

EUROPEANIZATION OF CRIME: HOW MUCH OF A SOLUTION IS EUROPEAN FUNDING?

Radu-Tudor PETRE *

Abstract

Justice and internal affairs are among the areas which benefited from the assistance provided by the European Union and other international donors both before and after Romania become one of member states. After the 1989, Romanian society witnessed an increase of crime and of costs associated with it, which raised concerns and placed crime control policies as top priority of foreign donor programmes. The European Union assistance in the field of justice and internal affairs focused on capacity building, achieving coherence and facilitating joint efforts in preventing and countering cross-border crime, through a robust support in ensuring material support and expertise transfer for Romanian judicial institutions. This was a response to Romanian priorities, but also to the Europeanization of crime – the spillover of crime and its associated costs within union territory.

While in Romania there have not been systematic research to assess the impact of foreign assistance in the areas of justice and home affairs, law and order empirical project data indicate that possibly the main effect of the external aid has been to facilitate and speed up adoption of innovative means in crime control, as well as replacing state budget support in critical fields of judicial cooperation which were underperforming due to lack of funding. The European Union response to the Europeanization of crime through the means of ensuring funding and adequate resource allocation has been a late reaction to the crime spillover phenomenon and too weak to achieve significant results. This paper will analyze several elements of external assistance from the perspective of the response to Europeanization of crime, while proposing future research directions useful for evaluating the impact of such assistance.

Keywords: Europeanization of crime, social exclusion, cost of crime, innovation

Résumé

La justice et les affaires intérieures sont parmi les domaines qui ont bénéficié de l'assistance fournie par l'Union européenne et d'autres bailleurs de fonds internationaux à la fois avant et après la Roumanie devienne l'un des Etats membres. Après 1989, la société roumaine a connu une augmentation de la criminalité et des coûts qui y sont associés, qui a également soulevé des préoccupations et placé les politiques de contrôle de la criminalité en priorité des programmes de donateurs étrangers. L'aide de l'Union européenne dans le domaine de la justice et des affaires intérieures axée sur le renforcement des capacités, pour assurer la cohérence et faciliter les efforts conjoints dans la prévention et la lutte contre la criminalité transfrontalière, à travers un support robuste pour assurer un soutien matériel et

* PhD student at School for Advanced Studies of Romanian Academy (SCOSAAR), National Institute of Economic Research “Costin C. Kiritescu”, Romanian Academy; email: p.r.tudor@alumnus.rug.nl

le transfert d'expertise pour les institutions judiciaires roumaines. C'était une réponse aux priorités roumaines, mais aussi à l'europeanisation de la criminalité – les retombées de la criminalité et les coûts associés au sein du territoire de l'Union.

En Roumanie on n'a pas fait recherches systématiques pour évaluer l'impact de l'aide étrangère dans les domaines de la justice et des affaires intérieures, mais des données empirique du projet, indiquent que peut-être le principal effet de l'aide extérieure a été de faciliter et d'accélérer l'adoption des moyens novateurs de lutte contre la criminalité, ainsi que le remplacement de l'appui budgétaire de l'état dans des domaines essentiels de la coopération judiciaire qui étaient moins performants en raison du manque de financement. La réponse de l'Union européenne à l'europeanisation de la criminalité à travers les moyens pour assurer le financement et l'allocation de ressources suffisantes a été une réaction tardive au phénomène de débordement de la criminalité et trop faible pour obtenir des résultats significatifs. Le présent document examine plusieurs éléments d'aide extérieure du point de vue de la réponse à l'europeanisation de la criminalité, tout en proposant des orientations futures pour la recherche, utiles pour évaluer l'impact d'une telle assistance.

