

MODULE 6 - 2084

LECTURE 3 – CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND PROPERTY CRIMES

THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

You **remember**, don't you, about how we saw that when the Government Spy, the Secretive Rogue, the Pinks and Burns, and the FBI and DEA investigators worked covertly, the public had **some problem-o's with that**. And how the investigators were then constrained from activities in the PLAN and ACTION phases to PREVENT and DETECT crime? And how, as a result, today the Bureaucrat Detective and the Traditional Investigation Process focus on responding to the ACTION and ESCAPE phases after they are completed and the offender is in the FUGITIVE phase? And how, as a result, the police gateway and CJ filter eliminate more than 90% of crimes from our CJ system, and result in 27 convictions out of 1,000 crimes committed?

Aw, **c'mon, how long has it been?** How are you going to use this stuff if you don't **remember** it? What if I'm running a rape case or something and my boss asks me what the victim's name is, and I say I forgot? What if I start to interrogate a suspect in a murder case, and I can't remember the rights advisal? **Sheesh**. So if you're struggling with this, go back and catch up. I'm starting to get a **little touchy** about this "**not remembering**" stuff, so I'm **gonna** wait one second, and then I'm moving on.

Right now I want to know how all the cameras and other technology we just forecasted **will fit into** our CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK and affect the police and investigative responses in the five phases of our crime continuum. And CUIISC and CUIPDSC - that stuff, too. That's why we spent so much time building that stuff, so we could understand the past, and then use it to see where it might lead us into the future – remember that? We know that there are **two main sources** of crime information – people and things, and technology is mainly focused on improving the amount of info people can get from things. So we're just **gonna** take another look at some of the **scenarios** we talked about earlier in the course and see if we can anticipate how technology may affect investigations in the rest of the 21st century.

THE STORE BURGLARY THINGIE – ANY HELP?

OK, so say a **store owner reports a Visible property crime like BURGLARY** of an item to the police. A patrol officer responds to the ACTION and ESCAPE scene after the offender is in the FUGITIVE phase, as usual, and proceeds with the preliminary investigation. The officer, wearing the **Google face-reader glasses**, interviews the store owner and gets feedback that he/she is telling the truth, and that a burglary probably really did

occur. Next the officer uses his/her hand-held smartphone to check all the **cameras** in the area and use **facial recognition** to get the identity of all the people seen going into and coming out of the area during the period of time the burglary most likely occurred. The officer then uses the built-in **mechanical sniffer** in his/her smartphone at the specific location where the item was stolen. The sniffer identifies the scent of the stolen item and a number of scents that can be traced to individuals. The officer uses his/her smartphone to conduct records checks to determine their criminal history, current address, and whether or not they have **nanobots**.

The smartphone prioritizes the suspects based on the info, and then the patrol officer checks with his/her supervisor, who is monitoring and checking everything in real time. With the supervisor's concurrence, the patrol officer, or maybe a detective, interviews them. He/she can verify their whereabouts at the crime scene (cameras), verify whether they had come into contact with the stolen item (mechanical sniffer), and tell if they're lying to him/her (Google face-reader glasses). The cameras, mechanical sniffer and Google face-reader glasses **corroborate** each other – the suspect was at the crime scene during the period the item was stolen, and had contact with the item. If the suspect does not confess, and the prosecutor wants more evidence, maybe accessing nanobot data bases, with a court order of course, would help. But let's assume the prosecutor is happy and the suspect is convicted without having to pry into his private nanobot whereabouts data.

So although the patrol officer or detective never had any info that the offender was planning a burglary, and was not present when the offender committed the burglary, the cameras and mechanical sniffers, and maybe even the offender's nanobots, were present during the ACTION and ESCAPE phases. They preserved the information regarding the offender's activities in a digital retrieval system, and the patrol officer could gain access to it. So instead of a person such as an Informer, Thief-taker, Agent Provocateur or witness seeing what the offender did, technology essentially saw him/her, preserved the information, and made it available.

