



UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

1408 W. Gregory Drive, MC-522
Urbana, IL 61801

Thank you for using the Interlibrary Loan Services at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Library. **This service is free to you.** Please ignore any dollar amounts that you might see on the photocopy cover page.

IS SOMETHING WRONG WITH THIS PHOTOCOPY?

We hope not! But mistakes can happen. If there is a problem with this photocopy contact us and we will fix it as quickly as possible. Please **do not** place a new request for the same item.

You may contact us by:

- Email: borrowing@library.illinois.edu
- Phone: (217) 333-0832

Provide the following information:

- The transaction number (TN #) of your request (preferred), or the full article title exactly as you requested it
- Your full name or NetID
- Describe the problem clearly (i.e. are pages missing, pictures too dark, or is the text illegible?)

WARNING CONCERNING COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS:

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

See <http://www.copyright.gov/> for more information.

Book Reviews

JACQUELINE E. ROSS & THIERRY DELPEUCH, *MAKING SENSE OF YOUTH CRIME: A COMPARISON OF POLICE INTELLIGENCE IN THE UNITED STATES AND FRANCE* (Cambridge University Press, 2023)[†]

*Reviewed by Marta Positò**

Recent decades have seen a growing literature on intelligence-led policing as an “operational model” to enhance law enforcement in multiple sectors.¹ Linked to the core issue of how to qualify the police—whether from an instrumental or a functional outlook²—the intelligence-led perspective stands out in emphasizing the importance of knowledge in performing policing tasks.

Traditionally anchored in Anglo-American countries, this intelligence-led approach has increasingly engaged European policymakers as well as scholars. The diffusion of this approach is due to several factors, primarily linked to the transnational development of serious crime, which requires more articulated, cross-border, and coordinated action from law enforcement agencies across jurisdictions. These elements have become driving forces behind a strategic shift in addressing multiple forms of criminality—one that favors proactive rather than reactive criminal policies.³

[†]<https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcl/avaf043>

*Ph.D. in Legal Sciences, University of Perugia, Perugia, Italy.

1. Jerry H. Ratcliffe & Ray Guidetti, *State Police Investigative Structure and the Adoption of Intelligence-Led Policing*, 31 *POLICING* 109, 110 (2008).

2. Scholars tend to adopt one of two principal perspectives in evaluating policing: one focuses on the tools deployed, and the other on the functions served. For the former, see EGON BITTNER, *THE FUNCTIONS OF THE POLICE IN MODERN SOCIETY: A REVIEW OF BACKGROUND FACTORS. CURRENT PRACTICES, AND POSSIBLE ROLE MODELS* (1970); BENJAMIN BOWLING, ROBERT REINER et al., *THE POLITICS OF THE POLICE* (2019). For the latter, see MICHAEL BANTON, *THE POLICEMAN IN THE COMMUNITY* (1964); PETER K. MANNING, *POLICE WORK: THE SOCIAL ORGANIZATION OF POLICING* (1977).

3. The reference is, in particular, to the shift from detection, investigation, and prosecution to prevention of certain offences.

© The Author(s) 2025. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the American Society of Comparative Law. All rights reserved. For commercial re-use, please contact reprints@oup.com for reprints and translation rights for reprints. All other permissions can be obtained through our RightsLink service via the Permissions link on the article page on our site—for further information please contact journals.permissions@oup.com.

Structured through the experience of practitioners, intelligence-led policing may also serve to fulfill important objectives. Recognizing the need to go beyond criminal intelligence to address certain acts, it offers a framework for preemptive risk assessment inspired by social policing and the harm-reduction approach (pp. 75–77, 80, 85), in dialectic with traditional crime-reduction strategies.⁴

In addition, the role of intelligence has recently expanded due to the spread of technology and the rise of big data.⁵ The preference for intelligence-led policing—as a more efficient approach for police and practitioners—has gained ground, particularly in relation to deviant behaviors that affect broader Western societies. The explanation lies not only in the logic of securitarian criminal policies but also in the increasingly complex structure of deviant acts, which demands a more nuanced analysis.⁶ Indeed, deviance and anti-social conduct may be amenable to varied forms of intelligence-led policing, as they lend themselves to multiple interpretations. When embedded in a criminal framework, such behaviors may be portrayed as precursors to, or components of, criminal activity.

