methods for ensuring the fight against crime and safety of the society in this field, this being one of the key obstacles in the prevention effectiveness (since persons after serv-



ing the imprisonment term experience stigmatization and get resocialized with much more difficulty), but also the inefficiency of prevention *per se* since it is related to high crime recidivism.

This predetermines the need to be in search of opportunities for optimizing crime prevention, first of all, by identifying the problems in this field.

*It is notable* that the development of prevention measures and their spontaneous implementation alone is far from being enough for achieving the expected results. As stated by S. Justickaja, “the previously not critically acceptable assumption that any prevention, if it is effected at a rather broad scale, ensures eventually crime reduction started to raise still more doubts” (Justickaja 2011). For this reason, research into the effectiveness of prevention measures is significant, since it helps to identify what prevention measures are actually important and into which it is expedient to invest.

*For example*, in 1996, during scientific research in the USA it was clarified that “a major part of the most applicable and popular prevention measures are completely inefficient. All “verbal,” “educational” prevention measures turned out to be inefficient. No positive effect was also made by youth activities, their recreational organization programs, as well as by legal education, guardianship of problematic juveniles and youth and many other prevention measures, the efficiency whereof previously was not doubted” (Justickaja 2011).

*Certainly*, this does not mean anyway that such prevention measures are inefficient *per se*, but it is necessary to study and identify the efficiency of specific measures, thus proceeding to the presumption of inefficiency of prevention measures.

*It is notable* that periodical assessment of the effectiveness of prevention measures would help distribute rationally not only material resources but would also ensure that state institutions, responsible for crime prevention, would operate expediently and purposefully. It would be thus ensured that funds and efforts would be “allocated only to those prevention programs and measures, the effectiveness thereof is diligently and comprehensively proved by the methods of contemporary prevention science” (Justickaja 2011).

According to S. Justickaja (2011), the perception of renovation of the mandatory crime prevention system is observed in Lithuania, and it is reflected in the program-based strategic state documents and methodical teaching aids. Nevertheless, the question arises of how this perception is implemented in practice by choosing proper crime prevention measures and organizing the operation of institutions in this field.

As correctly noticed by V. Justickis *et al.* (2008), crime prevention in Lithuania has faced numerous most variegated problems, characteristic not only of Lithuania but also of many other states. Such problems include lack of funds and well-trained and qualified staff, absence of proper administration skills, etc.

These problems quite often are emphasized to a high degree both in scholarly literature and in publicist writings, thereby substantiating crime prevention ineffectiveness, and thus preventing the search of constructive solutions since the possibility of resolving these problems is circumscribed by the objective circumstances.

*It is notable* that said problems are inevitably being solved. The improving economic situation in the country, the acquisition of required administrative skills, etc. are indicative of this. Here, however, mention as important should be made whether available resources are actually used duly. V. Justickis distinguishes *two* main problems relating to the improper prevention activity coordination: *absence of the structural center* and *lack of the real control* of prevention activity efficiency.

*In the first case it should be emphasized* that prevention activities in the country are carried out eclectically and spontaneously, including in the prevention programs a wide variety of prevention measures which are inadequately structured and targeted.

*In the second case it should be indicated* that “the preventive work, carried out in our country, is enormous by scope, use of monetary resources, number of participating institutions, and input.(...) Nonetheless, the control mechanism of the efficiency of all this activity to be reliable and complying with the contemporary science of prevention is lacking” (Justickis *et al.* 2008). For this reason, material and institutional human resources, allocated for prevention, are used irrationally. Therefore, not only the crime-caused damage has not been reduced but also funds and efforts are wasted.

S. Justickaja (2011) raises a hypothesis that the current legal regulation of crime prevention, obstructing the ensuring of the efficiency of prevention projects, is one of the key impediments in the modernization of the prevention system. Primarily, it concerns those requirements which have been set for funded prevention projects.

*In this case* utmost attention is devoted to organizational and quantitative criteria for the implementation of projects rather than to project efficiency.

*It is evident* that if/when obtaining the funding during the tender the efficiency criterion is not stressed; it shall not be given a great deal of attention during the project development either.

*The second premise* is that the prevention actors are not afforded the necessary conditions for obtaining information on the contemporary prevention science requirements. The author notices that the efficiency criterion in methodical publications is most often expressed in the declarative form “even though no explanation is given of the peculiarities of the requirements set for the efficiency by modern science and what measures are to be used to achieve it” (Justickaja 2011).

*This premise may be agreeable only in part*, since, though it is impossible to deny the need of the proper methodical publications, it is hardly possible to state that publicly accessible achievements of modern prevention science are not available to the prevention actors.