Mots-clés: europeanisation de la criminalité, l'exclusion sociale, coût de la criminalité, l'innovation

Rezumat

Justiția și afacerile interne sunt printre domeniile care au beneficiat de asistența oferită de către Uniunea Europeană și alți donatori internaționali, atât înainte cât și după ce România a devenit unul dintre statele membre. După 1989, societatea românească a cunoscut o creștere a criminalității care a generat preocuparea factorilor decizionali și a plasat politicile de control ale criminalității între prioritățile programelor donatarilor internaționali. Asistența Uniunii Europene în domeniul justiției și afacerilor interne s-a concentrat pe consolidarea capacităților, realizarea coerenței și facilitarea eforturilor comune în prevenirea și combaterea criminalității transfrontaliere, prin intermediul asigurării sprijinului material și transferului de expertiză pentru instituțiile judiciare române. Asistența acordată a fost un răspuns la prioritățile României, dar și la europeanizarea criminalității – propagarea criminalității și a costurilor asociate pe teritoriul Uniunii.

În România nu au existat cercetări sistematice pentru a evalua impactul asistenței externe în domeniul justiției și afacerilor interne, dar date empirice din proiectele conexe domeniului indică faptul că este posibil că principalul efect al asistenței externe a fost de a facilita și accelera adoptarea mijloace inovatoare în controlul criminalității, precum și înlocuirea sprijinul bugetar de stat în domenii critice ale cooperării judiciare care erau neperformante din lipsa finanțării. Răspunsul Uniunii Europene la europeanizarea criminalității prin intermediul mijloacelor finanțare și alocarea resurselor adecvate a fost o reacție târzie la fenomenul de propagare a criminalității și prea slab pentru a obține rezultate semnificative. Acest articol va analiza o serie de aspecte asociate asistenței externe din perspectiva răspunsului la europeanizarea criminalității și va propune, în același timp, direcții viitoare de cercetare, utile pentru evaluarea impactului acestui tip de asistență.

Cuvinte cheie: europeanizarea criminalității, excluziunea socială, costul criminalității, inovația

1. Social exclusion and Europeanization of crime

Social exclusion is a global phenomenon, manifesting itself also within European Union, at national, regional and local level. It has its roots in the increasingly exclusive postmodern society (Young 2009) which pushes towards its margins the disadvantaged groups and strengthens the divisions through different categories of age, class or ethnicity. Social exclusion manifests itself as a dynamic and multi-dimensional phenomenon, with global roots and local effects (Young 2002), which limits the access of certain persons or groups to various economic, political, cultural and social systems, thus reducing their full integration into society (Trevor 2001; Hale and Fitzgerald 2007). There are several individual or social responses which augment the social exclusion, from the feelings of abjection (Sibley 1995) - repulsion towards other groups associated with residues, considered impure and social waste, to othering and negative essentialization (Young 1999; 2007). The latter response refers to processes of perpetuating discrimination and stereotyping through means of overtly simplification and generalization of negative traits; while self-essentialization serves as defining an identity by concentrating on one trait, through negative essentialization groups perceived competing for the same resources are defined by one or few negative characteristics which justifies punitive measures against them and their exclusion (Young 2007). Such reactions result in advanced marginality (Wacquant 2007) which is materialized in the United States in the hyperghet to and in Europe by its less extreme alternative – the banlieues, carceral urban spaces, part of a continuum, which insulates marginal groups with prison-like means. Such phenomenon exists, sometimes with an accentuated spatial exclusion characteristics, in rural areas, with entire communities cut off from basic health and social services and even without usable roads or transport means.

The irreversible changes during late modernity in the areas of the market through consumerism, community through segmentation and family through the rise of the number of single parent families, have contributed to the expansion of exclusion within society (Young 1999). Those occupying the most vulnerable structural positions such as the poor and ethnic minorities, are subjected to not only to the intrinsic exclusionary processes, but also to moral panics – public discourses grossly exaggerating social problems and indicating marginal groups as responsible, which further led to their stigmatization (Cohen 2002; Young 2009). New terminology emerged first in the language of media and then in the public policy – the underclass (Murray 1999), defined as an undeserving and illegitimate social group, exploiting social benefits and perpetuating a dangerous lifestyle: underage single mothers living on social benefits, drug addicts, former convicts, unemployed persons.

