

Crime Prevention through Public-Private Cooperation within the Security System of Republic of Macedonia

Saše Gerasimoski

Purpose:

This article examines the contribution of public-private cooperation in crime prevention within the security system of Macedonia in the last 10 years.

Design/Methods/Approach:

Secondary data analysis on information obtained from the Ministry of Interior and private security entities as well as content analysis of available resources to estimate the importance of the crime prevention.

Findings:

In general, the contribution of the public-private cooperation to crime prevention within the contemporary security system of the Republic of Macedonia is seen more as potential than as reality, owing to the present level of co-existence between public and private security sector. Although the crime prevention advantages of the cooperation between them are recognized within both sectors, it is certain that only joint activities within securing the public events and transportation of money, documents and other valuables are functioning so far.

Research Limitations/Implications:

Considering the fact that secondary data are being used, employing primary data for analysis in the future will probably strengthen the findings obtained with this research and reveal new relations.

Originality/Value:

Though there are several studies related to private security in the Republic of Macedonia, there is a lack of studies concerning public-private cooperation within the security system, let alone their relationship to crime prevention. We see this study as a pivotal contribution to efforts to highlight this crucial dimension of their mutual relation nowadays and in the future.

UDC: 355.02(497)

Keywords: crime, prevention, public-private cooperation, security systems, Republic of Macedonia

Preprečevanje kriminalitete skozi javno-zasebno partnerstvo v varnostnem sistemu Republike Makedonije

Namen prispevka:

Članek analizira prispevek javno-zasebnega partnerstva na področju preprečevanja kriminalitete v varnostnem sistemu Republike Makedonije v zadnjih desetih letih.

Metode:

Uporabljena je metoda sekundarne analize podatkov Ministrstva za notranje zadeve in zasebnovarnostnih subjektov kot tudi analiza vsebine razpoložljivih relevantnih virov s področja preprečevanja kriminalitete.

Ugotovitve:

Na splošno gre prispevek javno-zasebnega partnerstva pri preprečevanju kriminalitete v sodobnem varnostnem sistemu Republike Makedonije opazovati predvsem v smislu potencialnega in ne realnega stanja, še posebej, če imamo pred očmi trenutno raven soobstoja javnega in zasebnega varnostnega sektorja. Čeprav oba sektorja prepoznavata prednosti, ki jih za preprečevanje kriminalitete prinaša njuno medsebojno sodelovanje, je to trenutno omejeno predvsem na varovanje javnih prireditev ter prevoz denarja, dokumentov in drugih dragocenosti.

Omejitve/uporabnost raziskave:

Glede na dejstvo, da so bili uporabljeni sekundarni podatki, bo primarna analiza podatkov v prihodnjih raziskavah verjetno okreplila ugotovitve te raziskave in razkrila nova razmerja med javnim in zasebnim varnostnim sektorjem.

Izvirnost/pomembnost prispevka:

Medtem, ko obstaja več študij o zasebnem varovanju, pa primanjkuje tako študij o javno-zasebnem partnerstvu v okviru varnostnega sistema v Republiki Makedoniji kot o njegovem vplivu na preprečevanje kriminala. To študijo lahko razumemo kot ključni prispevek k prizadevanjem, da bi osvetlili pomen medsebojnih odnosov med javnim in zasebnim varnostnim sektorjem za preprečevanje kriminalitete danes in v prihodnosti.

UDK: 355.02(497)

Ključne besede: kriminaliteta, preprečevanje, javno-zasebno partnerstvo, varnostni sistemi, Republika Makedonija

1 INTRODUCTION

There is a significant difference between the real role of the private security within contemporary security systems and the perceived, sometimes even stereotyped, picture of private security of public opinion. Surely, the very rapid and abrupt development of the private security phenomena caught many by surprise, even the theorists and practitioners in the field of security. Consequently, the real function and potential of the development of private security elsewhere has not been studied nor realized as it should be. For instance, many of the lay-people see private security as a repressive security component and as something that

has deviated from the very notion of security that is, security being seen as an integral societal phenomena, a public good. The very process of privatization of the security function contributed toward minimizing the preventive instead of the repressive function of private security. Private security, however, cannot be envisaged or practiced in any other way than preventive as its primary orientation. Since the position and the role of the private security sector are implied in what is called a subsystem of the security system and since the authorizations and exercise of the measures of coercion and use of weapons are strictly limited and defensively oriented, then there is no room to think about private security in other ways than preventive. Otherwise, repositioning and giving private security the role other than prevention would seriously shake the very concept of so called positive process of privatization within security, or top-down privatization. The private security sector is seen as complementary to the rest of the security system (state/public/civilian). The preventive orientation of the private security sector is now gaining in importance since the police, as the most important exponent of the public security, are also developing toward more preventive work in spite of their commonly accepted perception as a mainly repressive security institution. The new concept of police being service oriented means shifting their role more toward prevention, at the same time not entirely losing its recognizable repressive functions.