It follows that the multifaceted nature of collective offending by juveniles—an especially cross-cutting topic—offers an ideal field for intelligence-led policing analysis (p. 2).

From a scientific perspective, these insights form the basis for advancing both the normative and interpretive value of comparative research, as demonstrated in the erudite and valuable study by Jacqueline E. Ross and Thierry Delpuch in their book *Making Sense of Youth Crime: A Comparison of Police Intelligence in the United States and France*.

Ross and Delpuch contend that collective offending by juveniles can be approached in various ways, depending on the type of knowledge employed within the police (pp. 81–83). Within the context of the growing intersection between intelligence-led policing and deviant behavior, the theory underlying the book proposes a transversal cognitive framework (pp. 10, 52),⁷—one that uses the lens of intelligence-led policing to interpret and define the police and their work.

4. A preemptive risk assessment logic based on the grounds of social policing and the harm and crime reduction approaches implies a reshaping and reconsideration of the range of criminal liability as well (pp. 69–70, 75–76).

5. See ANDREW GUTHRIE FERGUSON, *THE RISE OF BIG DATA POLICING: SURVEILLANCE, RACE, AND THE FUTURE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT* (2017); RICHARD V. ERICSON & KEVIN D. HAGGERTY, *POLICING THE RISK SOCIETY* (1997); Lee Youngsub et al., *The Effectiveness of Big Data-Driven Predictive Policing: Systematic Review*, 7 *JUST. EVAL. J.* 127, 127–33 (2024); Sarah Brayne, *The Criminal Law and Law Enforcement Implications of Big Data*, 14 *ANN. REV. L. & SOC. SCI.* 293 (2018).

6. Diverse intelligence-led policing represents an essential tool for understanding the background of a pragmatically designated law enforcement's approach towards a complex criminal phenomenon. ROSS & DELPEUCH, *supra* note 4, at 3.

7. See also Thierry Delpuch et al., *The Joint Production of Intelligence in Local Security Partnerships: French Initiatives in Local Risk Management*, in *COMPARING THE*

The main thread of the analysis is a rejection of monist visions of policing (pp. 6–8)—typically limited to ground-level operational units. Instead, the book advances a different conception. It seeks to promote a pluralist view of intelligence within the police—understood here as knowledge workers (pp. 2, 4–5)⁸—on the grounds that such a perspective may overcome a purely functionalist account of policing.⁹

Ross and Delpuech argue that a pluralist view enables both scholars and practitioners to develop a transversal vision of policing strategies.¹⁰ This cross-cutting vision arises from their observation of a “networked governance of intelligence”¹¹ as an emerging model, especially relevant to complex phenomena such as juvenile crime (p. 2).

The authors conduct a comparative empirical study of policing in the United States and France, contrasting the highly decentralized structure of the former with the highly centralized structure of the latter in terms of security management (pp. 11–15, 62, 68, 70, 84). In both countries, the choice of research sites followed a dual standard of representativeness: cities that had experimented with multiple approaches to persistent crime problems, and both small and large cities in different geographical regions (p. 4).

The book is the result of ten years of fieldwork, carried out between 2007 and 2017.

The central axis of the research is the effort to determine the extent to which different professional subcommunities—or “intelligence regimes”—within police understand gang membership as a helpful lens for explaining collective criminal offending by young people. From this question follows the analytical turning point of the study, which introduces a major theoretical innovation. This consists in reframing what police do as knowledge workers, and examining how they interpret and respond to the social problems they are tasked with addressing, through the particular intelligence regimes in which their knowledge practices are embedded (p. 2).

DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE OF POLICE INTELLIGENCE: NEW MODELS OF PARTICIPATION AND EXPERTISE IN THE UNITED STATES AND EUROPE 43, 48–49 (Jacqueline E. Ross & Thierry Delpuech eds., 2016); Stephan Klose, *Re-Defining Evidence-Based Policing*, 18 POLICING: J. POL'Y & PRAC. 1 (2024).

