

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

Williams Honors College, Honors Research
Projects

The Dr. Gary B. and Pamela S. Williams Honors
College

Spring 2023

Crime Analysis and its Applications Throughout Different Countries and Systems

Derek Blanc
dmb304@uakron.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/honors_research_projects



Part of the [Criminal Procedure Commons](#), and the [Law Enforcement and Corrections Commons](#)

Please take a moment to share how this work helps you [through this survey](#). Your feedback will be important as we plan further development of our repository.

Recommended Citation

Blanc, Derek, "Crime Analysis and its Applications Throughout Different Countries and Systems" (2023). *Williams Honors College, Honors Research Projects*. 1689.

https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/honors_research_projects/1689

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by The Dr. Gary B. and Pamela S. Williams Honors College at IdeaExchange@UAkron, the institutional repository of The University of Akron in Akron, Ohio, USA. It has been accepted for inclusion in Williams Honors College, Honors Research Projects by an authorized administrator of IdeaExchange@UAkron. For more information, please contact mjon@uakron.edu, uapress@uakron.edu.

Crime Analysis and its Applications Throughout Different Countries and Systems

Derek Blanc

The University of Akron

Williams Honors College Research Project

Spring 2023

Abstract

Crime analysis plays a vital role in policing and maintaining law and order throughout many countries around the globe. The application and uses of crime analysis can vary greatly not only worldwide, but also between local police agencies as well. Many factors, including resources that are available, as well as funding and the legal frameworks in place can all affect how crime analysis is used and operated. This paper will provide a deeper understanding of how the criminal justice system has evolved into the way it is today, as well as how crime analysis was developed. In addition, the paper will show how crime analysis is utilized throughout the United States of America, Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia, and compare their applications of crime analysis.

Keywords: crime analysis, policing, criminal justice

Crime analysis was developed to study crime in both, a more qualitative and quantitative way. More factors have been introduced, including spatial and socio-economic relationships, in order to study the causes of specific crimes. In addition, these factors are used to prevent these crimes from taking place in the future, as well implement design changes in police organizational procedures.¹ While this may be viewed as the worldwide textbook definition of crime analysis, the application of the analysis across different departments and even countries may be drastically different. This analysis aims to gain a deeper understanding of why crime analysis has been created and widely used within the world of criminal justice, as well as how four different countries may define the use of crime analysis and how they implement their own findings into their police departments.

This analysis will center around four of the major world leaders in applications of crime analysis within the world of policing. These countries include the United States of America, the neighboring country of Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia. After conducting a literature review of crime analysis in each country, a comparative analysis will be presented identifying any similarities and differences between the applications and definitions of crime analysis between the countries as well as a focus on any applications that the United States may be able to incorporate into our own knowledge of policing.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Political Era

The idea of an organized police force within the United States of America originated in New York City and other notable municipal cities around the mid-1840s. From its inception, until the early 1900s, this is widely known as the Political Era of policing.² This era was known

as political due to the heavy representative nature of police forces to local politicians. Political agenda were expected to be met by the officers that were hired. This era of policing contained little to no diversity as only white men were hired into the profession. The Political Era was ravaged by corrupt politicians and bribery.

Professional Era

Fast-forward to the 1930s, the model of policing took a complete turn towards a more professional appearance and turned away from political affiliation. This was known as the Reform Era of policing.² Candidates for police departments were put through intensive training academies as well as intelligence and psychological testing. Criminal investigations were more inquisitive and scientific. Later into this era, forensic testing was utilized.³ Chief August Vollmer is widely regarded as the founder of the Reform Era as we founded the first School of Criminology within the University of California at Berkeley. This allowed the field of Criminal Justice to formally be known as a scientific discipline. Vollmer wanted police officers to completely understand the criminals as an individual and attempt to understand why they choose to commit crimes.³

Community Era

During the 1960s-70s, the civil rights movement led to a double increase in crime. Community relations with local law enforcement were at an all-time worst. The trust and bond between civilians and police officers were extremely lacking. From the 1980s to the early 2000s, a third era of policing was developed, known as the Community Era of policing.² This time represented an increase in civilian involvement in police procedures. Community-based philosophies surrounding the causes of crime, such as the broken windows theory, were developed during this time as a means of identifying certain problems within the community and

eliminating them. The Community Era also provided an increase in professional research of crime data and introduced problem-oriented policing (POP).³ POP uses organized crime data to focus on the implementing specific strategies and tactics to eliminate specific crimes within a community.