Our everyday life has become overwhelmed by different and constantly changing security risks, threats and endangerments. We are living in an era of post-modern societies and globalization where security has become very fluid notion constantly redefined and re-esteemed. Everything that is happening in an era in which we search for maximum possible freedom of living and expression within the given order, is permanently creating possibilities for disrupting that order and endangering the security of others. Thus, paradoxically, the more freedom we are looking for and experiencing, the more dangers we are encountering simultaneously. Or, if we could translate it in security language, the more we want to be free and live free, the more insecure we are becoming. The abrupt and unprecedented rise of the security measures, mostly, but not entirely related to the private security entities, are real evidence for that situation. We don't need more tangible proof for the rise of crime in our lives than the very security surroundings in which we are living. The fact that we have physical and technical security all around us reminds us that we are living in a risky and dangerous time where all that people and devices are here to protect us from those who disrespect the order and from those who break the law thus creating the crime and most importantly-the fear of crime. As Lars Svendsen wisely puts, "the wall (meaning the medieval walls erected to protect the medieval cities from the endangerments) that it supposed to protect us from the threats from 'outside' has been shifted all the way to the walls of our houses". Moreover, "the alarms and security locks in our houses affirm the picture of the dangerous world in which we are living" (Svendsen, 2010: 34).

Paradoxically enough, the unprecedented upsurge of the private security industry could not be sustained without creating in one or another way the need for security services many times greater than the real threats. These needs are accompanied by fear of threats, thus presenting itself, as some authors point out, as a "fear industry" (Whattam, 2011). That is why it is hard to talk about a

present security situation from a philosophical or sociological point of view rather than from securitological. Speaking from the point of view of security sciences, there is nothing wrong with the present security situation. We have a rise of crime worldwide and the private security sector has every reason to stand there and to justify its existence, moreover, since its role is primarily preventive. And indeed, seen from this point the private security is really fulfilling its role and societal function and that is to strengthen the security system capacities in prevention of crime and fight against crime, knowing that the police and other security services from the state /public/ security has found themselves less capable and efficient in dealing with diverse and numerous forms of contemporary crimes.

This study gives a scientific account of what is happening with the private security preventive function and elaborates the experience thus far and possibilities of crime prevention through police-private security cooperation primarily in Republic of Macedonia. At the same time, referring to the state-of-the-art in this field with the countries that have more experience in this kind of cooperative security efforts. We will see that the preventive function of the security system can be best achieved and implemented through cooperation between the security actors within it, that the cooperation of the police and private security, sometimes called public-private security partnership, is between the most important ones regarding this cooperation and that the cooperation between the segments of the security systems cannot be reached without the existence of mutual trust. And trust, its existence or non-existence, abundance or lack of trust is what predetermines not only the preventive actions of the security actors and providers, but also is a precondition to prevention at all.

2 THE ROLE OF PRIVATE SECURITY IN CRIME PREVENTION

Private security currently represents a vital segment of contemporary security systems. What was once considered as pure addition to public security and policing in general, today has become an inevitable and unavoidable part of the contemporary security system, policy and especially prevention. The very beginnings of the private security sector (or subsystem as we like to call it) are primarily related to the preventive security function. It is understandable if we know that the private security sector is complementary to the other parts of the security system and considering its legal and security limitations regarding the usage of authorizations, time and space of exerting of authorizations. The private security sector is actually envisaged and designed to help detect and prevent crime, especially proprietary and persons related to crime. Its main functions, tasks and responsibilities lie with protecting property, persons, securing transport of money and valuables and securing events with creating conditions that will diminish or eliminate the possibility of occurring of different forms of crime. Thus, the private security activity can be defined as oriented towards secondary crime prevention speaking broadly, mainly concerned with undertaking situational crime prevention measures (Palmer & Button, 2011). Apart from the closeness in explaining the role of private security with different criminological and crime prevention theories, it

seems quite obvious that the closest theory is a situational crime prevention theory with its roots in the routine activity and rational choice theoretical approaches (Clarke, 1997).