*Thirdly*, one of the key hindrances in crime prevention activity modernization is the subjective standpoints and attitudes of prevention actors (Justickaja 2011). Such attitudes most often express the standpoint that prevention actors are more reliant on their subjective practical experience rather than on professional knowledge of prevention science.

*It is assumptive* that this circumstance may be related to poor self-education of prevention actors and a gap in evidence-based prevention traditions in Lithuania.

*Hence, a methodological issue arises*, how it should be estimated whether a crime control and prevention program complies with efficiency criteria.

S. Justickaja (2011) proposes to estimate such program by ten parameters: problem exploration and formulation, choice of targets and tasks, analysis of negative effects, analysis of alternative problem-solving methods (whether alternative problem-solving methods were analyzed), analysis of factors (whether crime-predetermining factors, aimed to be impacted by the measures under the program, were analyzed), choice of prevention measures, choice of result assessment indicators, formulation of expected results, efficiency control measures, assessment and description of the results obtained.

In developing the effective crime prevention measures, one should consider the criminogenic needs of law offenders that in criminology are subdivided into *static* (factors, not to be changed or impacted) and *dynamic* (subject to impact and control).

*According to the most recent research data*, the further criminal behavior of persons is determined by the possession, on the average, of four unsatisfied needs or unsolved problems (Justickaja, Gavenaite 2009).

*This presupposes a conclusion* that proper crime prevention in respect of a law offender starts from the identification of his criminogenic needs. On this basis, law offenders may be subdivided into separate groups, with different prevention measures to be applied in respect of them. *For example*, the Penal Code of Latvia has enforced a positive provision that rehabilitation of convicts covers the involvement of convicts in professional and educational programs of general type, with the interests of the specific convict being considered (Zahars, Stivrenieks 2014).

*As another example*, mention is to be made of a prevention system of seven pathways, adopted and implemented in the United Kingdom, which in 2005 was laid out in a special state program, targeted to the prevention of repeat crime factors.

This program was designed for persons serving either custodial or non-custodial penalty. The program envisages measures targeted at satisfying the seven key areas of the needs of convicts or ex-convicts: accommodation, education, professional training and employment, health care, drug addiction and alcohol consumption control, management of finance, income and debts, maintenance of the family relationships, thinking, attitudes and behavioral control (Justickaja, Gavenaite 2009).

Even though in Lithuania part of similar prevention measures is being implemented, the United Kingdom system is distinguished for its purposefulness since it is focused only to those actions which reduce the risk of repeat crime commission.

*On the other hand*, prevention programs, pursued in the United Kingdom, are of a wider scope since they envisage measures that are practically not addressed in Lithuania, for instance, ensuring of social relations; however, they do not foresee such forms of prevention measures in respect of which explicit evidence of efficiency is absent (e.g., various lectures) (Justickaja, Gavenaite 2009).

Of no less importance is that in the United Kingdom the preconditions are made for observing the efficiency of the system of such measures since the system of indicators has been devised, linking thereof the changes of recidivism with the implemented measures. Accordingly, it is possible to identify specifically the measures permitting to achieve the effective results and those preventing the results to be achieved.

*In summary, it should be stated* that crime prevention priority is related to the Western democracy values. In Eastern Europe, crime prevention traditionally was accorded less attention and possessed somewhat stricter penal policy as regards the custodial penalty duration and the number of convicted people. However, a high level of imprisonment not only reflects inappropriate fight against crime and inefficient methods of ensuring social security in this field but also is a signal of prevention ineffectiveness in the state. Even though in Lithuania the perception of the necessary to renovate a crime prevention system is observed, however, it is possible to indicate the following obstacles in prevention effectiveness: the absence of the structural center; legal regulation of crime prevention, hindering to ensure the efficiency of prevention projects; lack in the control of the real prevention activity efficiency; subjective standpoints and approaches of prevention actors, and a gap in self-education.

The main premise of efficient crime prevention, ensuring the optimum use of the available resources of the state, is the identification and consideration of criminogenic needs of law offenders when elaborating crime prevention measures. The efficiency of the prevention program is to be assessed by examination and formulation of the problem, choice of targets and tasks, analysis of negative consequences, study of alternative problem-solving ways; analysis of factors; choice of prevention measures, choice of result assessment indicators, formulation of the expected results; efficiency control measures, appraisal and description of the results obtained.

### 2.1.1. Problems of criminal process control

Any social process is primarily controlled by the society where it is occurring. Therefore, criminal processes are also affected by social control. Social control is to be defined as a certain system of sanctions aimed at ensuring that the people would obey the established rules and norms (Nikartas 2014). Social control may be both informal and formal.

