Negative: Predictive Policing - good

By “Coach Vance” Trefethen

***Resolved: The United States federal government substantially reform the use of Artificial Intelligence technology***

Case Summary: The AFF plan bans local government from using AI systems to guide police on where crimes are most likely to occur, in order to focus their resources in the most needed spots. Most likely, the issue will be racial bias that the AI will be perpetuating, which will be worse than human policing because, as we all know, there is no human racial bias anywhere today (ahem….<cough>). The test is not “does AI have bias?” – the question should be “Does AI have more bias than humans?” And the answer is no.
 The most powerful Solvency argument is probably #2, where the evidence says each police department should study it for themselves to determine effectiveness. A blanket federal policy is bad because different police departments do it differently and local conditions are different. If it works in some places and doesn’t work in other places, the unsuccessful places shouldn’t stop the successful ones from using it. Studies and winning the evidence battle will be a key Negative strategy. There are no empirical studies actually showing PP has ever harmed anyone; two that found it has no effect (and we have specific refutation on both of those studies – Shreveport and Chicago); and lots of studies showing it’s beneficial.
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Negative: Predictive Policing (PP) - good

MINOR REPAIR – More study is all we need

PP AI companies are improving their algorithms. Resolve the “debate” by monitoring and studying them to verify it

Dr. Bilel Benbouzid 2019 (PhD; professor of sociology at Eiffel University, France) 10 July 2019 “To predict and to manage. Predictive policing in the United States” <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/2053951719861703> (accessed 30 Nov 2021) (note: author’s first language is not English, so some grammatical errors exist in the text as written. It doesn’t mean he’s ignorant – he has a PhD in sociology. You’d make mistakes too if you were writing in French.)

Of course, the metrics used to define safety and harm are subjective to debate, particularly as they are balanced against each other. In this case, driven by a desire to make this dosage fair, developers try to limit the algorithmic biases into the process of machine design and imagine an algorithmic solution that recommends patrol trajectories as a function of a more or less acceptable quantity of fruitless stops distributed in the population. PredPol or Hunchlab try to compute a quantitative norm that not only distributes safety in the population, but also corrects police behavior, and, thereby, reflect the right of each person to be protected against excessive stops guaranteed by the Fourth Amendment. To predict crime is to integrate rules for action into machine parameters—the cybernetic imaginary of grounding social harmony in calculations ([Supiot, 2015](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/2053951719861703)). As predictive policing private companies become more active actors in public safety policies, they must be continued to be closely followed by sociological inquiries. Understanding how these new actors help guide choices, give specific meaning to public action, and produce “algorithmic” rules that govern safety will be fundamental to understanding the practice of policing in our data and algorithm rich society.

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

1. A/T “PP doesn’t work”

Santa Cruz, California, Study: 19% fewer burglaries when officers patrolled PP/AI designated “hot spots” more frequently

Zach Friend 2013. (Master’s in Public Policy) 9 Apr 2013 Predictive Policing: Using Technology to Reduce Crime <https://leb.fbi.gov/articles/featured-articles/predictive-policing-using-technology-to-reduce-crime> (accessed 30 Nov 2021)

During the first 6 months of the program, the department made over 2 dozen arrests within the hot spot locations. However, the true measure of the program’s success is not apprehensions, but the reduction of crime. Santa Cruz police officers indicated an initial 11 percent reduction in burglaries and a 4 percent decrease in motor vehicle thefts. As time progresses, the reductions increase. Over a 6-month period, burglaries declined 19 percent. The system requires 6 months of data to assess whether the method actually is reducing the crime rate. Because the Santa Cruz police did not introduce any additional variables—no additional officers were hired, shift lengths continued, patrol structure remained the same—the department attributed the crime reduction to the model.