The effect of the vindictive and stigmatizing public discourse on the excluded varies greatly. On the one side there is passive self-blaming (Young 1999) when

marginal groups internalize the general values of the society and blame themselves for not being able to achieve social desirable goals. Secondly, there is the social isolation (Wilson 1987), when members of marginal groups give away any hope of being accepted into society and separate from social and economic networks that can facilitate their social reintegration. Lastly, there are the active manifestations of discontent, mediated by subculture, which can take the form of criminal acts or political violence (Lea and Young 1984).

What has become a characteristic of the exclusive society is the continuous expansion of the criminal justice role for the control of socio-economically disadvantaged groups. This is accomplished primarily by criminalizing social problems and targeting specific groups, mainly, but not exclusively, those affected by poverty such as the homeless persons, travelers, young persons from ethnic or racial minority groups (Baumann 1998; Young 2011). In the same time the response to poverty is articulated as if it is a law and order issue, with policing and control mechanisms which resort not only to state owned means, but, increasingly, appeal to community to establish and support such mechanisms, contributing towards a culture of control (Garland 2001). This amplifies feelings of injustice and relative deprivation (Runciman 1993; Box 1987). In certain political situations, these feelings lead to increased crime while control agencies, under public pressure, concentrate their efforts on vulnerable groups thus amplifying the deviance (Hall *et al.* 1978; Young 2009).

The exclusionary discourse, as well as the criminalizing action framework which is transposed into practice with law and order means, is centered on the presumption that them, the pariah, underclass, criminals or would-be criminals, are a minority who has to be controlled for the benefit of the entire society and also for their own benefit. The transgression, interpreted as living outside the mainstream society rules, by criminal or otherwise social undesirable activities, is therefore limited to a small number of individuals. Such beliefs are reflected in the design of the policies in the field of community safety, the allocation of resources and the overall activities of the state control agencies directed more towards reactive measures of enforcement and correction, increasing the use of detention or judicial control.

The European Union concentrated its efforts into supporting social inclusion and development through policy and funding measures, the main objective of the Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund to narrow the development disparities among regions and Member States. While the strong social inclusion measures will indirectly tackle the crime phenomenon, designated pre-accession and post-accession financial instruments directly support justice and home affairs. These financial instruments of the European Union in have been complemented by funding made available by the Government of Switzerland and other donors, such as EEA Grants or Financial Norwegian Mechanism.

An interesting research domain which is yet to be thoroughly analyzed is the impact of the European Union funding aimed at reducing development disparities

on the crime phenomenon as some official data sources¹ indicate an increase of number of registered crime in new member states, before and after accession, while various reports point towards an increase in crime committed by the citizens of new member states in other member states. The dynamics between social exclusion and the reported increasing “crime of foreign origin” trend in the European Union, if indeed confirmed, has to be analyzed not only in relation to the above mentioned postmodernist exclusionary process, but also related to lack of development and disparities between new and old member states. Relations between social exclusion and Europeanization of crime in the European Union deserve a more in-depth research than the general points indicated in the present paper and can significantly contribute to shaping policy funding process in the field of social inclusion.

2. Responding to Europeanization of crime

Europeanization, as a concept, has a variety of uses to define a wide array of phenomena, frequently connected with institutional change. Most referred uses are changes in external boundaries, developing institutions at the European level, central penetration of national systems of governance, exporting forms of political organization and a political unification project (Olsen 2002).

In the context of the present paper Europeanization of crime has limited scope, referring to a spill-over effect of crime from candidate and new member states to European Union space. Such effect shapes both policy and discursive European framing, with effects in financial instruments aimed at addressing the crime phenomenon.

In terms of temporal moment of the costs of crime it is important to distinguish between costs in anticipation of crime costs, costs due to crime and costs as response to crime (Brand and Price, 2000). The costs incurred in anticipation of crime are measures to reduce the risk of victimization, such as physical security and items for improving home or urban safety, or measures to reduce the consequences of victimization, respectively insurance costs. Costs due to crime are quantified by estimating the damage and resources needed to deal with the crime effects. Costs as response to crime are calculated by estimating the resources allocated to judicial institutions responsible for the identification of offenders and maintaining their custodial status. In the same category there are also included costs for the offender and their families, such as the contributions or income that was lost for them in carrying out employment or business activities.