Private security is oriented towards secondary crime prevention because it does not have the mechanisms, nor authorizations and powers to influence significantly and directly the primary crime prevention which implies creating conditions and use of every kind of means and measures aimed at preventing the crime from being committed, or preventing the causes for crime (Krivokapič, 2002). It acts in preventing crime in a certain situation, in certain circumstances related to protection of life, property, valuables or events. In this case, private security crime prevention also carries traits of so called technical and special prevention (Spaseski, Nikolovski, & Gerasimoski, 2010). Private security is directly involved in crime prevention, while indirectly could contribute towards preventing antisocial and socio-pathological phenomena, because prevention in broader terms encompass them together with crime or breaching the laws that crime implies (Stanarevič & Ejduš, 2009). In actual fact, private security acts towards minimizing the opportunity for certain crime being committed in an area of the protection, deterring the potential offenders from committing crime and thus contributing toward reductions in the crime rate in a protected space and wider area. It is this peculiarity of crime prevention that makes private security significant player in the wider crime prevention strategies and policies that have been undertaken by various security providers within the state. Once the significant role of private security in the contemporary crime prevention has been recognized and affirmed, it has been almost unthinkable that successful crime prevention could be nowadays envisaged, planned or implemented without participation of the private security sector. The wide and continuously increased presence of the private security makes the private security sector, together with police and civilian sectors, three basic pillars of contemporary crime prevention, while the quality of their mutual cooperation and sound partnerships determine the success of the crime prevention strategies and policies.

Throughout the history of stratified societies, the prevention of crime seemed to be overshadowed by the repressive criminal justice system that considers various forms of punishment (sometimes too cruel and uncivilized for today's understanding) as the most appropriate for dealing with crime. History also teaches us that no matter what kinds of rigid and repressive criminal justice systems were designed, crime could not be eradicated or diminished significantly (Milosavljević, 2003). There were periods when the inappropriate and excessive use of repressive security and penal measures even increased crime rates. Today, we are living in a world where crime is constantly increasing, with new and more sophisticated forms of crime being invented and occurring every day, and with crime being widespread across the societal structure and geographically. The time in which we live calls for preventive crime strategies and policies as a first choice in combating contemporary crime and it presupposes continuous, joined, organized and successful efforts by different security actors.

Speaking of the roles that the segments (subsystems) of the contemporary security system play when considering crime prevention, we can differentiate the

role of the police and state/public/security sectors in general as being repressive and preventive with an overtone on prevention in recent years, then, the role of the private security sector as primarily preventively oriented and including defensively oriented repressive authorizations, and lastly the civilian security sector that exerts only preventive oriented measures (Spaseski, Aslimoski, & Gerasimoski, 2008).

The crucial role that private security plays in contemporary crime prevention could be summarized as follows:

- Decreasing the crime rates by implementing preventive security measures such as situational crime prevention;
- Creating crime awareness among their clients and the general public;
- Diminishing the possibilities for crime occurrence through surveillance and patrol activities and creating a perception of omnipresence (Steenkamp, 2002; Wakefield, 2005);
- Joint efforts on secondary crime prevention directly and primary crime prevention indirectly through public-private partnerships.

3 PUBLIC-PRIVATE COOPERATION FOR SUCCESSFUL CRIME PREVENTION

Public-private cooperation in crime prevention is nothing new in contemporary security, but building lasting and strategic partnerships between public and private security actors is certainly something that is to be achieved in most parts of the Europe and across the world. We can see the U.S.A., Great Britain, Germany and Australia leading the process, but what about other countries?

It seems that building such partnership requires other preconditions that have to be ripe enough to guarantee sound partnership. The first and the most important thing is of course mutual trust between the public (police) and private security based on high qualitative level of work reached by both sectors. Even in those circumstances, the tensions between state and private interests, lack of consultation with at-risk groups and the community, a predominance of situational crime prevention over other types of prevention and poorly trained personnel, are among the confining factors for sound partnership between public and private sector in crime prevention (Capobianco, 2005). Irrespective of the obstacles, there are very positive examples of public-private partnership that has produced decrease of crime rates and has seriously lowered other forms of crime in terms of their frequency, seriousness and damage they inflicted. Thus, for example, over 90% of assignments of the private security in Germany and in most developed countries of Western Europe (Great Britain, Netherlands, France, Austria, Sweden, Belgium) cover the field of prevention, i.e. warding off danger and preventing criminal offences in the private-law area (Olschok, 2002).