*Informal control* is “based on common agreement, traditions or other not articulated social norms” (Nikartas 2014). Control of that type may become manifest by various negative reactions to the deviant behavior.

*It is noteworthy* that though paradoxical but such negative reactions may have not only a frequently underlined positive but also negative impact on criminal process control and prevention in general. As *an example* may serve the stigmatization of convicts, stimulating repeat crime. However, as concerns the criminal process control, most often it is understood as formal social control, covering sanctions introduced by the state for failure to follow the set norms. Such control arises due to legal regulation; its execution is being ensured by state-authorized institutions. Formal social control, however, is not circumscribed just by legal norms. *For example*, the science of sociology attributes to the social control form not only officially imposed sanctions but also social measures (e.g., education), whereby it is sought that “members of society would follow the norms, set by the state (society)” (Nikartas 2014). However, no doubt, control of criminal processes is the task of law enforcement institutions.

Thus, control of criminal processes may be perceived in a broad sense; according to this concept, the control subjects of criminal processes are not only law enforcement institutions but also other state institutions or public organizations, the activities thereof impact or have potency to impact criminal processes.

In a narrow sense, the control subjects of criminal processes are law enforcement institutions under the subordination of the Ministry of the Interior, since crime control is their priority task. Control of criminal processes is likely to be conditionally divided into lawmaking and application of law stages.

**Low quality of implementing legislation.** At a *lawmaking stage*, control of criminal processes manifests itself as the identification of appropriate legal norms. Special laws may be enacted on criminal processes, the prevention thereof is deemed to be a priority task of the state and the precondition for ensuring national security. As examples of such laws could be the Law on the Prevention of Money Laundering and Terrorist Financing (1997), the Law on the Organized Crime Prevention (1997), etc.

*Legal acts*, regulating control of criminal processes, are adopted not only by a legislator but also by the Ministry of the Interior and institutions under its subordination, that is, the subjects of control over criminal processes, involved in the legislation of sub-statutory legal acts.

*It is notable* that quality of these legal acts is of special importance for effective control of criminal processes, since they most often regulate very particular and specific problematic situations. As *examples* of such implementable legal acts could be orders and instructions of the Lithuanian Police Commissioner General, for instance, instructions of the Commissioner General on police activity in preventing vandalism acts and other illegal acts involving the use of Nazi or Communist symbols (Concerning Police Activities in Preventing Vandalism ... 2011), whereby specific measures are indicated to the heads of territorial police bodies, which are aimed at controlling of such criminal acts.

*It is noteworthy* that quality of such legal acts is one of the key problems facing control of criminal processes. Provisions of legal acts with the higher power are frequently revised, updated and improved. Thus, the permanent assessment of these legal acts is performed, gaps and collisions as well as other inaccuracies eliminated. Permanent control of the efficiency of such legal acts and conformity to the superior legal acts is also exercised. Meanwhile, sub-statutory legal acts, intended for regulation of the narrow functions and tasks of the institu-

tions exercising control of criminal processes, are subject to somewhat less control; therefore, their quality has not been under regular supervision. This makes it possible to draw a conclusion that mistakes and inaccuracies in the legal acts of narrow purpose are hardly noticeable and eliminated, whereas consequences of such poor control and revision may be identified with difficulty, but be very negative, e.g., to predetermine the ineffective prevention of criminal acts of the specific type.

*Presumably*, this problem is possible to be solved only by regular reviewing the legal acts in this field and evaluating their efficiency.

**Low quality of institutional activities.** At the stage of *application of law*, control of criminal processes is manifest as comprehensive, targeted and organized activities of law enforcement institutions, whereby it is aimed to combat crime. Therefore, the second essential problem is deemed to be the poor quality of work organization and coordination of the bodies involved in the control of criminal processes.

*Primarily*, the poor work quality of law enforcement institutions is to be related to the high latency of crimes, since with the law enforcement institutions functioning effectively and duly, involving the community members in the crime prevention and control, trust of the residents in law enforcement institutions gets enhanced and *vice versa*.

*Also worth of mentioning* is human rights protection problem, which is also to be linked with the poor work quality of law enforcement institutions. The duty of performing functions in a way they would not have a negative effect on human rights protection is enacted by a number of national legal acts, designed for regulation of the law enforcement institutional activities. *For example*, the provisions of human rights and freedoms are elaborated comparatively extensively in Article 5 of the Law on Criminal Intelligence (2011), reinforcing thereof not only the duty of criminal intelligence subjects not to violate human rights and freedoms and to limit them only in the procedure prescribed by law with an aim of ensuring the public and state security, but also the banning to discriminate people, who are in the target of criminal intelligence actions, banning of provocation, the right of the criminal intelligence object to appeal the criminal intelligence actions, etc.