New York Study: PP reduced crime and increased efficient use of police resources

Albert Meijer & Martijn Wessels 2019 (both are with School of Governance, Utrecht University, Netherlands) 12 Feb 2019 “Predictive Policing: Review of Benefits and Drawbacks” INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (accessed 30 Nov 2021) https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01900692.2019.1575664?scroll=top&needAccess=true

Levine, Tisch, Tasso, and Joy ([2017](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01900692.2019.1575664?scroll=top&needAccess=true)) evaluated the utilization of predictive policing techniques by the New York Police Department (NYPD). They assessed the Domain Awareness system, which is a network of sensors, databases, devices, software and infrastructure that delivers tailored information and analytics to mobile devices and precinct desktops (Levine et al., [2017](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01900692.2019.1575664?scroll=top&needAccess=true), p. 71). The NYPD combined video analysis of cameras, environmental sensors, license plate readers, the 911-feed and an acoustic correlation processing of gun firing (i.e. ShotSpotter) to keep track of criminal activity in the city. The authors compared traditional hot spot policing with NYPD’s predictive policing software and the accuracy of predicting certain types of criminal behavior (i.e. burglary, felony assault, grand larceny, robbery & shootings). They did this by comparing traditional hot spot policing with this new predictive policing system in a 24-week cross-validation period and the results were striking: the accuracy of the predictions on the different types of criminal behavior have increased, especially for shootings. In addition, the efficiency of the officers was also improved as they could better respond on criminal activity and find suspects through the full network of sensors by which it is easier to find suspects or stolen vehicles through license plate recognition. Also, officers can respond faster on shootings through ShotSpotter (which registers the sounds of shootings). Overall, the overall crime index of New York decreased with 6% since the implementation of DAS. The authors recognize that this cannot be fully attributed to this system but still qualify the system as a success.

Atlanta Study: PP reduced crime in zones where it was used, compared to zones where it wasn’t used

Atlanta Police Chief George Turner, Dr. Jeff Brantingham and Dr. George Mohler 2014. (Turner – Atlanta police chief. Brantingham – PhD; professor at UCLA. Mohler – PhD; assistant professor, Santa Clara Univ.) “Predictive Policing in Action in Atlanta, Georgia” May 2014 POLICE CHIEF MAGAZINE http://rockdalesheriff.netfirms.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Predicative\_Policing\_Atlanta.pdf



Richmond, Va.: PP reduced gunfire and saved money

Beth Pearsall 2010 (freelance writer and frequent contributor to the *NIJ Journal*) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE JOURNAL, (NIJ is an agency of the US Dept of Justice) Predictive Policing: The Future of Law Enforcement? 22 June 2010 <https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/articles/predictive-policing-future-law-enforcement> (accessed 30 Nov 2021)

**Reducing Random Gunfire in Richmond.** Every New Year's Eve, Richmond, Va., would experience an increase in random gunfire. Police began looking at data gathered over the years, and based on that information, they were able to anticipate the time, location and nature of future incidents. On New Year's Eve 2003, Richmond police placed officers at those locations to prevent crime and respond more rapidly. The result was a 47 percent decrease in random gunfire and a 246 percent increase in weapons seized. The department saved $15,000 in personnel costs.

A/T “RAND Corp. / Shreveport, Louisiana study found no benefit” – Shreveport study was flawed and benefits still occurred

Mara Hvistendahl 2016. (contributing correspondent for *Science*) 28 Sept 2016 “Can ‘predictive policing' prevent crime before it happens?” SCIENCE magazine <https://www.science.org/content/article/can-predictive-policing-prevent-crime-it-happens> (accessed 30 Nov 2021)

One notable randomized, controlled experiment was conducted by the Shreveport, Louisiana, police department in 2012 with NIJ funding. The study found that the difference in crime reduction between the control and experimental districts was statistically insignificant. But the experiment, which focused on property crimes, also revealed the challenges of such studies. Take-up of predictive hot spot policing among the three experimental districts was high at first, but dropped off after 4 months as enthusiasm waned, likely skewing the results. Commanders in one of the control districts, meanwhile, grew excited by the experimental districts' success at reducing crime and decided to pursue their own targeted operations in known hot spots.

A/T “Chicago Study found no benefit” – More recent testing (2020) with newer software shows crime reduction in Chicago and Philadelphia

Ishmael Mugari and Emeka E. Obioha 2021 (Department of Social Sciences, Walter Sisulu University, South Africa) Predictive Policing and Crime Control in The United States of America and Europe: Trends in a Decade of Research and the Future of Predictive Policing 20 June 2021 SOCIAL SCIENCES <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-0760/10/6/234/pdf> (accessed 30 Nov 2021)