In the USA, the public-private partnerships include advanced forms of partnerships, where the private security sector is widely included in numerous public-private security initiatives and projects. "Operation Cooperation" represents a major national initiative to encourage partnerships between law enforcement and private security professionals (Connors, Cunningham, Ohlhausen, Oliver,

& Van Meter, 2000). The crime prevention partnerships are basic in the overall public-private partnerships in the USA and they form a nucleus from which much wider and advanced forms of cooperation like emergency planning and response, assistance in guaranteeing public security, exchange of information concerning public and state security emerge. It has to be stressed that the public (police)-private security partnership started with crime prevention initiatives, programs and projects, so it is a kind of core for further deepening and widening of the notion of public (police)-private security partnership (Dempsey, 2011). Private security is considered a significant factor that has helped to decrease crime rates in the U.S.A., especially proprietary crimes and in 2005 has reached its lowest level since 1973 (Fischer, Halibozek, & Green, 2008). Although the real impact and merit of private security in decreasing crimes is hard to assess and weigh, it is indisputable that it plays a significant, even crucial role, especially when compared with data when the main job of crime prevention was done by the police alone. Also, we can see salient differences when comparing isolated from joint efforts in crime prevention. The practice has shown that private security, alone or through partnership with police, has a crucial influence on deterring crime, minimizing the crime risk as well as improving the structure of crime (for example, the crimes against people's life and body are less brutal, violent and serious; proprietary crimes inflict less damage; there is a reallocation of the crimes with many entities being affected with minor crimes instead of few with great losses; the propensity for crime is lowering while crime deterrence is growing etc.). This is in accordance with the very essence of crime prevention, since crime prevention understands that intervention in the causes of criminal events, and seeks to reduce the risk of their occurrence and their potential seriousness (Home Office, 2004).

The Australian experience in crime prevention through public-private partnerships is notably valuable. Since the introduction of various programs and projects within public-private partnerships in crime prevention, significant positive results have been noted. A study of several crime-prevention programs and projects grounded in public-private partnerships in Australia found that they have reduced crime by 78% over the last 15 years, and in some cases even 90%. The authors further conclude that the main ingredients for that successful partnership were mutual respect, shared goals, information sharing, confidentiality, complementary powers (the powers were not an obstacle) and mutual benefits (Prenzler & Sarre, 2011).

4 PUBLIC-PRIVATE COOPERATION IN CRIME PREVENTION IN REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

Crime has always been tied to human historical development. We have almost no record of stratified societies without some form of crime. What is most peculiar to the present human condition is that crime is found almost everywhere and more than that, it is found more in latent forms like organized crime and other forms of crime that are more dangerous and all encompassing, but less visible. It makes the fight against crime a painstaking enterprise. Contemporary crime is a kind of

skillfully disguised matter as once described by the renown French theoretician of crime Cristian Carle when he spoke about the crime in Western societies and its latent and disguised development as a real danger and challenge. He actually spoke boldly about so called "crime society", which is surely pretty exaggerated, but he was probably right when he concluded that "la societe du crime s'avance masquee-the crime society is advancing masked" (Carle, 1996).

The Republic of Macedonia passed through a very difficult transitional period marked with a significant increase in the crime and other antisocial and socio-pathological phenomena. What is most concerning is the rapid rise of crime against property and crime against person's life and their physical integrity. According to the statistical data, there are around 20,000 criminal acts against property and life in the past few years on average in the Republic of Macedonia and those criminal acts constitute 60% of all criminal acts. Compared to the situation in the region there are not greater differences, but there are surely significant differences when compared to European averages where the average increase of the crime rate is 1% (Mustać, 2004; Spaseski et al., 2008). For comparison, the crimes against life and body have increased from 696 in 2001, to 982 in 2010, while the increase in crimes against property are dramatic; they doubled from 2001 when they were 9599, to 19846 in 2010 (Državen zavod za statistika, 2011). That explains pretty convincingly the boom of private security in Republic of Macedonia and that is exactly the very period that coincides with that rapid development of this sector in the last decade.