Homeland Security Era

As time has now moved well into the 21st century, there has been a shift away from POP and more towards intelligence-led policing (ILP). While the origins of ILP can be traced back to the United Kingdom in the early 1990s, the implementation of ILP around the globe did not accelerate until the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in New York City on September 11th, 2001.⁴ The 9/11 attacks represented a turning point towards a fourth era of policing. The modern era of policing is now known as the Homeland Security Era.⁴ This new era focuses on utilizing ILP as a means of preparing law enforcement to prevent crimes from taking place, rather than the traditional form of responsive policing.

In response to the 9/11 attacks, the U.S. government passed the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act (IRTPA) in 2004.⁴ This legislation led to the creation of Information Sharing Environment (ISE). The ISE is a national database used by law enforcement, homeland security, as well as foreign affairs personnel. The database contains all information regarding national security. The ISE is at the forefront for crime analysts in terms of sharing crime data and understanding the various threats to the American people.⁴

Compstat

One of the most important influences for the introduction of crime analysis and ILP into modern police departments is the creation of Compstat. Compstat is a performance measuring system within a police department driven solely by crime data and statistics.⁵ The system is used

for significantly reducing crime and increasing department efficiency. Usually held weekly, Compstat meetings are utilized to establish any problems involving crime in the area and establish strategies and tactics to combat these problems in a timely matter.

Compstat originated in the New York City Police Department (NYPD) in the early 1990s. During this time period, crime was at an all-time high in the neighborhoods of NYC. Police commissioner, Bill Bratton, developed Compstat as a way of keeping track of crime statistics and having his officers adequately respond to the alarming statistics.⁵ Compstat aimed at understanding the root of the problems associated at different crimes, rather than simply accepting that nothing could be done to prevent crime, which was the belief in policing for many years. Compstat was released during the time of the shift to the Community Era and put more emphasis on POP. In order to follow a more POP approach, the system had four major components⁵:

- 1.) Timely and Accurate Information or Intelligence**
- 2.) Rapid Deployment of Resources**
- 3.) Effective Tactics**
- 4.) Relentless Follow-up**

Prior to the implementation of Compstat, crime statistics shared within the NYPD were usually around six to twelve months old and were not accurate or representative of the crimes currently taking place. Through the use of the weekly meetings, executives were able to accurately pinpoint the current needs of the city based on the most current crime data and intelligence.⁵ This allowed the NYPD to rapidly deploy all the necessary police officers and resources to specific areas of the city and perform the effective tactics necessary to prevent specific crimes from occurring. Following the deployment of resources, the goal is to continue to

follow-up and make sure the area is completely clear of all crime before pulling the resources to a different area.⁵

Compstat opened the door for limitless sharing of information between different levels of a police department, as well as different departments entirely. This sharing of crime data and intelligence was the first of its kind and was a small glimpse at the potential of a national database of intelligence and information sharing, now known as the ISE.⁵ Compstat became significantly successful in New York and has been adopted throughout several police departments in major cities around the country. In addition to being popular in the States, many similar strategy systems have been used around the world over the course of the 21st century.⁵

Barriers to Intelligence-Led Policing

While ILP has successfully meandered its way into most major police departments within the United States, there have been numerous obstacles along the way. One of the biggest problems within the field of criminal justice for decades has been the older police officers not abiding by the new ideas of the future.⁴ For example, during the Reform Era, many experienced officers were fully against the younger, more educated, and professional-oriented officers instructing them on a new way of policing. The same can be said for the modern age of intelligence-led officers with more education attempting to change the way older officers are used to policing.

In addition to resistance from the older generation of police officers, many new officers are hesitant to follow the instructions provided by civilian crime analysts. Since many crime analysts within police departments are not typically sworn officers, the actual police officers within the department may not feel inclined to follow orders.⁴ Crime analysis also carries the burden of taking a significant portion of a department's funding. There are over 16,000 different

law enforcement agencies within the United States, with a majority containing less than 10 police officers.⁴ This shows that over half of the police departments in the country are unable to sustain a functioning ILP system and crime analysis unit.