Perhaps the recent and probably more complicated predictive policing application in the United States is the HunchLab, which, according to Ferguson (2020), features the elements of technologies underlying RTM and PredPol, as well as adding other factors. HunchLab considers a number of aspects which, among others, include underlying crime rates, near repeat patterns, socioeconomic factors, temporal factors, and social events [**END QUOTE]** (Ferguson 2017; Shapiro 2017). The information is fed into a machine learning algorithm, and there will be updates for every police shift (Ferguson 2017). Using machine learning techniques, HunchLab analyses the crime data through training and testing of the data before modelling the data for use in forecasts, which are then used for patrol allocation suggestions (Ferguson 2020). Given its thrust on patrol-related police responses, HunchLab calls itself a “patrol management system”. To support officers on patrol, HunchLab is built into mobile devices to allow police patrol officers to view in real time the areas where criminal activities are likely to occur (Ferguson 2020). [**THEY GO ON LATER IN THE SAME CONTEXT QUOTE:]** Through the use of HunchLab tools, commanders can customise patrol priorities by adding constraints such as the size of manpower and time available for deployment (Shapiro 2017). In terms of effectiveness, early testing of HunchLab showed a positive impact on crime reduction in Chicago and Philadelphia (Fingas, in Ferguson 2020)

2. A/T “Constitutional rights violated”

No one is arrested because PP/AI said to arrest them or before they commit a crime

Beth Pearsall 2010 (freelance writer and frequent contributor to the *NIJ Journal*) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE JOURNAL, (NIJ is an agency of the US Dept of Justice) Predictive Policing: The Future of Law Enforcement? 22 June 2010 <https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/articles/predictive-policing-future-law-enforcement> (accessed 30 Nov 2021)

Sean Malinowski, a lieutenant with the LAPD, assured participants that predictive policing does not deny civil rights. "Police are not arresting people on the probability that they will commit a crime," he said. "Police still must have probable cause." In addition, predictive policing methods do not identify specific individuals; instead, they anticipate particular times and locations where crime is likely to occur.

3. A/T “Racism”

Los Angeles study: Rate of minorities arrested was the same using PP/AI and not-using it. The difference was, they caught more crime with PP/AI because it was better at predicting it

Annie Gilbertson 2020 (journalist) 20 Aug 2020 “Data-Informed Predictive Policing Was Heralded As Less Biased. Is It?” <https://themarkup.org/ask-the-markup/2020/08/20/does-predictive-police-technology-contribute-to-bias> (accessed 30 Nov 2021)

Brantingham, Mohler, and their co-author, Matthew Valasik, conducted a real-life experiment with the Los Angeles Police Department. They compared the results between two groups: officers sent to PredPol-predicted crime hotspots and officers sent to hotspots picked by crime analysts, which served as a control group. They varied the groups each officer was assigned to day to day. Brantingham, Mohler, and Valasik found the *rate*of minority arrests was about the same whether the software or analysts made the predictions. What changed was the *number* of arrests in the PredPol hotspots. That number was higher. The increase in arrests, they wrote, is “perhaps understandable given that algorithmic crime predictions are more accurate.”

PP/AI bias is no worse than “regular” policing bias, and might even be easier to address

Prof. Andrew Ferguson 2017 (Professor of Law, UDC David A. Clarke School of Law) “Policing Predictive Policing” WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY LAW REVIEW <https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=6306&context=law_lawreview> (accessed 30 Nov 2021)

While “data bias” presents a potential vulnerability, it may not be any worse than the existing policing practice. The same implicit and explicit biases that influence the data also influence the police officer on the street (with or without the data). Thus, supporters of predictive policing might rightly argue that while predictive policing programs are not completely free from bias, the move to a data-driven system could reduce bias, or at worst maintain the status quo. Further, if these vulnerabilities could be addressed, then an overall reduction of bias would occur.

A/T “Focuses officers on minority areas” – Turn: Santa Cruz study found PP/AI expanded their focus areas to danger spots they didn’t know about

Zach Friend 2013. (Master’s in Public Policy) 9 Apr 2013 Predictive Policing: Using Technology to Reduce Crime <https://leb.fbi.gov/articles/featured-articles/predictive-policing-using-technology-to-reduce-crime> (accessed 30 Nov 2021)

The Santa Cruz Police Department found that veteran officers usually identify 8 or 9 of the 15 hot spot locations. Newer officers discover 1 or 2 of the areas. This validates skilled police officers’ intuition, provides additional targeted locations, and imparts tactical information for new officers. The maps reinforce existing knowledge and inform about targeting locations. They standardize information across shifts and experience levels. The algorithm combines historic and daily crime information, produces real-time predictions of areas to patrol, and normalizes information among shifts. It eliminates the concern about adequate information sharing.