The data from the Ministry of Interior are also very indicative. They show a decrease of police efficaciousness in resolving crime. The efficaciousness has dropped from 60.7% in 2001 to 51.03 in 2010. Also, the crime rate has increased from 840.7 crimes on 100 000 people in 2001 to 1331.4 crimes on 100 000 people in 2009. The structure of clarified crimes is uneven. While the police has shown increased efficaciousness in resolving crimes against life and body from 2004 onwards, it has proven less efficacious in dealing with proprietary crimes like theft, burglary, and other proprietary crimes (Ministerstvo za vnatrešni raboti na Republika Makedonija, 2012a). This is also very interesting when compared to the rise of the private security sector. It seems that neither the police, nor the private security sector had shown greater efficaciousness when considering proprietary crimes and indirectly, the high rate of proprietary crime means that the private security has not played the preventive role for which it primarily exists. This conclusion is supported by the rapid increase of proprietary crimes in the given period.

What is also intriguing is that all private security agencies praise themselves as being very efficacious when dealing especially with proprietary crimes, and they support this with the satisfaction of their clients with the quality of security services they offer to them. Their explanation could be partially accepted, especially when considering the safety and security of their clients, but the wider preventive effects on crimes are certainly missing in this story. Namely, the lack of cooperation between the police and the private security sector in crime prevention, unsatisfactory involvement of the private security sector in crime prevention as part of the public interest work and insufficient preventive measures undertaken in securing property, together with increased proprietary crime towards unsecured

citizens and entities from the private security sector explain why we have increases in proprietary crimes and why we don't have appropriate and efficacious crime prevention policies.

Our content analysis of security services and security policy of private security agencies for securing persons and property that operate in the Republic of Macedonia has shown low levels of awareness of prevention and the significance of prevention in their work, although it can be indirectly observed and assumed in the services they offer. For that purpose, we analyzed the available contents of their Internet pages and found that the word prevention appeared only 3 times (once in each Internet page) of three different agencies out of 31 agencies that are members of the Chamber for securing persons and property, which has become an active member of CoESS this year. We analyzed 5 active pages out of 12 (the other 7 are inactive) (Komora na Republika Makedonija za obezbeduvanje na lica i imot, 2012). We found that the word prevention appears only three times, all of which were related with physical security (physical securing of property) as part of situational crime prevention. We found no mention of prevention within the context of public-private security cooperation, let alone partnerships. As far as mentioning the derivatives of prevention are concerned, we found preventive patrol security, preventive circulation (enclosure) and preventive signboards. It seems that the private security agencies that operate in the Republic of Macedonia are unaware or slightly aware with the vast opportunities of a preventive function in private security and almost unaware of the public (police)-private cooperation and partnership in crime prevention, although they cooperate in terms of securing manifestations and events, transport of money and other valuables and ad-hock exchange of security information concerning crime prevention.

With some other developments added to the previous discussion, we will be able to get clearer picture of what is really happening with crime prevention in the Republic of Macedonia and to get an answer to the question: Why there's not significant cooperation between the police and private security sectors in terms of crime prevention?, and, Why is it that we cannot speak of partnership in crime prevention between public and private security sectors but rather of minimal necessary cooperation?

Some latest developments showed interesting and to some extent disturbing evidence of what was only feared previously, and which was considered as feature of private security development in the first decade (1991–2000). In this first decade private security in the Republic of Macedonia was not legally regulated and it was associated with crime activities, among them organized crime activities, enabled through the links of private security officers and some police officers with political parties and criminal structures (Cvetkovski, 2011; Gerasimoski, 2011a). The police action called "Detonator" undertaken in the beginning of this year revealed another kind of "partnership", completely opposite to the intended one. There were even commentaries that behind all action lay a struggle between some of the private security agencies for market positions. The mentioned police action that at first was undertaken in Eastern Macedonia in the towns of Kočani, Štip and Vinica and then spread across other towns in Macedonia, has revealed hidden and illegal cooperation of local police and some private security agencies in doing

illegal business, racketeering, hustling, blackmailing and other crimes. As a result of this police action, 13 commanders of the police stations and one head of the police sector in Štip were dismissed and others appointed. Besides that, the private security agency "Titan" from Kočani was closed under the allegation of direct involvement in criminal activities, among them for gambling and unauthorized running of gambling business. More than 1000 poker machines were confiscated during the police action "Detonator".