Federal Bureau of Investigation

The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) acts as the highest level of law enforcement within the United States. Through the use of criminal intelligence analysis, the FBI is able to adequately prepare the United States for terrorist attacks, both foreign and domestic, as well as assist local law enforcement agencies in major crimes such as homicides and kidnappings.⁶ The FBI contains roles of intelligence agents and crime analysts that work together to develop a fundamental plan and prepare for many different types of crimes that may occur on U.S. soil.



This image shows the seals for the FBI, CIA, and NSA

Central Intelligence Agency

The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) is similar to the FBI in the way it conducts intelligence analysis. However, unlike the FBI, the CIA does not have any law enforcement function and only functions as a means of collecting foreign intelligence, rather than domestic.⁶

The CIA also contains intelligence agents and crime analysts that develop emergency tactics and strategies in the case of a foreign threat or a series of international crimes that could involve the United States.

CANADA

Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Prior to the 1920s, Canada was fairly split between its policing services. While the Dominion Police Force was the dominant policing service for the country for much of the late 1800s to early 1900s, there was virtually no police presence for much of the Northwest territories.⁷ In the early 1870s, the Royal North-West Mounted Police was created to monitor and enforce the law within the northwest territories of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba. In 1920, an effort to bring together a unified law enforcement body was successfully enacted by Canadian Prime Minister, Robert Borden. The legislation brought the Dominion Police Force and Royal North-West Mounted Police together to create the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), which has jurisdiction over all of Canada.⁷

Today, the RCMP is Federal and National police service for all of Canada and its territories, except for the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. These provinces have established their own provincial police service. While the remaining provinces also have their own provincial police services, they also contract policing responsibilities to the RCMP.⁷ The RCMP has a great relationship with the Canadian citizens and is widely viewed as a national symbol for Canada by the general public.



This image shows the RCMP logo, seen as a national symbol of Canada

Criminal Intelligence Service Canada

Developed and established in 1970, the Criminal Intelligence Service Canada (CISC) was created as an organization to share criminal intelligence data and statistics with fellow Canadian police departments as well as the RCMP.⁸ The CISC's headquarters are currently located in Ottawa, the capital city of Canada. The CISC contains the Criminal Intelligence Bureau, which serves the role of providing access to the national criminal intelligence database that is accessed by all members of the CISC. The bureau also provides services to all members of the Canadian law enforcement community.⁸ As branches of the central bureau, each province within the country is home to their own provincial bureau. These provincial bureaus virtually perform the same general tasks as the central bureau, but only on an individual provincial level.

There are three levels of members involved in the CISC⁸:

- 1.) Level 1 – Police Agencies**
- 2.) Level 2 – Agencies with Specific Law Enforcement Roles**
- 3.) Level 3 – Agencies with Roles Complementary to Law Enforcement**

Level 1 consists of police agencies with both federal and provincial law enforcement that contain their own criminal intelligence unit. Due to the increasing cost of housing a working crime analysis unit, many smaller individual police departments do not contain their own unit, similar to police departments in the United States.⁸ Level 2 consists of police agencies that have their own specific role within law enforcement. An example of this is the Border Patrol, otherwise known as the Canadian Border Service Agency. Level 3 contains all agencies that do not contain a role in law enforcement but provide services and assistance to law enforcement agencies.⁸

Member police agencies provide intelligence data to their respective provincial bureaus. Then, the provincial bureaus add this intelligence data to national online database known as the Automated Criminal Intelligence Information System (ACIIS). While the provincial bureaus are responsible for adding data to the ACIIS, the central bureau is responsible for managing and overseeing the database. The ACIIS is used by Canada for intelligence data the same as the ISE is used in the United States for national security data.

UNITED KINGDOM

Watchmen and Constables

Prior to the implementation of a formal police force in the United Kingdom, local communities established a group of men to guard the streets during the night hours. These became known as the neighborhood watchmen.⁹ In 1737, Parliament passed an Act to solidify a night watch for the city of London in order to have a handful of paid constables to guard the streets. Constables, unlike police officers, did not have true law enforcement authority at the time.