Los Angeles Study: No racial/ethnic differences in arrests between areas patrolled using PP/AI and not-using it

P. Jeffrey Brantingham, Matthew Valasik, and George O. Mohler 2018 (Brantingham- UCLA Department of Anthropology. Valasik - Department of Sociology, Louisiana State University. Mohler - Department of Computer and Information Science, Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis) 9 Apr 2018 STATISTICS & PUBLIC POLICY “Does Predictive Policing Lead to Biased Arrests? Results From a Randomized Controlled Trial” <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/2330443X.2018.1438940> (accessed 30 Nov 2021)

Racial bias in predictive policing algorithms has been the focus of a number of recent news articles, statements of concern by several national organizations (e.g., the ACLU and NAACP), and simulation-based research. There is reasonable concern that predictive algorithms encourage directed police patrols to target minority communities with discriminatory consequences for minority individuals. However, to date there have been no empirical studies on the bias of predictive algorithms used for police patrol. Here, we test for such biases using arrest data from the Los Angeles predictive policing experiments. We find that there were no significant differences in the proportion of arrests by racial-ethnic group between control and treatment conditions.

4. All talk, no studies

Lots of literature talks about it, but no empirical studies have been done showing anyone harmed by PP

Albert Meijer & Martijn Wessels 2019 (both are with School of Governance, Utrecht University, Netherlands) 12 Feb 2019 “Predictive Policing: Review of Benefits and Drawbacks” INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (accessed 30 Nov 2021) https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01900692.2019.1575664?scroll=top&needAccess=true

This literature review highlights the potential drawbacks of predictive policing have been discussed quite extensively, but empirical evidence for these drawbacks is lacking. The risk of predictive policing lacking transparency, with affiliated problems such as accountability issues, is plausible. In addition, if law enforcement agencies have limited boundaries or legislation they need to comply to, a wedge might develop between the government and its citizens since the mutual trust is reduced. However, in academic literature, there is little empirical evidence how predictive policing methods lead to difficulties in practice. The focus in the (limited number of) empirical evaluation studies is on testing whether the desirable outcomes were realized and not whether this resulted in adverse effects. This is a gap that needs to be filled by empirical research, to show whether these claimed drawbacks actually occur in the implementation of predictive policing.

5. A/T “Over-policing / harassment”

Turn: AI can advise police “not” to stop people who have already been contacted a lot by police

Dr. Bilel Benbouzid 2019 (PhD; professor of sociology at Eiffel University, France) 10 July 2019 “To predict and to manage. Predictive policing in the United States” <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/2053951719861703> (accessed 30 Nov 2021)

If during two simultaneous road stops, aimed, for example, at obtaining information on recent gang activities in an area, where the two drivers are equally likely to provide relevant information and to possess a firearm, should the police question the driver who has been subjected to three fruitless stops in the last month, or the one who has not had any contact with the police in more than a year? Once a driver’s identity is known, the machine could invite officers to abstain from performing a search, or, in contrast, could encourage them to do so, as function of the associated harms. In sectors where exposure to police activity is relatively high due to particular problems with crime, an algorithm could limit the contacts of the police with the public as a function of the more or less balanced distribution of stops across different sectors. But how a machine could distribute policing harms fairly in the population? By dosing patrols in a way that involves a gradual imposition of algorithmic control that progressively limits the number of associated stops and the associated citations until a sort of optimal level of policing harms is reached. In other words, it is a matter of optimizing the acceptable quantity of stops, in nonlinear fashion, in real time. By collecting data on routine stops, a machine has an overall view of the frequency of police stops over space and time within the coverage area. It thus acts as a sort of moral intelligence which, at a given moment, is informed about trends in crime, the situation of resources in the coverage area, and the distribution of stops of innocent persons.

6. A/T “No accountability”

Turn: PP/AI can actually increase accountability

Prof. Andrew Ferguson 2017 (Professor of Law, UDC David A. Clarke School of Law) “Policing Predictive Policing” WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY LAW REVIEW <https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=6306&context=law_lawreview> (accessed 30 Nov 2021)

Despite vulnerabilities, predictive policing can be a force for accountability. The original data-driven police systems were created to foster accountability. In New York City, Commissioner Bratton’s innovation of demanding real-time reports of crime statistics allowed for both internal and external accountability about crime rates. CompStat organizational meetings literally brought police leaders into a room to be held accountable for what had happened in their district. The recognition that accountability matters should be central to the next generation of predictive policing technologies. At an operational level, if accountability becomes a priority, the data-driven nature of the technologies makes accountability easier to implement. Building off the CompStat model, such statistics could be made available to city administrators and the larger community.