*Nonetheless*, the problem of human rights protection remains very acute especially in those institutions the activities thereof are not open to society. For example, as underlined by M. Jokubauskas (2007), “analysis of the statistical assessment data and empirical research data of the actions of the employees in imprisonment facilities of the Republic of Lithuania, conducted by the Seimas Ombudsmen of the Republic of Lithuania and examined in the cases of the European Human Rights Court, reveals the situation that does not satisfy either the observers exercising the human rights protection at the international and national levels or the persons serving their sentences in imprisonment facilities under the Prison Department of the Ministry of Justice.”

Enhancement of publicity and accountability of institutional activities is necessary to tackle these problems.

**Inefficiency of control over criminal processes as the outcome of ineffective crime prevention.** Eventually, a wide range of problems predetermining the ineffectiveness of control over criminal processes that emerged due to improper and inefficient crime prevention have been distinguished. No doubt, control over criminal processes is under direct effect of the crime prevention quality. The more inefficient the crime prevention, the more difficult the further control of the development of criminal processes, if their conditions and reasons have not been overcome.

The most illustrative example of such ineffective prevention, as a result of which control of criminal processes cannot be ensured, is the situation in the Vilnius Roma Settlement, which is the biggest place of the Roma concentration in the Baltic States. The Vilnius Roma Settlement has been widely known as the heroin trade center (Vilnius Roma Settlement); due to the community specificity and ineffective crime prevention, control over criminal processes in the Roma settlement remains completely inefficient. After the event which took place in the summer of 2015 and was widely communicated through mass media that 9 drug addicts died from

overdosing with heroin they acquired in the Roma settlement (The Ninth Drug Addict Died...2015), situational prevention measures have been started to be intensively implemented – any person entering the Roma settlement was checked.

These prevention measures of coercive type, however, did not yield any specific results. Due to the ineffective Roma integration, actually non-applicable crime prevention measures of help and persuasion, the proper control over criminal processes in the Roma settlement is practically impossible.

*It is assumptive* that this problem possibly may be tackled only by drafting specific and purposeful prevention programs, intended for a specific situation, *for example*, to be focused on the specific community. Main attention should be also devoted not to the coercive situational prevention measures but rather to social assistance and persuasion.

Similar tendencies, related to the complicated integration of minorities and thus aggravated control over criminal processes in such communities, have been faced in other countries of Central and Eastern Europe, *for example*, in Hungary.<sup>1</sup>

*Hence, in summary*, criminal processes are under effect of social control, which may be subdivided into formal and informal. Control of criminal processes may be perceived in a broad sense – according to this concept, subjects of control over criminal processes are not only law enforcement institutions but also other state institutions or public organizations, the activities whereof have an effect or have potency to affect criminal processes.

*In a narrow sense*, subjects of control over criminal processes are law enforcement institutions under the Ministry of the Interior since crime control is their priority task. Control over criminal processes, presumably, may be also conditionally subdivided into the stages of lawmaking and application of law. At the lawmaking stage, the most important problem is too weak control of compatibility and efficiency of the sub-statutory implementing legal acts.

At the stage of application of law, ineffectiveness of control over criminal processes is conditioned by the poor work quality of institutional activities, due to which distrust in institutions and crime latency get enhanced. To improve the quality of institutional activities, publicity and accountability of their activities should be ensured and community involvement in the actions of control over criminal processes increased.

Effectiveness of control over criminal processes also depends on the prevention efficiency; therefore, as much as possible attention should be devoted to the social prevention measures of social assistance and persuasion, purposeful and focused on specific problems.

### **2.1.2. Creation of new models for control and prevention of criminal acts**

When developing new models for control and prevention of criminal acts it is necessary to follow science-based methods and recommendations. Primarily, the principles for drafting of crime prevention and control programs are to be mentioned. A. Kiskis and A. Kuodyte (2012) distinguish the following most characteristic principles: *program complexity*, *scientific validity* (account should be taken of the concrete territorial space, period, causality of the specific crime type), principles of *orientation towards the wide system of crime prevention subjects*. Additionally, the principles of *respect for rights and freedoms of each individual*, *legitimacy*, *systematization*, *activity planning*, *flexibility*, *effectiveness*, *continuity*, etc. are also to be distinguished.

In developing crime prevention programs, *it is necessary* to follow certain stages ensuring the effectiveness of prevention and control activities. Problem identification and formulation are to be distinguished as the *first* stage.