Qualitative research based on a methodology for estimating the three types of costs allowed calculation of crime broken down by categories of offenses. The major differences in costs of various crimes for different countries, for example United Kingdom and United States, in part, by use of different methodologies, but

¹ Eurostat, Crimes recorded by police, Available at: <http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu>, accessed 22.09.2014.

also by different calculation of the civil damages awarded by the judicial system in the United States, much higher compared than those recorded in Europe.

For a number of common crimes estimated costs for the UK Home Office in 2010 are presented in the *Table 1*.

Table 1. Estimated costs for common crimes in United Kingdom in 2010

No.	Type of crime	Estimated cost (2010) GBP	Estimated cost (2010) USD
1	Homicide	1774681	2743124
2	Aggravated assault	25747	39797.1
3	Sexual crime	36952	57116.7
4	Robbery	8810	13617.6
5	Burglary	3925	6066.8

Data source: Home Office. (2011). Revisions made to the multipliers and unit costs of crime used in the Integrated Offender Management Value for Money Toolkit, London, pg. 9. Currency conversion from GBP into USD has used a reference rate for 2010 1 GBP = 1.5457 USD.

As a comparison, the costs of crime estimated for the USA for the similar types of crime, presented in *Table 2*, are significantly higher.

Table 2. Estimated costs for common crimes in United States of America in 2012

No.	Type of crime	Estimated cost GBP	Estimated cost USD
1	Homicide	3533123	5600000
2	Aggravated assault	56309.1	89250
3	Sexual crime	99369.1	157500
4	Robbery	25835.9	40950
5	Burglary	3426.5	5431

Data source: Chalfin, A. (2014). "The Economic Costs of Crime" in Wesley Jennings (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Crime and Punishment*, Wiley-Blackwell, 2014. Currency conversion from USD into GBP has used a reference rate for 2012 1 GBP = 1.5850 USD.

For Romania there are no qualitative studies regarding the cost of crime, but we can have a rough estimation using, proportionally with GDP per capita, the costs of crime calculated in United Kingdom for the year 2010. The results of the estimation are presented in *Table 3*.

Proportionally, the costs of crime in Romania are up to five times lower per crime then the corresponding cost of crime in United Kingdom. The different judicial system, with different definitions of crimes, for which does not exists perfect correspondence between the judicial systems of the two countries, increases the difficulties of transferring and adapting of the methodologies of calculating the costs of crime.

Table 3. Estimated costs for common crimes in Romania in 2010

No.	Type of crime Romania	Estimated cost GPB	Estimated cost USD
1	Homicide	370730.9	573038.6
2	Aggravated assault	5378.5	8313.6
3	Sexual crime	7719.2	11931.6
4	Robbery	1840.4	2844.7
5	Burglary	819.9	1267.3

Data source: Own calculation using World Bank datasets for 2010: United Kingdom had a GDP per capita of 36703 USD, Romania had a GDP per capita of 7670 USD, respectively 0.2089 of the value reported for United Kingdom.

If the costs of crime in Romania is just a one fifth of the cost of crime in United Kingdom, there are no methodologies to estimate the cost of crime committed by Romanians in United Kingdom, therefore we have to accept the same cost as for any crime in United Kingdom. The data on crime committed by foreigners in European Union member states is available only for certain categories of citizens, usually of a non-EU citizenship, but more frequently not aggregated on nationalities in order to conform to data protection regulations. In order to obtain a general estimation of the costs of crime committed by Romanian citizens in London a set of data released by Metropolitan Police of London can be used, which details the nationalities of the foreigners arrested for different crimes. By employing the reference values for United Kingdom costs of crime in 2010, we can estimate, as presented in *Table 4*, the individual and total costs of crime for common crimes.