Metropolitan Police Act of 1829

For the remainder of the 18th century, night watchmen and constables were the peak of policing authority within many cities within the United Kingdom. However, in 1800, the city of Glasgow, Scotland established its own police force.⁹ This led to several other industrialized cities to develop their own unique police forces. While these police departments are widely considered to be the first unified police forces in the United Kingdom, their blueprint was not adequate enough to be implemented nationally.



This image shows Sir Robert Peel, the father of modern policing

Sir Robert Peel, universally regarded as the father of modern policing, introduced the idea of establishing a permanent police force within the city of London. He made his claim to Parliament, which passed the Metropolitan Police Act of 1829.⁹ The London Metropolitan Police replaced the watchmen and constables and introduced peelers and bobbies, which are the equivalent of the modern police officer. Peel's philosophy that a police department's success is not measured by the number of arrests it makes, but by the total lack of crime in the area, is one

of the founding principles for modern-day ILP and criminal intelligence analysis.⁹ The Metropolitan Police Act of 1829 established the proper blueprint for all modern police agencies within the United Kingdom.

National Criminal Intelligence Service

In sharp contrast to the United States, the United Kingdom has been developing and perfecting their own form of criminal intelligence analysis for years prior to the 2000s. For example, due to the drastic increase in drug trafficking in the 1980s, the United Kingdom developed the National Drugs Intelligence Unit (NDIU) in order to focus more intelligence directed towards drug trafficking to adequately limit the amount of associated crime.⁴ While the NDIU functioned exceptionally for several years, the United Kingdom wanted to create a national intelligence system directed towards all types and levels of crime. Therefore, in 1992, the NDIU was expanded and changed to the National Criminal Intelligence Service (NCIS).⁴

National Intelligence Model

In the late 1990s to early 2000s, the NCIS developed the British National Intelligence Model (NIM). The NIM was created in respect to the United Kingdom's government policy to utilize a professional business model to limit the outbreak of crime and limit crime at the source. This was done by implementing ILP into all levels of policing. After the NIM was formally passed and accepted in 2002, all chief constables of all provincial police departments within England and Wales chose to utilize the NIM and the ILP philosophy.⁴ However, many chief constables soon realized that a universal NIM and ILP plan did not properly function for every police department. In response, the chiefs were able to manipulate and change the plans in order to work for their respective areas.

At the local level, criminal intelligence analysis mainly focuses on local organized crime, violent crime, and many reoccurring crimes. Whereas, at the national level, the Serious Organised Crime Agency (SOCA), is responsible for national organized crime, terrorism, both domestic and international, and all other international threats from outside the country.⁴ Similar to the implementation of ILP within the United States, many individuals were hesitant to make the switch to ILP. This can be attributed to the intense level of analytical data needed. Many factors associated with implementing ILP require newer police officers to have higher educations and more experience dealing with this type of data. Due to this restraint from officers, the switch to ILP had lost significant momentum in around the mid 2000s.

AUSTRALIA

The New South Wales Police Force

Similar to the watchmen and constables in the United Kingdom, New South Wales (NSW) Governor, Arthur Phillip, formed the Night Watch in 1789.¹⁰ This Night Watch consisted of civilian officers and watchmen. These civilians were in charge of protecting the safety of the city of Sydney. Over the course the first half of the 19th century, many different small police forces of watchmen were established in other major industrialized cities throughout NSW. In 1862, Parliament passed the Police Regulation Act, which established the first official NSW Police Force by combining all police forces within NSW into one functioning department. Today, the NSW Police Force is one of the largest police departments in the English-speaking world.¹⁰

The Australian Model of Policing

Within the country of Australia, there are 6 unified states and 2 territories. In contrast with the United States model of policing, the Australian model does not rely on municipal police

departments working independently of each other. The Australian model provides each state with its own police force as well as a federal police force that oversees the entire country.¹¹ The state police for NSW, Tasmania, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, and Western Australia, as well as the territories of Northern and Australian Capital, undertake all county, city, and local police functions.