SOLVENCY

1. Won’t solve racism

PP/AI uses the same methodologies / strategies as before (just faster and with more data).

**Analysis: If PP/AI is racist, going back to how they did it before won’t solve anything – because it’s the same**

Beth Pearsall 2010 (freelance writer and frequent contributor to the *NIJ Journal*) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE JOURNAL, (NIJ is an agency of the US Dept of Justice) Predictive Policing: The Future of Law Enforcement? 22 June 2010 <https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/articles/predictive-policing-future-law-enforcement> (accessed 30 Nov 2021)

Some participants questioned whether predictive policing was, in fact, a new model. They argued that good crime analysts have been practicing predictive policing for more than 40 years. "Are we doing anything new or innovative with this data or are we just doing it better and quicker?" asked Chief Tom Casady of the Lincoln, Neb., Police Department. Casady argued that the idea is not new. "It is a coalescing of interrelated police strategies and tactics that were already around, like intelligence-led policing and problem solving. This just brings them all under the umbrella of predictive policing," he said. "What is new is the tremendous infusion of data," Casady added. Referencing the Richmond example, he explained, "We knew there were shootings on New Year's Eve, and we knew where they were happening. So if we could pinpoint the time, we could put more police in those areas. This is pretty basic stuff," he said, "and we have been doing this for years." Casady said the real question the field should be asking is how to take this to a new level: How do we use information to stimulate different interventions?

Won’t solve racism because PP is no more nor less discriminatory than previous police patrols

Dr. Bilel Benbouzid 2019 (PhD; professor of sociology at Eiffel University, France) 10 July 2019 “To predict and to manage. Predictive policing in the United States” <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/2053951719861703> (accessed 30 Nov 2021)

 In their article entitled “Does Predictive Policing Lead to Biased Arrests? Results From a Randomized Controlled Trial” ([Brantingham et al., 2018](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/2053951719861703)), the PredPol developers analyzed data from a randomized controlled trial carried out in 2011 in Los Angeles to test the efficiency of their machine ([Mohler et al., 2015](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/2053951719861703)). Comparing the distribution of arrests by patrols according to ethnic variables (as reported by the police officers themselves) for areas where no algorithmic recommendations were made (control group) with those where PredPol was used (treatment group), the study demonstrated that the activity produced by predictive policing is neither more nor less discriminatory than the existing practices of patrols.

Non-PP/AI policing has racism and bias too [so not-using it doesn’t solve anything]

P. Jeffrey Brantingham, Matthew Valasik, and George O. Mohler 2018 (Brantingham- UCLA Department of Anthropology. Valasik - Department of Sociology, Louisiana State University. Mohler - Department of Computer and Information Science, Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis) 9 Apr 2018 STATISTICS & PUBLIC POLICY “Does Predictive Policing Lead to Biased Arrests? Results From a Randomized Controlled Trial” <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/2330443X.2018.1438940> (accessed 30 Nov 2021)

Research has demonstrated that a racial bias exists in the business of policing including the racial profiling of vehicles ( Harris 1999; Smith and Petrocelli 2001; Meehan and Ponder 2002; Novak 2004; Farrell and McDevitt 2006; Ridgeway 2006; Warren et al. 2006; Epp, Maynard-Moody, and Haider-Markel 2014; Baumgartner et al. 2016; Horrace and Rohlin 2016), pedestrian stops (Harris 1994; Gelman, Fagan, and Kiss 2007; Fagan et al. 2010; Rios 2011; Fagan et al. 2015; Goel, Rao, and Shroff 2016; Stuart 2016), traffic tickets (Dunn 2009), drug enforcement and arrests (Black and Reiss Jr. 1970; Smith, Visher, and Davidson 1984; Beckett, Nyrop, and Pfingst 2006; Kochel, Wilson, and Mastrofski 2011; Lynch et al. 2013), use of force (Schuck 2004; Legewie 2016; Buehler 2017; Nix et al. 2017), and even in the decision to shoot white or black criminal suspects while in a training simulator (Geller and Toch 1995; Plant and Peruche 2005). While the mechanisms driving these observed patterns of racial disparity (i.e., racial profiling, stereotyping/cognitive bias, deployment, racial animus/prejudice) remain difficult to disentangle, as (Warren et al. 2006) attests, there is little doubt that racial disparities in policing outcomes do exist.