Regretfully, it appears that in the previous years there was more cooperation between police and private security in producing rather, than preventing crime. Recent research has shown that, among the general public, private security agencies are still considered a kind of criminal entities and the security officers as racketeers (Petrevski & Dimitrovska, 2011). Generally speaking, it is a kind of ambivalent situation. On one hand, we have latent criminal connections and more or less visible criminal activities, and on the other we have numerous private security entities that seems like they are doing their job fine and are well organized and equipped for doing their job properly. After all these events, one may get a clearer idea from the numbers outlined above that describe the rise of crime in the Republic of Macedonia in spite of continuous strengthening of police and private security capacities in quantity and in quality.

It is also worth noting that police have started implementing some crime and security prevention initiatives such as the "Safe City" project and "Mixed patrols" project. Both are still in a phase of pilot projects, but both projects do not include participation of the private security sector. This is even strange to some point knowing that private security agencies are even more informed about some crimes and can directly influence in their prevention, like for example, crimes that occur in night clubs, casinos and other tourist and catering locations secured by the private security sector. Therefore, it seems that the police should seriously consider the inclusion of the private security sector in the crime and security prevention projects as mentioned above.

The previous discussion calls for immediate and concerted efforts of the police and the private security sector in preventing crimes and building strong and lasting partnership in crime prevention, since the preventive measures taken so far appear to be inefficacious and insufficient. Importantly, taking preventive measures implies activities of police and other security authorities aimed at precluding the advent of crime, serious transgression of public order as well as securing people and objects. Most of the preventive measures include police patrol and surveillance service, authorizations that nowadays have also been transferred to some extent to private security entities (Boškovič, 1999).

5 THE FUTURE OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP IN CRIME PREVENTION IN REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

It is said that the best security is the one that is unremarkable, that is a security situation where everything goes normally, commonly and without any disturbance of the life or activity of the secured persons, property or event. That is

precisely what we mean when we discuss crime prevention. Private security is a predominantly prevention oriented and can perform its preventive tasks alone or in partnership with other segments of the security system. In doing its everyday preventive activities, the private security sector mainly focuses on the situational crime prevention measures of securing persons' lives and their property (Dorevski, 2004). The use of repressive mechanisms in private security is so narrowed and limited and above all unwanted, that there are actually more theoretical than practical possibilities for their usage, or, as Frederic Ocquetau wisely puts, "private security is concerned essentially with prevention and protection, with the (theoretical) exception of repression" (Ocquetau, 1993). It means that the private security companies provide mainly defensive services (in a sense of protective, preventive oriented) (Holmqvist, 2005).

The private security sector in the Republic of Macedonia faces a serious challenge of heightening the preventive function. In order to reach that goal, the private security sector (subsystem) must improve its relations and cooperation with the public security sector (police) to the level of partnership (Gerasimoski, 2011b). The present situation concerning public-private partnerships in the Republic of Macedonia can be described as one of minimal cooperation, that is realized mainly in securing public events and mutual cooperation, assistance and exchange of information in securing the transport of money and other valuables. While there are some who believe that the police and private security cooperate as partners, this is surely not the case in practice. Maybe, some tend to see that they are partners or present themselves as partners in a quest to become such in the future (Savovski, 2011). The current loose public-private security cooperation is a very modest contribution toward crime prevention and in the time ahead it is expected that the mutual recognition and trust must be raised as preconditions to higher and closer forms of cooperation and partnership, especially related to crime prevention. The present situation is unfortunately characterized mainly as unsystematic and ad-hock (from case to case, from time to time) cooperation and one where the police still consider themselves as superior and the main provider of security, while private security is seen as inferior, a stance that is been accepted more or less even among private security entities. This represents a serious obstacle towards other forms of close cooperation and partnership that cannot be carried out if the actors are not seen and taken to be equal. Taking into consideration the fact that the role of the private security sector in crime prevention will be more important as time passes, it is a question of time when the police will recognize that fact.

Today, there are 111 registered agencies for securing persons and property in the Republic of Macedonia, but only around 30 of them (members of the Chamber for securing persons and property) are significant, and there are only five registered private detective agencies (Komora na Republika Makedonija za obezbeduvanje na lica i imot, 2011). The new Draft Law of private securing proposes several new means of coercion that the agencies for securing persons and property could exercise, such as truncheons, means for tying and tear-gas. Although the Draft version of the Law is still waiting be adopted by the Parliament, there are much divided opinions among experts to whether this Law will be a step

further considering prevention and especially crime prevention. This is evident when we speak about the inadequate level of trust and cooperation between police and private security entities that is necessary to preclude any chances for abuse of these authorizations for using more repressive than preventive measures. For sure, the Law makes some very important improvements, but considering the use of measures of coercion and fire arms there is still an air of fear of how this will be implemented in practice. The new Law of private securing does not mention prevention or prevention of crime specifically, nor does it leave room for any forms of cooperation or partnership in this sense. (Ministerstvo za vnatrešni raboti na Republika Makedonija, 2012b)