8. The concept of police as “knowledge workers” was coined by ERICSON & HAGGERTY, *supra* note 5, at 5, 19.

9. The authors distinguish multiple intelligence regimes for highlighting the intercommunication among different cognitive ecosystems in which police officers are set while facing the same kind of crime. The main goal of that classification is transversally to embrace the notion of policing. Identifying several intelligence regimes makes it possible to overcome fixed cognitive frameworks, based on activity, specialization or working hierarchy, and visions of intelligence-led policing mostly confined to intelligence units (pp. 80, 7–10). For an overview focusing on “unpacking” the notion of “police culture” leading thus to the necessity of further in-depth analysis, see Holly Campeau, “*Police Culture*” at Work: *Making Sense of Police Oversight*, 55 BRIT. J. CRIMINOL. 669 (2015).

10. See Thierry Delpuech & Jacqueline E. Ross, *The Co-Production of Security in the United States and France*, 44 AM. J. CRIM. L. 187, 188–216 (2017).

11. Delpuech et al., *supra* note 7, at 49–66, 74–83.

This novel perspective gives new momentum to reformist thinking in police studies, especially regarding the outputs of intelligence-led policing across diverse law enforcement activities. The book identifies five ideal-typical intelligence regimes (p. 86): criminal intelligence, public safety, order maintenance, partnership, and managerial—the last conceived as a meta-regime that coordinates, evaluates, and selects among the other four (pp. 53, 77–78, 80, 85–86). The rationale for this typology is based on how members of each regime search for and interpret information, and the purposes for which they analyze it (pp. 5–6, 9–10, 84).

By providing a systemic interpretation of these regimes, the authors aim to improve their functioning through the shared logic of intelligence-led policing—capitalizing on its innovative potential to coordinate different kinds of knowledge (pp. 3, 10–11, 15, 52, 70–71, 80, 82–86). This intent is also rooted in empirical and training-oriented concerns, recognizing that advances in policing are often driven more by practitioner experience than by research (pp. 10, 85, 87).¹²

The book's deductive methodology is designed to clarify the interactions and tensions among intelligence regimes and to identify which regime tends to dominate in practice. The typology helps explain how various police cultures shape the actions taken to address collective juvenile delinquency (pp. 3–4, 8, 14–15, 63–71, 84). This pluralist framework enables more differentiated and substantive responses to youth deviance—responses that move beyond simple criminalization (p. 74).

Cross-national comparisons, moreover, align with the abovementioned guiding axes by emphasizing the affinities between the two national approaches to intelligence-led policing, which display similar patterns despite opposite starting assumptions (pp. 3, 12–15, 82–84).

Presenting multiple intelligence regimes ultimately serves this analytical perspective by allowing for the consideration of situational and social factors in juvenile offending (pp. 5–6). Thanks to these epistemological lenses, significant attention is paid to the possibility of envisaging alternative constructions of police routines. This prospect refers primarily to policing choices that immediately classify youth deviance as gang-related crime, linking it directly to the fight against organized crime. This is mostly the case in the United States, where the spread of gang violence is seen as the primary driver of collective juvenile offending, thereby reinforcing the criminal intelligence regime. In France, by contrast, the focus is on addressing collective youth crime as a public safety issue, since gangs are not treated by default as a criminal phenomenon, but rather as a mirror reflecting other forms of juvenile violence or illegal conduct. For this reason, national law enforcement agencies tend to adopt an approach aimed at unsettling the resort to

12. See also David Weisburd & Anthony A. Braga, *Hot Spots Policing as a Model for Police Innovation*, in *POLICE INNOVATION: CONTRASTING PERSPECTIVES* 225 (David Weisburd & Anthony A. Braga eds., 2006).

violence that characterizes many manifestations of collective juvenile offending or deviant behavior (pp. 12–13, 21–25).

One cannot fail to appreciate the brilliant achievements of Ross and Delpuch. This book clearly conveys the complexity of a constructive reform proposal, intended to promote the analytical and effective use of intelligence-led policing through a variety of intelligence regimes, particularly in response to composite and persistent forms of crime.