So now we're **using technology to collect information in the ACTION and ESCAPE** phases, and even in the **FUGITIVE** phase, so it can be used to solve crime. That's **CUISC**, and that's great. But even with all the technology, if the store owner had not reported the crime to the police, the police would likely have not known of it. So for **CUISC**, we still needed a **person to report** the crime, but once a burglary was reported, **TECHNOLOGY HELPED TO SOLVE THE CRIME.**

CUISC AND CUIPDSC

Now we know **that people do not report most Visible crimes** to the police for various reasons - that the police can't or won't help; that it was a personal/private matter; that the severity of the offense was not sufficient; that they feared reprisal; that they wanted to protect the offender; that they were involved in the crime; and that it was not in their best interest to do so. **Remember?** So while the technology **may be a big help in SOLVING** a reported crime, we still have the issue of the police/public relationship and the willingness of people to report crime. Of course, if the police solve more crime, that may motivate people to report more crime (the police can in fact help). Or maybe not (fear of reprisal, protect the offender, etc.).

But can the technology do anything to help **PREVENT and DETECT Visible crimes like burglaries** and such? Obviously, if potential offenders are aware that the technology makes the burglary a harder target, and makes it more likely that they will be caught, then they may be **deterred** from planning the crime. Or at least the PLAN phase might become **more complex**. But if the thief and the store owner are colluding to commit the crime, and if it is in their best interests not to report the crime, such as in many Victimless, Occupational, Organized and Political crimes, the police may never learn of it, even though the technology has documented and preserved the ACTION and ESCAPE phases of the crime.

So like most things, the technology may be defeated or compromised one way or another – some crooks are really smart. But at least we'll argue that for **LAMB slash BLVA CRIMES**, the technology may **PREVENT CRIMES A LITTLE**, because it **hardens** the crime targets and makes it more **difficult** for crooks to commit the crimes. But because of the likely costs and effort involved in protecting property, this would probably be limited mostly to the more high-value or sensitive property.

So now let's dig down a little further on this **DETECTing** stuff. What about DETECTING crime, like in the **PLAN** phase? Well, we know that the technology may document information, and that it will preserve it, but it generally does not alert anyone about a crime because it cannot determine whether a crime will be or has been committed. It doesn't have a self-reporting alert mechanism. And most Visible burglary crimes may not have very many PLANning activities that the technology can record in the first place. So thus far, I'd say NO, future technology probably won't be much help here. But then, you know, some crimes may have PLANning activities that technology can detect – like the purchase of burglary tools, safe-cracking equipment, chemicals and such.

There may be other examples which escape me at the moment, but we have technology today that can track some of that stuff already, so I'd say that future technology will be more sophisticated. So it looks to me like,

for **BURGLARY crimes**, the technology will PROBABLY HAVE **SOME CAPABILITY TO DETECT SOME CRIMES IN THE PLAN PHASE** – again, at least for the more high-value and sensitive property.

OK, then what about DETECTING crime in the **ACTION PHASE**? We know that technology will likely document the crime, but we still need some sort of an **alert mechanism** to distinguish between authorized and unauthorized activities, and to alert the authorities. Now most property probably will not have that, but again, for **sensitive or high-cost** property we already have things like burglar **alarms**, computer chip keys for motor vehicles, etc. And I expect that these things will continue to develop in the future.

So I conclude that for **BURGLARY crimes**, the technology will **PROBABLY HAVE SOME CAPABILITY TO DETECT SOME CRIMES IN THE ACTION PHASE** – at least for the more high-value and sensitive property.

So, for those TENACIOUS TRAVELERS among you who followed me through all that, what we just did, kind of step by step, was run a crime through our crime continuum phases to see how future technology may help. We, or I, (yeah, you weren't very much help on this, you know?) determined that for **BURGLARY crimes**, technology may be:

1- a LITTLE help in PREVENTING crimes, and it can be

2- SOME help in DETECTing some crimes in both the PLAN and ACTION phases. No panacea, but some improvement over the current situation. However, it should definitely be

3- a BIG help in SOLVING crime in the FUGITIVE phase.

And without going through this process for every type of **LAMB** or **BLVA** crime, let's just for the sake of my **sanity** take a **big leap of faith** and assume that we'd get similar results for all of them. LAMB, BLVA – the acronyms for property crimes, **you got that, right?** You can go through the same process with the various other property crimes on your own, if you wish. And if you get different results, let me know, OK?

OK, now let that sink in a little bit – we threw some future tech stuff into our **CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK** and came up with some useful conclusions about how and where it might help to PREVENT, DETECT and SOLVE a property crime in the various phases of the crime continuum. We used the framework to develop a theoretical perspective of the effects of future tech on investigations in an organized and rational way. And

we can use it again, or change the types of crime or future tech, and maybe do some other things, too. **Not too shabby.**

So let's see what we come up with when we look at some other kinds of crime in the next lecture.