The worsened reputation of private security with the latest developments surely will require more time for the public to acquire a more positive image of private security and the private security, by its own side, to improve the quality and professionalism needed to become equal partners with police. The police, on the other hand, should be aware of the need to offer closer cooperation and partnership when the quality of work of private security entities will guarantee success of the partnerships. Both have to be sure that nothing prevents crime better than joint efforts. When this requirement is met, we can talk of serious, stable and long-standing partnership between police and private security that could be implemented in the following areas of crime prevention:

- Undertaking complementary and coordinated measures in situational crime prevention;
- Participation in joint projects and programs related with implementation of the CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design);
- Exchange of useful operative information concerning crimes against life and body, crime against property as well as crimes committed during public events or transport of money and other valuables;
- Exchange of security know-how, especially the one related with timely and appropriate assessment of risks, threats and endangerments and in designing of security plans;
- Mutual support with material and human resources concerning reduction of crime; and
- Joint participation in wider crime prevention strategies, programs and projects, especially with community and civilian oriented ones like participation in crime prevention initiatives and activities of the local prevention councils.

6 CONCLUSION

Private security undoubtedly plays a significant, if not crucial role, in contemporary crime prevention and therefore it has to be taken into consideration as an important factor when considering partnerships in the contemporary security systems. The preventive orientation of private security has helped numerous security systems reconsider the idea of prevention and to build lasting partnerships with the public sector (police), all of these being strongly supported by obvious positive effects on crime prevention.

The Republic of Macedonia seems to be distant from these contemporary developments presently. There is an unsystematic and loose cooperation between private security and the police and it seems that it will take some time before leaders in both sectors understand the real advantage of partnership in crime prevention. We found the lack of mutual trust and some illegal activities to stand on the way of realizing the idea of partnership in crime prevention. We can freely conclude that the idea of prevention in general has been slowly accepted and even the private security sector appears not to be fully aware of its preventive potential. When all these prerequisites are being met, we can expect a next phase of heightening the cooperation between the public and private sectors from the present level of co-existence to the level of partnership, especially concerning crime prevention.

REFERENCES

- Boškovič, M. (1999). *Kriminološki leksikon*. Novi Sad: Matica Srpska.
- Capobianco, L. (2005). *Sharpening the lens: Private sector involvement in crime prevention*. International Centre for the Prevention of Crime. Retrieved from http://www.crime-prevention-intl.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/Sharpening_the_Lens_Private_Sector_Involvement_in_Crime_Prevention_ANG.pdf
- Carle, C. (1996). *La Société du crime*. Paris: Les Éditions de la Passion.
- Clarke, V. R. (1997). *Situational crime prevention: Successful case studies*. New York: Harrow & Heston Publishers.
- Connors, E., Cunningham, W., Ohlhausen, P., Oliver, L., & Van Meter, C. (2000). *Operation cooperation: Guidelines for partnerships between law enforcement and private security organizations*. Washington: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Cvetkovski, G. (2011). *Profesija privaten detektiv*. Skopje: Panili.
- Dempsey, J. D. (2011). *Introduction to private security*. Belmont: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Dorevski, Z. (2004). *Obezbeduvanje: praktikum*. Skopje: Komora na Republika Makedonija za obezbeduvanje na lica i imot.
- Državen zavod za statistika. (2011). *Storiteli na krivični dela vo 2010: statistički pregled*. Skopje: Državen zavod za statistika.
- Fischer, R. J., Halibozek, E., & Green, G. (2008). *Introduction to security*. Burlington: Elsevier.
- Gerasimoski, S. (2011a). Relations between police and private security sector in Republic of Macedonia. In Ž. Nikač et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Archibald Reiss Days International Scientific Conference* (vol. 2, pp. 795–803). Belgrade: Academy of Criminalistics and Police Studies.
- Gerasimoski, S. (2011b). The development of private security in Republic of Macedonia: Contradictions and possibilities. In C. Mojanoski (Ed.), *Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference Security in the Post-Conflict (Western) Balkans: Transition and Challenges Faced by the Republic of Macedonia, Ohrid, Skopje* (vol. 2, pp. 326–340). Skopje: Faculty of security.
- Holmqvist, C. (2005). *Private security companies: The case for regulation*. Stockholm: SIPRI International Peace Research Institute.