The Australian Federal Police (AFP) is responsible for investigating major national crimes as well as protecting federal assets. The AFP is also the primary connection between Australia's criminal justice system to close allies around the globe.¹¹ For example, the AFP works closely with the United States' Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) and FBI in order to combat global drug trafficking and terrorism, as well as share criminal intelligence information.



This image shows the seal for the AFP

Intelligence Analysis

In terms of Australia's use of criminal intelligence analysis, the country has been involved in integrating intelligence analysis into its police forces since the 1960s. However, there was never a defined crime analysis unit until after the creation of the AFP in 1979. While the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom all established criminal intelligence agencies

within their respective countries far prior to the turn of the 21st century, Australia did not develop the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission (ACIC) until very recently in 2016.¹² The ACIC is responsible for sharing all intelligence data and information with all state police forces and territories. The agency also works with international agencies in order to protect Australia from international dangers and criminal threats.¹²

The ACIC has a list of priority crimes in which the agency focuses on examining and deterring.

These include but are not limited to¹²:

- 1.) Cybercrime**
- 2.) Financial Crime**
- 3.) Firearms**
- 4.) Gangs**
- 5.) Illicit Drugs**
- 6.) National Security**

In order to combat these priority crimes, the ACIC has established a handful of task forces aimed at several of these crimes, among others. These taskforces include¹²:

- 1.) Black Economy Standing Taskforce**
- 2.) Criminal Assets Confiscation Taskforce**
- 3.) Illicit Tobacco Taskforce**
- 4.) Joint Organized Crime Taskforces**
- 5.) National Taskforce Morpheus**
- 6.) Phoenix Taskforce**
- 7.) Vestigo Taskforce**

8.) Serious Financial Crime Taskforce

COMPARITIVE ANALYSIS

While the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia have drastically different histories when it comes to each individual country's criminal justice systems, the 21st century has shown that all four countries have shifted gears towards a more unified sense of policing. Since the late 1990s, ILP has been at the forefront for policing tactics. More and more police agencies are making the switch to ILP as this intelligence-driven policing style has proven to be useful in understanding why specific crimes may be occurring and being able to prevent the crimes from occurring in the first place.⁴

However, even though all four countries have adopted ILP principles with a large focus on criminal intelligence analysis and crime analysis, their means of implementing them are quite different. The United States made the sudden shift to ILP following the most notable terrorist attack in the country's history in 9/11. As a country, with federal agencies like the FBI and CIA, has a large focus on foreign intelligence and counterterrorism in order to prevent another attack such as 9/11 from occurring again on U.S. soil. The ISE provides a database for all federal agencies to access intelligence information that is sensitive to national security.⁴ Unlike the countries in this analysis, the United States does not have a central policing force.¹¹

Rather than one national police force, agencies are based in municipal areas and can vary greatly in the way they use criminal intelligence. For example, operating a crime analysis unit can be extremely costly. Therefore, only larger police departments with the proper funding can hold and operate a crime analysis unit. The smaller, less-funded, police departments may not

have access to specific criminal intelligence data and information, limiting their potential to adequately use ILP philosophies.⁴

In contrast to the United States, countries like Canada and Australia have a national police force. However, they have different ways of implementing these national police forces around their respective countries. In Canada, the RCMP acts as the national police organization for the entire country, except for Ontario and Quebec. These provinces contain their own provincial police that are responsible for the policing in those areas.⁷ However, the RCMP handles all of the federal level policing equivalent to the DEA, FBI, and CIA in the United States. The CISC is responsible for providing criminal intelligence information to all members of Canadian law enforcement. Australia also contains a national police force, the AFP, which is similar to the RCMP. However, Australia also has state police forces for each of its 6 states and territories. While these state police forces work independently, they are overseen by the AFP and receive all intelligence data and information from the ACIC.¹¹

The United Kingdom bears the most resemblance to the United States in terms of its policing system. The country's system is built mostly upon municipal police forces that are overseen by the National Crime Agency (NCA). The main difference, however, is the implementation of the British NIM. The NIM's business model is incorporated into all police agencies within the United Kingdom in order to successfully equip each agency with the proper blueprint to use ILP in their areas. The NIM has been tweaked and changed to properly work for different agencies in rural and industrialized areas.⁹

CONCLUSION

Immediately following the comparative analysis for all four countries, it became apparent that one of the biggest weaknesses for the United States' policing system is the lack of a national police force that oversees all municipal police agencies. While some may argue that the United States having individual municipal police forces is needed in order to prevent national police force from becoming a fascist state, this seems rather unlikely. Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia all have a national police force without being fascist or authoritarian. The national police force in these countries simply oversees the more area-focused police forces beneath.