Table 4. Estimated costs for common crimes committed by Romanian citizens in London 2008-2012

Type of crime	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Total crimes	Total cost (USD)
Homicide	0	1	1	5	3	10	27431240
Aggravated assault	230	476	657	760	779	2902	115491184.2
Sexual crime	20	120	151	197	178	666	38039722.2
Robbery	19	49	75	67	93	303	4126132.8
Burglary	54	178	312	385	441	1370	8311516
Total cost (USD)	10882009	30287700	40428602	58461503	53339981		193399795.2

Data source: Metropolitan Police, Arrests of foreign nationals by nationality 2008-2012, Available at http://www.met.police.uk/foi/pdfs/disclosure_2013/feb_2013/2013010000160.pdf, accessed on 21.09.2014. The costs of crime were calculated using the reference values from Home Office. (2011). Revisions made to the multipliers and unit costs of crime used in the Integrated Offender Management Value for Money Toolkit, London, pg. 9.

The results have to be interpreted just as a general indication, the limitations being evident: the reported data refers to arrested Romanian citizens, therefore they are still presumed innocent – possibly overestimating the number of guilty offenders, it refers to reported or registered crime - therefore a possible underestimation of the number of crimes, does not include the financial, economic or cybercrimes – therefore an underestimation of number of crimes and associated costs, and the area is London which has a higher rate of crime than small urban centers or rural areas.

Still, the results have a limited and indicative value, even if for the very particular case of London: the costs of crime committed by Romanian citizens have risen abruptly starting with 2008, up to almost five times in 2012. This limited data confirms some claims pointing towards raising trends of crime from new member states after becoming members of the European Union, but focused research has to be conducted in order to confirm this trend for different member states and related to different types of crime.

The response of European Union regarding funding support for law and order has matched the direction, but not the magnitude of this spillover effect: more funding has been directed to the states from which crime originated. Taking just one example, the External Borders Fund for Romania doubled its allocation between 2010 and 2013. The general allocations for Prevention and Fight against Crime Programme also more than doubled between 2007 and 2012², but as data suggests the allocation of such funding for Romania was a fraction of the estimated costs of crime committed by the Romanian citizens abroad. Adding to all this another layer of analysis, namely the Romanian budgetary allocation for justice and home affairs, reduced particularly during the economic crises of 2008-2010, we can infer some interesting conclusions regarding the European Union allocation of resources for fighting crime, which at this moment we can only suggest that is has not been managed in an efficient manner.

Similarly, there was a response to the Europeanization of crime and of the costs of crime from other international assistance programmes for Romania. Taking for example the EEA Grants, for the programming period 2004-2009 there was not a priority area specifically concerned with justice and home affairs, while for 2009-2014 period, through the Norwegian Financial Mechanism there were a specific provision for four programme areas connected with justice and home affairs with a total budget of 25.300.000 EUR³.

² European Commission, http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/financing/fundings/mapping-funds/countries/romania/index_en.htm, accessed on 23.09.2014.

³ MoU Norway Grants 09-14 22 (in force as of 22 March 2012, amended 18 October 2012 and 3 February 2014), Available at: <http://eeagrants.org/Results-data/Results-overview/Documents/Legal-documents/Memoranda-of-Understanding/Romania>, accessed on 23.09.2014.

Focused and comparative research for analyzing the data related to crime and costs of crime committed by foreign citizens in different European Union member states has yet to be performed, especially in relation with policies and funding allocation of the European Union for the countries of which citizens are most frequently committing crimes abroad, but the scarce data available allows to posit that the funding allocations from the European Union in the field of justice and home affairs came as a late reaction to the Europeanization of crime, a weak and inefficient response when compared to the volume of crime and the costs of such crime.

3. Promoting and supporting innovation

There is evidence that the European Union response to spillover effects of crime from new member states, through funding allocation, has not matched the crime volume or its costs. In other areas the contribution of such assistance had a more palpable effect, encouraging adoption of new technologies and methods, increasing thus the efficiency of judicial authorities.