<sup>1</sup> *For example*, in 2006, in Hungary, an event gained renown when a male accidentally hit a Roma girl by a car, and upon getting out of the car, he was killed by a group of Roma guys. The author of this article relates this incident to the intensification of the activity of the right-wing politicians in Hungary, this predetermining the adoption of several discriminatory legal acts.

*The proper identification of the problem* is the primary premise for program expediency and purposefulness since the program must specify precisely criminal acts – where, when, and in respect of what persons a preventive impact was sought to be made (Kiskis, Kuodyte 2012).

*While specifying a problem*, its precise and specific formulation should be made, its scope and problematic phenomenon stability described (Justickis, *et.al.* 2015). Certainly, of importance is the selection of a problem of a proper scope – a problem should be sufficiently specific, when identifying it as being subject to the same prevention measures.

The program should also specify the scope and factors of the problem in order to formulate the specific opportunities for their overcoming. As underlined by V. Justickis (2008), “crimes of each group differ in essence from others by most important parameters, each requires other prevention measures, prevention of each one may require different organization, control, management, etc.” Therefore, the need for precision and purposefulness of programs is to be emphasized, *for example*, with the use of crime mapping (CM) methods, identifying precisely groups of persons, a program is focused on, and thus avoiding the effect of “diffusion” of prevention measures and their impact (Justickis 2008).

*The second stage* identifies the program objectives and tasks (Kiskis, Kuodyte 2012). The program objective shall be sufficiently specific and reflect the problem, raised in the program. The analogous tasks shall specify the set objective. Of special importance is that it should be possible to measure by the selected indicators whether the tasks are implementable, if yes, whether their implementation is suitable by quantity and quality.

*The third stage* in the program creation is the selection of prevention measures (Kiskis, Kuodyte 2012). For that purpose, all possible and most suitable prevention measures selected for tackling a specific problem shall be analyzed with account taken of their efficiency potential. Such choice shall be objective since, according to A. Kiskis and A. Kuodyte (2012), “subjective evaluations, based on common sense, professional experience, and scientific reasoning that a certain measure will be efficient, are almost always erroneous.”

Therefore, the only strong basis for deciding whether a specific preventive measure will be efficient is its multiple and successful application, for instance, during the previous programs. Such method of evaluation may be problematic due to the lack of successful prevention of specific situations in the state when practical experience of applying preventive measures is lacking.

*In truth*, in that case experience of other states could be of use. Here, however, another problem arises. If the program is focused on resolving the sufficiently narrow and specific problem, such problem may be unique or at least characteristic of a specific region or state, also with account taken of differences in crime causality in different states, the program would be more affected by other prevention measures. V. Justickis’s (2008) opinion is acceptable as regards the opportunity to be given to prevention activity actors to apply “a broader range of worldwide well-known and regularly applied situational prevention measures (instruments).” Of special importance is to devote attention to those measures that are perspective and widely applied in foreign states, even though in Lithuania they are scarcely applied.

One of the reasons of such practice being formed is poor awareness of prevention subjects, and this situation could be improved by preparing methodical literature in the Lithuanian language. The system for competence assessment of prevention subjects should be also created in order to ensure that only qualified officers are involved in exercising prevention.

*The further stage* is the identification of the structure of program execution and management (Kiskis, Kuodyte 2012). This stage is highly significant in order to properly coordinate the program execution. It is important to choose the proper and competent crime control or prevention subjects, responsible for program execution. Most often several institutions of different level are envisaged in the program, for instance, the ministry and institutions under its subordination.

*In the program*, competence overlapping situations should be avoided when the institution, responsible for implementing of a certain task, is appointed and it does not have the necessary authorization to do this, and situations when the function delegated to the institution may be implemented more successfully by another, *for example*, under its subordination (e.g., the function is attributed to the MoI, even though it would be implemented best by the Police Department).

*Final stage* in the program development covers the identification of assessment criteria for program execution efficiency and impact (Kiskis, Kuodyte 2012). Criteria shall be based on the objective data and should be real, clearly and simply formulated, enabling to make comparisons and to assess program execution input and results obtained.

*Indicators*, helping to assess the program efficiency, should cover statistical crime indicators and indicators, reflecting the situation of various criminogenic phenomena. The selected indicators must be easily observable and closely related to a problematic phenomenon (Justickis, *et al.* 2005). S. Justickaja's (2011) opinion is to be agreed since in order to properly assess crime control and prevention program efficiency it is necessary to create the smoothly functioning crime prevention information system, consisting of three sub-systems: *criminological-informative* (information about crime in the country), *methodical-informative* (information about the efficient crime prevention methods and their specifications), and *managerial-informative* (information on the specifications of crime prevention subjects).