2. More study needed

No blanket policy: Each police department should study PP for themselves to determine effectiveness

Albert Meijer & Martijn Wessels 2019 (both are with School of Governance, Utrecht University, Netherlands) 12 Feb 2019 “Predictive Policing: Review of Benefits and Drawbacks” INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (accessed 30 Nov 2021) https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01900692.2019.1575664?scroll=top&needAccess=true

Whereas several studies show a positive significant effect for geospatial predictions, other studies have no significant results. Only one studied focused on profiling and this study produced ambiguous outcomes. The mixed findings can be attributed to the type of evaluation, to the type of predictive policing or to the type of method that was used for predictive policing. A preliminary conclusion is that this approach has potential but not all types of crimes can be effectively reduced through predictive policing models and therefore the officers executing these strategies need to adequately use these models. Every individual predictive model that is applied by police departments should be individually evaluated to determine their effectiveness and efficiency.

3. No jurisdiction

Federal government cannot fiat actions by state and local governments or police. They can only fiat in “federal enclaves”

**[Examples of “federal enclaves”: District of Columbia, military bases, national parks, Indian reservations]**

Congressional Research Service 2020 (non-partisan research agency of Congress) What Role Might the Federal Government Play in Law Enforcement Reform? Updated 1 June 2020 <https://sgp.fas.org/crs/misc/IF10572.pdf> (accessed 30 Nov 2021)

The federalized system of government in the United States limits the influence Congress can have over state and local law enforcement policies. The U.S. Constitution established a federal government of limited powers. A general police power is not among them. That authority is largely reserved for the states. The Constitution, however, does vest Congress with legislative powers under the Spending, Commerce, Territorial, and Necessary and Proper Clauses, as well as under the enforcement sections of the Civil War Amendments. Congress has exercised this authority in the past to enact legislation that relates to law enforcement matters. Yet even here, its authority is not boundless. Congress may spend for the general welfare and thereby encourage states to take or refrain from various activities. In doing so, however, the encouraged state action must relate to the purpose for which federal funds are spent. Moreover, state action may be encouraged, not commandeered or compelled. Commandeering and compulsion are also beyond the scope of the Commerce Clause, which otherwise empowers Congress to regulate the flow, instrumentalities, and substantial impacts of interstate and foreign commerce. Congress may enact model legislation for federal enclaves, but its reach there is geographically limited.

DISADVANTAGES

1. Wrong mindset – Reacting versus Preventing Crime

Affirmative mindset is bad because it moves us from preventing crime back to reacting to it after it happens

Ishmael Mugari and Emeka E. Obioha 2021 (Department of Social Sciences, Walter Sisulu University, South Africa) Predictive Policing and Crime Control in The United States of America and Europe: Trends in a Decade of Research and the Future of Predictive Policing 20 June 2021 SOCIAL SCIENCES <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-0760/10/6/234/pdf> (accessed 30 Nov 2021)

The predictive narrative moves the police from focussing on what happened to focussing on what might happen, as well as the effective and efficient deployment of resources to fight crime (Beck and McCue, in Pearsall 2010). Though an ideal scenario for any rationale police agency is to prevent the occurrence of criminal activities, predictive policing also plays an instrumental role in reacting to incidents of crime. For instance, it can assist the police in catching the criminal in the act (Martens 2017). Whilst it has been argued that predictive policing has been there for several decades (Ferguson 2020; Ferguson 2017; Bachner 2013; Perry et al. 2013), perhaps the centrality of advanced technology to enhance predictive policing has been a recent phenomenon. Before the move towards reliance on technology to predict crime, it was human experience and knowledge that allowed the police to make these predictions about crime. In the 1990s, however, Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and Computerised Statistics (CompStat) were used to predict and respond to crime in developed countries such as the United States of America (CCI 2020; Ferguson 2017). Whereas the traditional use of GIS and CompStat were predominantly reactive, the focus of predictive policing is proactive, that is, crime should be prevented from occurring in the first place (Bachner 2013).