- Home Office. (2004). *Safer places: The planning system and crime prevention*. London: Home Office.
- Komora na Republika Makedonija za obezbeduvanje na lica i imot. (2011). *Prelged na podatoci za dejnosta obezbeduvanje lica i imot*. Presentation at the meeting "Denovi na privatno obezbeduvanje Zaedno sme sigurni, zaedno sme edno", Skopje.
- Komora na Republika Makedonija za obezbeduvanje na lica i imot. (2012). *Agencii za obezbeduvanje na lica i imot-členki na Komorata*. Retrieved from <http://www.obezbeduvanje.org.mk/KomoraContent.aspx?id=232>
- Krivokapič, V. (2002). *Prevenција kriminaliteta*. Beograd: Policijska akademija.
- Milosavljević, M. (2003). *Devijacije i društvo*. Beograd: Draganić.
- Ministerstvo za vnatrešni raboti na Republika Makedonija. (2012a). *Dviženje na kriminalot vo Republika Makedonija vo periodot 2001–2010 godina*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za vnatrešni raboti na Republika Makedonija.
- Ministerstvo za vnatrešni raboti na Republika Makedonija. (2012b). *Predlog Zakon za privatno obezbeduvanje*. Skopje: Ministerstvo za vnatrešni raboti na Republika Makedonija.
- Mustać, V. (2004). *Prevenција kriminaliteta u Europskoj Uniji*. Zagreb: MUP RH i OSCE.
- Ocquetau, F. (1993). Legitimation of the private security sector in France. *European Journal of Criminal Policy and Research*, 1(4), 108–122.
- Olschok, H. (2002). Private security in Germany and the cooperation with the police. *Wirtschaft und Politik*, (3), 11–14.
- Palmer, W. R., & Button, M. (2011). *Civilian private security services: Their role, oversight and contribution to crime prevention and community safety*. Vienna: Expert Group on Civilian Private Security Services.
- Petrevski, B., & Dimitrovska, A. (2011). Reforms of Restructuring the Private Security Subsystem in the Republic of Macedonia Within the Modern Concept of Security System. In C. Mojanoski (Ed.), *Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference Security in the Post-Conflict (Western) Balkans: Transition and Challenges Faced by the Republic of Macedonia, Ohrid, Skopje* (vol. 2, pp. 439–453). Skopje: Faculty of security.
- Prenzler, T., & Sarre, R. (2011). *Public-private crime prevention partnerships in Australia*. Sydney: ARC Centre of Excellence in Policing and Security.
- Savovski, G. (2011). *Analiza na sostojbite vo praksa*. Presentation at the meeting "Denovi na privatno obezbeduvanje Zaedno sme sigurni, zaedno sme edno", Skopje.
- Spaseski, J., Aslimoski, P., & Gerasimoski, S. (2008). *Privatna bezbednost*. Skopje-Ohrid: Policijska akademija i Fakultet za turizam i ugostitelstvo.
- Spaseski, J., Nikolovski, M., & Gerasimoski, S. (2010). *Bezbednosni sistemi: prilog kon učenjeto za nacionalnite bezbednosni sistemi*. Skopje: Fakultet za bezbednost.
- Stanarević, S., & Ejđus, F. (2009). *Pojmovnik bezbednosne kulture*. Beograd: Centar za civilno-vojne odnose.
- Steenkamp, D. G. (2002). *The role of private security in crime prevention* (Doctoral dissertation). Zululand: University of Zululand.
- Svendsen, L. Fr. H. (2010). *Filozofija na stravot*. Skopje: ViG Zenica.
- Wakefield, A. (2005). The public surveillance functions of private security. *Surveillance & Society*, 2(4), 529–545.

Whattam, S. (2011). Situational crime prevention: Modern society's trojan horse. *Internet Journal of Criminology*, 1-52.

About the Author:

Saše Gerasimoski, Ph.D., is Assistant Professor of Private Security and Social Pathology at the head of the Security department and Criminology and Criminal Justice department at the Faculty of Security, Skopje, University of St. "Kliment Ohridski"- Bitola, Republic of Macedonia. His research interests are Security, Private Security, Sociology and Social Pathology. E-mail: sgerasimoski@yahoo.com