## Conclusions

*At the lawmaking stage*, the most important problem is too weak control of compatibility and efficiency of the sub-statutory implementing legal acts. *At the stage of law application*, ineffectiveness of control over criminal processes is conditioned by the poor quality of institutional activities, due to which distrust in institutions and crime latency get enhanced.

Effectiveness of control over criminal processes depends on the prevention efficiency; therefore, as much as possible attention should be devoted to the social prevention measures of social assistance and persuasion type, purposeful and focused on specific problems. Even though in Lithuania the perception of renovating a mandatory crime prevention system is observed, however, it is possible to indicate the following obstacles in prevention effectiveness, like *the absence of the structural center; legal regulation of crime prevention, hindering to ensure the efficiency of prevention projects; lack in the control of the real prevention activity efficiency; subjective standpoints and approaches of prevention actors and lack of self-education.*

## References

Babachinaitė, G.; Galinaitytė, J.; Jurgelaitienė, G.; Kiškis, A.; Kuolaitė, A.; Palavinskienė, B.; Paukštė, A.; Petkus, A.; Raudonienė, A.; Rudzki, T.; Uscila, R. 2010. *Kriminologija: vadovėlis* [Criminology: Textbook/Mykolas Romeris University]. Vilnius: Mykolas Romeris universitetas.

*Europos narkotikų vartojimo paplitimo ataskaita. Tendencijos ir pokyčiai.* Europos narkotikų ir narkomanijos stebėsenos centras, Liuksemburgas: Europos Sąjungos leidinių biuras. Europos narkotikų ir narkomanijos stebėsenos centro (EMCDDA) leidinys [European Drug Report. Trends and Developments. European Monitoring Centre for Drug and Drug Addiction Publication, Luxembourg]. 2015.

Duomenys apie nusikalstamumą Baltijos valstybėse per 2014 m. sausio–gruodžio mėn. Informacijos ir ryšių departamentas prie Vidaus reikalų ministerijos. [Data on Crime in the Baltic States in January–December 2014. Information and Communications Department under the the Ministry of Interior]. Available in Internet: <[http://www.ird.lt/statistines-ataskaitos/wpcontent/themes/ird/reports/html\\_file.php?metai=2015&menuo=12&ff=12&ff=1Z&fmr=1&rt=1&oldYear=2015](http://www.ird.lt/statistines-ataskaitos/wpcontent/themes/ird/reports/html_file.php?metai=2015&menuo=12&ff=12&ff=1Z&fmr=1&rt=1&oldYear=2015)>.

Duomenys apie nusikalstamumą Baltijos valstybėse per 2015 m. sausio–gruodžio mėn. Informatikos ir ryšių departamentas prie Vidaus reikalų ministerijos. [Data on Crime in the Baltic States in January–December 2015. Information and Communications Department under the the Ministry of Interior]. Available in Internet: <<http://www.ird.lt/statistines-ataskaitos/?metai=2015&menuo=12&idAta=6&rt=1&oldYear=2015&id=136&idStat=10&regionas=0&id3=1#Atas-BV>>.

Jatkevičius, A. 2003. *Nepilnamečių smurtinio nusikalstamumo prevencija.* Daktaro disertacija. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas. [Preven-



tion of Juvenile Violent Crime. Doctoral Thesis. Vilnius University].

Jokubauskas, M. 2007. Pataisos įstaigų personalo veiklos humanizavimo prielaidos atsižvelgiant į tarptautinius teisinius standartus [The Humanization Assumptions for Professional Activities of Correctional Staff in Compliance with the International Law Standards]. *Jurisprudence*, 12(102), p. 88–94.

Justickaja, S. 2011. Nusikaltimų prevencija Lietuvoje: perėjimas nuo intuityvios prie įrodymais grindžiamos [Crime Prevention in Lithuania: from “Sensual” to Evidence-Based Crime Prevention]. *Law problems*, 1(71), p. 81–108.

Justickaja, S. 2011. *Pasiūlymai dėl nusikaltimų prevencijos subjektų prevencinės informacijos tvarkymo koncepcinio modelio*. Vilnius: Teisės institutas [Proposals for the Conceptual Model of Preventive Information Handling of Crime Prevention Subjects. Vilnius: Institute of Law].

Justickaja, S.; Gavėnaitė, A. Recidyvinis nusikalstamumas: tyrimo galimybės ir perspektyvos Lietuvoje [Recidivism: Research Problems and Prospects in Lithuania]. *Law problems*, 2009, 3(65), p. 3–56.