A national police force with state police forces in the United States, similar to Australia's model, would allow for all states and smaller police agencies to have equal opportunity to obtain intelligence data and information. Limiting the number of municipal police agencies would also create a more unified sense of policing that doesn't change from city to city. Larger cities such as New York City, Chicago, Los Angeles, Houston, etc. could still have their own municipal police forces as they have the funding to do so. This would be similar to Canada's model that allows for Ontario and Quebec to maintain their own provincial police forces that act independently of the RCMP.

The limited access to criminal intelligence data as well as the limited funding to have a crime analysis unit for most police agencies is the other glaring weakness for the United States' system. The CISC for Canada, the NCIS for the United Kingdom, and ACIC for Australia are national criminal intelligence agencies that provide intelligence data and information to all members of their organizations. Meanwhile, in the United States, the FBI and CIA do not operate in the same way in accordance with the ISE. Specifically, the CIA only manages international foreign intelligence data. A national and state police force that work harmoniously with a

national intelligence agency to provide intelligence data agency to readily provide intelligence data to even the smallest and least funded of police departments would be ideal.

References

-
- ¹ Boba, Rachel. 2001. Introductory guide to crime analysis and mapping. *Community Oriented Policing Services. USA*.
- ² Hooper, Michael. K. 2014. Acknowledging existence of a fourth era of policing: The information era. *Journal of Forensic Research and Crime Studies, 1*, 1-4.
- ³ Morey, Tiffany and Kate McLean. n.d. "4.3. Policing Eras." *Introduction to the US Criminal Justice System*. Retrieved March 24, 2023 (<https://psu.pb.unizin.org/criminaljusticemclean/chapter/5-3-policing-eras/>).
- ⁴ Carter, David. L., & Carter, Jeremy. G. 2009. Intelligence-led policing: Conceptual and functional considerations for public policy. *Criminal justice policy review, 20*(3), 310-325.
- ⁵ BJA. 2013. *Compstat: Its Origins, Evolution, and Future in Law Enforcement Agencies*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.
- ⁶ University of Bridgeport. 2023. "FBI vs. CIA Agent Career Paths: University of Bridgeport." *University of Bridgeport News*. Retrieved April 7, 2023 (<https://www.bridgeport.edu/news/fbi-agents-vs-cia-agents/#:~:text=What%20is%20the%20CIA%3F,the%20U.S.%20is%20at%20risk.>).
- ⁷ RCMP. 2023. "Royal Canadian Mounted Police." *RCMP.ca*. Retrieved March 29, 2023 (<https://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/corporate-organisation/history-histoire/rcmp-origin-story-histoire-origine-grc-eng.htm>).
- ⁸ Government of Canada. 2014. "Criminal Intelligence Service Canada." *Government of Canada, Royal Canadian Mounted Police*. Retrieved March 30, 2023 (<https://cisc-scrs.gc.ca/about-ausujet/index-eng.htm>).
- ⁹ Lyman, J. L. 1964. The metropolitan police act of 1829: An analysis of certain events influencing the passage and character of the metropolitan police act in England. *The journal of criminal law, criminology, and police science, 55*(1), 141-154.
- ¹⁰ NSW Government. n.d. "NSW Police Force." *History - NSW Police Public Site*. Retrieved March 29, 2023 (https://www.police.nsw.gov.au/about_us/history#:~:text=It%20began%20as%20the%20first,form%20the%20NSW%20Police%20Force.).
- ¹¹ Briskey, Mark F. and Samuel M. Makinda. 2023. "Law Enforcement and Policing in Australia." Pp. 227–40 in *Global Perspectives in policing and law enforcement*. S.I.: LEXINGTON BOOKS.

¹² ACIC. n.d. "The Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission." *Welcome | Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission*. Retrieved April 2, 2023 (<https://www.acic.gov.au/>).