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Jerry Ratcliffe recommends this, his second, edition of *Intelligence Led Policing* to readers as, substantially, the means by which motivated policing and criminal justice students, and law enforcement practitioners can synthesise ILP’s concepts and processes with their experience and practice to better understand this evolving dynamic. Whilst some (including the author – I will not shy away from that reality) may question just how novel ILP really is, readers will welcome Ratcliffe’s insights into what has been presented as a new paradigm in public policing. Certainly, in the information age, it would be difficult to underestimate ILP’s significance for police executives. The book is an insightful, perceptive and engaging account of the development of ILP from its earliest beginnings; fusing research data, scholarly reflection and ‘real life’ examples. Moreover, it is sprinkled with practitioners’ anecdotes. The book deserves a wide readership.

The term ILP is applied to a variety of crime-fighting processes that usually rely on the efforts of analysts and intelligence specialists engaged in crime mapping, data analysis and other problem-solving approaches. Another dimension of ILP (often labelled as proactive or covert policing) relies on the work of analysts and other specialists to target groups and individuals involved in serious organised crime or terrorism. From their earliest beginnings in the UK at the end of the last century, ILP strategies have become significant elements of policing arrangements in modern liberal democracies. Many argue that police activities of this kind are no more than pragmatic realities; necessary evils, justified by the increasing dangerousness of the social world and it is to this group that Ratcliffe’s research and writing on ILP largely seem to be addressed.

In Chapter 1, Ratcliffe explains the origins of ILP, demonstrating that though it was given a significant boost by 9/11; in fact, the ideas and beliefs that underpin ILP have their roots in the ‘changing priorities around fiscal accountability and public sector management’ that predate those terrible events (p.10). Some of the challenges facing the police are explored in Chapter 2 as a means of providing a rationale for ILP strategies, which without that justification, provide critics with further evidence of the inexorable expansion of the surveillance society with all its attendant iniquities. In Chapter 3, Ratcliffe reconceptualises the workings of the wider criminal justice system using the concept of the ‘crime funnel’ (he revisits that
concept in Chapter 8 to make the case for crime prevention). Chapter 4 addresses the ambiguity often associated with the term and compares and contrasts ILP with other conceptual models of policing. Ratcliffe highlights that one of ILP’s strengths is that it complements other alternative strategies that also are being pursued by the police.

Chapter 5, 6, and 7 explore some fundamental concepts at the heart of ILP. The emphasis in these chapters is on the business of intelligence: intelligence analysis; information collection and management; and the analyst/decision-maker dynamic. Chapter 8 examines inter alia some of the ways that ILP’s aims have been re-engineered so that some of the commonly accepted goals of public policing have been replaced with those of disruption and dislocation. Chapter 9 is a completely new chapter that assesses the impact of modern technologies on policing practice. Chapter 10 draws together empirical research into ILP from around the globe. The final chapter, 11, explores the challenges and opportunities that ILP strategies present and concludes with what Ratcliffe calls ‘a modest agenda for the future ... a preliminary road map to consider where ILP is now, and where it could be in the future’ (p.11).

Ratcliffe has done an excellent job of updating what was already a seminal text on ILP, analysing the impact of new and emerging technologies, and assessing modern phenomena such as predictive policing and ‘Big Data’. A passionate advocate of ILP, Ratcliffe seems keenly aware of its limitations and eschews simple solutions to policing’s ills or indeed to the problems of crime. The book is altogether more credible for that. One of its real strengths is the quality of insight provided by experienced police practitioners. Contributors include the head of New Jersey State Police’s Investigations Department and the Canadian analyst credited with creating the ‘Sleipner’ method of ranking criminal networks, which has spawned any number of imitations around the world.

Many readers will be aware that around the Western world, within a relatively short period, evidence-based practice (EBP) has become the new orthodoxy in policing. Arguably, the worldwide recession at the beginning of the twenty-first century intensified governments’ search for evidence of what works; it is not too much of a stretch to suggest that EBP has now become something of an obsession for many governments and institutions. Ratcliffe provides an important, scholarly contribution to that debate, which counterbalances some of the more positivist interpretations of the merits of EBP (often based on randomised control trials and
the like). The book is full of evidence about what has worked and what might work; happily, Ratcliffe does not fall into the trap of over-claiming for the significance of that evidence. Largely, readers are left to judge its value for themselves. For example, Ratcliffe advances ‘Ten yardsticks for success’ (p.191) against which the development of ILP may be assessed. Rather than providing something akin to a wish list, he describes those criteria in the detail that readers need to understand and appreciate just how challenging achieving any of those standards is likely to be.

With such a heavy focus on evidence and practice, it is inevitable that the socio-legal and socio-political dimensions of the subject receive rather less attention. All public policing is political, no matter what form it takes. As Ratcliffe highlights at the beginning of the book, ILP is unequivocally a product of belt-tightening by the police in a period when ‘What works?’ mattered less than ‘What does it cost?’ The quasi-philosophy of ‘new public management’ was a much more significant driver of change in policing in this context than any operational or tactical imperative. The challenges to public policing in that context in the modern era are even more acute. Perhaps that strand of the analysis could have been developed just a little more to satisfy readers who, while welcoming answers to the ‘when, what, and how?’ questions routinely associated with ILP, may also want to explore the ‘Why?’ questions.

That is not intended to detract from the very many positives in Ratcliffe’s book, which is a comprehensive analysis of ILP that, with this update, remains one of the most significant texts that has been written on the subject. The book will, and rightly should, appeal to readers across a range of disciplines. It will be of particular value to students of policing and to practitioners in a variety of business and functional areas who currently are wrestling with the challenges of implementing ILP strategies in their own institutions. My professional experiences in that regard, confirm the utility of ILP as a policing strategy and the credibility of the evidence that Ratcliffe brings forward for their use. Though those experiences also suggest that practitioners will need all the help they can get in overcoming the kinds of institutional barriers that normatively are erected whenever fundamental organisational change on this scale is proposed.