Justickis, V.; Gečėnienė, S.; Čepas, A. 2005. *Nusikaltimų prevencijos ir kontrolės programų ir priemonių veiksmingumo vertinimo metodika*. Vilnius: Lietuvos Respublikos vidaus reikalų ministerija. [Assessment Methods of Efficiency of Crime Prevention and Control Programs and Measures. The Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Lithuania].

Justickis, V.; Uscila, R.; Cibarauskiene, N.; Kuodis, G. *Situacinės nusikaltimų prevencijos taikymo praktikos ir plėtros Lietuvoje galimybių analizė ir pasiūlymų parengimas* [Analysis of Opportunities for Practical Application and Development of Situational Crime Prevention in Lithuania and Preparation of Proposals]. Vilnius, 2008.

Kiškis A., Justickaja S., Uscila R., Justickis V. Nusikalstamumas Lietuvoje ir jo prevencijos perspektyvos. Monografija. [Crime in Lithuania and its Prevention perspectives. Monograph/Mykolas Romeris University]. Vilnius: Mykolo Romerio universitetas, 2014. – 467 p.

Kiškis, A. 2015. *Nusikalstamumas. Paskaitų medžiaga*. Vilnius: Mykolo Romerio universitetas. [Crime. Lecture material/Mykolas Romeris University].

Kiškis, A.; Kuodytė, A. 2012. Nusikalstamumo prevencijos programų rengimo Lietuvoje tyrimas [Analysis of Preparation of Crime Prevention Programs in Lithuania]. *Jurisprudence*, 19(2), p. 773–774.

*Komisijos ataskaita Tarybai. Europos Sąjungos nusikalstamumo prevencijos tinklo vertinimo ataskaita* [Report from the Commission to the Council. Evaluation report on the European Union Crime Prevention Network]. Briuselis, 2012.

Laurinavičius, A. 2001. Saugios aplinkos kūrimo teorija ir patirtis [Theory and Practice for Creating the Safety Social Environment]. *Jurisprudence*, 21(13), p. 183–193.

Lietuvos policijos generalinio komisaro 2011 m. balandžio 28 d. nurodymas Nr. 5-N-6 „Dėl policijos veiklos užkardant vandališkus veiksmus ir kitas neteisėtas veikas, susijusias su nacistinių ar komunistinių simbolių naudojimu“ [Lithuanian Police Commissioner General Order No. 5-N-6 of 28 April 2011 “Concerning Police Activities in Preventing Vandalism Acts and Other Illegal Acts Involving the Use of Nazi or Communist Symbols”].

Lietuvos Respublikos kriminalinės žvalgybos įstatymas [Republic of Lithuania Law on Criminal Intelligence]. *Official gazette*. 2012, No. 122-6093.

Lietuvos Respublikos nacionalinio saugumo pagrindų įstatymas [Republic of Lithuania Law on the Basics of National Security]. *Official gazette*. 1997, No. 2–16.

Lietuvos Respublikos organizuoto nusikalstamumo užkardymo įstatymas [Republic of Lithuania Law on the Organised Crime Prevention]. *Official gazette*. 1997, No. 69-1731.

Lietuvos Respublikos pinigų plovimo ir teroristų finansavimo prevencijos įstatymas [Republic of Lithuania Law on the Prevention of Money Laundering and Terrorist Financing]. *Official gazette*. 1997, No. 64-1502.

Lietuvos Respublikos Seimo 2003 m. kovo 20 d. nutarimas Nr. IX-1383 „Dėl Nacionalinės nusikaltimų prevencijos ir kontrolės programos patvirtinimo“ [Republic of Lithuania Seimas Resolution No. IX-1383 of 20 March 2003 “On the Approval of the National Crime Prevention and Control Program”].

Lietuvos Respublikos Seimo 2015 m. gegužės 7 d. nutarimas Nr. XII-1682 „Dėl Viešojo saugumo plėtros 2015–2025 metų programos patvirtinimo“. *TAR*. 2015-05-13, Nr. 7293.

Lietuvos Respublikos Seimo 2015 m. kovo 10 d. nutarimas Nr. XII-1537 „Dėl Lietuvos Respublikos nacionalinės kovos su korupcija 2015–2025 metų programos patvirtinimo“ [Republic of Lithuania Seimas Resolution No. XII-1537 of 10 March 2015 “On the Approval

of the 2015–2025 Program for the National Fight against Corruption in the Republic of Lithuania”].

Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės 2012 m. lapkričio 14 d. nutarimas Nr. 1381 „Dėl Nacionalinės nusikaltimų prevencijos ir kontrolės programos įgyvendinimo tarpinstitucinio veiklos plano patvirtinimo“ [Republic of Lithuania Government Resolution No. 1381 of 14 November 2012 “On the Approval of the Inter-institutional Action Plan for the National Crime Prevention and Control Program Implementation”].