Again, there is little data to evaluate the impact of innovation and variations of administrative efficiency of different law enforcement agencies in Romania following the implementation of projects funded by the European Union or other international donors.

The data which are available concern only individual projects and confirms the contribution of the international assistance in the field of innovation and increasing efficiency, especially when it's the case of adopting information technology solutions and systems for the operational and administrative processes. As such, adopting the intelligence led policing concept and methodologies, implementing a national automated system for reporting of incidents, adopting an integrated informational system for management decisional support or implementing automation systems for criminal records system contributed to increasing the administrative efficiency of the Romanian Police⁴. Regarding to justice reform, important resources have been dedicated by various international donors such as World Bank, European Union, EEA Grants and Norwegian Mechanism Fund which resulted into, among other improvements, automation of the distribution and processing of dossiers, implementing a national information system, making available to the public through a web based interface, ensuring thus transparency and objectivity of the legal process⁵.

⁴ Romanian Police, Available at:

http://www.politiaromana.ro/biroul_implementare_programe.htm, accessed on 23.09.2014.

⁵ Romanian Ministry of Justice, Available at:

<http://www.just.ro/MinisterulJustitiei/Organizare/ProgrameInternationale/tabid/201/Default.aspx>, accessed on 23.09.2014.

Most of the externally funded projects in the area of justice and home affairs are connected at the programme level and strive to achieve coherence with the other projects in the same or adjacent areas, such as the social inclusion. For a limited number of projects the continuity and coherence has been emphasized to a higher degree by the donor, resulting in a visible impact and overall increased administrative efficiency for the implementing agency. The limitations related to the availability of data does not allow comparisons among projects at national level, but project empirical data concur towards the idea that consistent financial support provided to projects and follow up initiatives, over longer timeframe, might achieve better results than punctual projects, even if connected within programmes.

One of the projects that illustrate the effectiveness of consistent support over longer periods, tackling both problems of crime and social exclusion, is an initiative aiming at introducing in Romania the community policing concept, using a Swiss model (Petre 2012). It is an exemplary case for transfer, adaptation and implementation of a new concept for a law enforcement agency, because the implementation of the concept of community policing was done in phases, starting in the year 2000 with external financial support from the Government of Switzerland. During the initial project community policing activity and its methods have been tested, the results recorded, and, based on the assessed performance, the model was extended to all urban areas police units. After 10 years since the introduction of this method of policing in Romania, benefiting again from external funding from the same donor, the Romanian Police continued to extend the community policing model towards the rural areas.

Community policing, in the wider understanding of the term, is the modern method of police work in which the attitude towards work and organizational strategy are geared towards community awareness of those problems that causes fear or uncertainty in order to identify causes that may lead to crime, but also to identify solutions through joint efforts with members of the community (Tutilescu *et al.* 2007, p. 19).

In 2003 an agreement was signed in Bern between the Governments of Romania and Switzerland, in order to implement the concept of community policing. A pilot project was initially implemented in 2000 in two urban districts and because it was considered a success, it was extended in urban areas throughout the country. Given the success of the first project, the Government of Switzerland, as a donor, 10 years after the initial project, decided to continue to fund the extension of the policing method towards the rural areas and focusing on ensuring quality public service for minority groups. Within the Swiss-Romanian Cooperation Programme a new project was formulated and approved: "Promoting the concept of community policing in rural areas, with focus on Roma and other disadvantaged communities"⁶.

⁶ Swiss-Romanian Cooperation Programme, Available at: <http://www.swiss-contribution.admin.ch>, accessed on 20.09.2014.

The project, due to its large scale and extended implementation period, offers a useful case study for the role of external grants in facilitating in Romania the transfer and adaptation of new work methods that have proven useful in European countries for preventing and countering the crime. A particular element of the project and its follow-ups are the long implementation period and, especially the fact that 10 years the donor has chosen to continue supporting the project in order to ensure the coverage of community policing for the rest of the national territory of Romania.