Nikartas, S. 2014. *Gyventojų dalyvavimas užtikrinant saugumą bendruomenėse: kriminologinės ir teisinės prielaidos*. Monografija [Residents’ Involvement in Ensuring the Safety in Communities: Criminological and Legal Premises. Monography]. Vilnius.

Policijos departamento duomenys [Police Department Data]. Available in Internet: <[www.policija.lt/index.php?id=23854](http://www.policija.lt/index.php?id=23854)>.

Teivāns-Treinovskis, J.; Jefimovs, N. 2012. State national security: aspect of recorded crime, *Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues*, 2(2): 41–48. DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2012.2.2\(4\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2012.2.2(4))

The Globalization of Crime. A Transnational Organized Crime Threat Assessment. Vienna: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2010.

Ustinavičiūtė, L. 2012. *Lietuvos teisės pažeidėjų rizikos veiksnių, susijusių su pakartotiniu nusikalstamumu, analize*. Daktaro disertacija. Vilnius: Mykolo Romerio universitetas. [Analysis of Risk Factors of Lithuanian Law Offenders Related to Repeated Crime. Doctoral Thesis. Vilnius: Mykolas Romeris University].

Vileikienė, E. 2012. *Lietuvos gyventojų požiūris į teisėsaugos institucijas ir viešojo saugumo būklės vertinimas*. Vilnius: Lietuvos Respublikos vidaus reikalų ministerija [Lithuanian Population Attitudes towards Law Enforcement Institutions and Public Security Assessment. Vilnius: The Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Lithuania].

Vileikienė, E. 2015. *Ataskaita apie viešojo saugumo būklę Lietuvoje 2005–2014 metais*. Vilnius: Lietuvos Respublikos vidaus reikalų ministerija [Report on the Situation of Public Security in Lithuania in 2005–2014. Vilnius: The Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Lithuania].

Vilniaus romų taboras [Vilnius Roma Settlement]. Available in Internet: <[https://lt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vilniaus\\_taboras](https://lt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vilniaus_taboras)>.

Vilniuje nuo heroino perdozavimo mirė jau devintas narkomanas. *Straipsnis interneto dienraštyje 15min.lt, 2015 m. liepos 31 d.* [The Ninth Drug Addict Died from Heroin Overdosing in Vilnius]. Available in Internet: <<http://www.15min.lt/naujiena/aktualu/nusikaltimai-irnelaimes/vilniuje-nuo-heroino-perdozavimo-mire-jau-devintas-narkomanas-59-519137>>.

*Visuomenės savisaugos sistemos Lietuvoje būklės ir visuomenės bendradarbiavimo su teisėsaugos institucijomis analizė*. 2008. Vilnius: Lietuvos Respublikos vidaus reikalų ministerija [Analysis of Societal Self-Security Situation in Lithuania and Cooperation of Society with Law Enforcement Institutions. Vilnius: The Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Lithuania].

Zahars, V.; Stivrenieks, M. 2014. Security implementation facets: convicted women imprisonment sentence execution, *Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues*, 3(3): 45–53. DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2014.3.3\(4\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2014.3.3(4))

Zahars, V.; Stivrenieks, M. 2015. Security implementation facets: peculiarities of execution of the sentence of imprisonment in respect of convicted minors, *Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues*, 4(3): 221–231. DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2015.4.3\(3\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2015.4.3(3))

#### About authors:

**Vladas TUMALAVIČIUS** is Doctoral candidate in Law, Lecturer of the Department of Management at The General Jonas Žemaitis Military Academy of Lithuania. Research interests: Legal Regulation of Public Servants Activity; Legal Regulation of Public Safety; Issues of National, State and Regional Security.

**Ingrīda VEIKŠA** is Professor, PhD. Head of the Law Department of the Law Faculty of the Turība University. Research interests: Copyrights; Intellectual Property Law; Issues of Security and Sustainability.

**Jānis NAČISČIONIS** is Professor, PhD. Dean of the Law Faculty of the Turība University. Research interests: Administrative Law; Administrative Procedure Law; Issues of the Legal Regulation of the State Security.

**Vitolds ZAHARS** is Professor, PhD. Head of the Law Department of the Daugavpils University and Head of Doctoral degree programme Law. Research interests: Criminal Justice; Sentence Execution Rights; Issues of Security and Sustainability.

**Veselin DRASKOVIC** is Professor at University of Montenegro, Maritime Faculty of Kotor, Montenegro, Serbia