In addition to the classical concept already well-structured of community policing, focusing on improving the relationship between police and community, a new element was inserted, namely the relationship with disadvantaged communities socio-economically, mainly Roma communities. This was in itself an element of social innovation inserted into a law and order project and such an approach was supported by findings of a study supported by World Bank⁷ which indicated that Roma communities are the most economically and socially disadvantaged group, being subject of extreme poverty.

The elements of innovation of the project consisted in adapting and transferring new methodologies for the management of public order activities. The transfer of expertise was envisaged to be implemented through the training 2500 police officers in various areas related to community policing, evaluating the European best practices in policing minority groups and assessing opportunities for transferring certain elements of such practices in Romania. Also, as a completely new approach for the police work in Romania, in-depth cultural and language training will be performed related to national minorities, especially with regard to Roma culture and language, for the police officers working in rural areas with large Roma communities

The aim of the project was to increase the quality of public services in 100 rural localities by improving mobility and training of police officers, increasing degree of trust and cooperation between police and citizens and creating a climate of respect for human rights, traditions and culture of national minorities. In addition to these results, an innovative framework for the police work was stimulated, by testing and adapting new approaches to prevent and combat crime in rural areas, coherent with European Union and national strategies for preventing discrimination of national minorities.

The project has received funding for yet another follow-up, focusing on victimization of Roma communities. The new follow-up project “Integrated

⁷ Romania: Poverty Assessment Analytical and Advisory Assistance Program: First Phase Report, Fiscal Year 2007 November 2007 Document published jointly by World Bank, Ministry of Labor, Family, and Equal Opportunities – Romania National Institute of Statistics – Romania.

approach for preventing victimization in Roma communities” will be funded by the Norwegian Financial Mechanism and will result in the first Romanian national victimization survey. Such data will provide crucial information for the Romanian decision makers in the field of crime control, for addressing root causes of crime and focusing on the geographical areas and communities most prone to crime victimization⁸.

This case study reveals the potential for implementing and disseminating innovation in the field of public order over long periods, in this case 16 years, in extended geographical locations – first only urban centers, then also rural areas, while mainstreaming into the community policing initiative antidiscrimination and minority protection measures. The financial support that was provided from two main donors, with one continuing to support the same project idea after 10 years and the second to support a follow up, makes the project even more emblematic for the long term effect which external aid can have on justice and home affairs areas, when there is concern from both parties, donors and beneficiary, for sustainability and coherence. Moreover, the project addressed some effects of the Europeanization of crime by improving the relations between police and communities most likely to be victimized and exploited abroad by transnational crime networks, with possible effects in increasing the efficiency of identifying and ensuring protection for victims of crime, as well as identifying and prosecuting the perpetrators of crime.

4. Conclusions

This article has argued that the Europeanization of crime and its associated costs, understood as a spillover effect of crime between its member states, usually from new member states to the rest of the union, has been met by the European Union with a late reaction and with weak allocation of funding, which, even if followed the growing trend of the crimes generated by EU citizens outside their origin country, has not matched it in volume or in geographical allocation. More focused quantitative research is needed to confirm this hypothesis, but data of law enforcement agencies indicate the increasing trend of crime with its associated costs, while data of European Union for funding allocations indicate growing budget for projects in the field of justice and home affairs, especially for the new member states. What is still to be analyzed are the funding from national budgets earmarked for justice and home affairs, especially during the economic crisis of 2008-2010, and the data of reported crime in the European Union for the same period.

⁸ Project: Integrated approach for prevention of victimization in Roma communities RO21-MAI-IGPR-PDP- 4, Available at: <http://www.norwegian.mai.gov.ro/en/documents/Fisa%20PDP4.pdf>, accessed on 23.09.2014.

While regarding the funding allocation the European Union has not, most probably, achieved significant impact in diminishing the spillover effect of crime, empirical project data indicate some successes in promoting and supporting innovation, increasing thus the administrative efficiency of national judicial institutions and, therefore, indirectly addressing the Europeanization of crime.

A number of new methodologies and technologies, as well as integrating information systems and system automation, for judicial agencies have been introduced through externally funded projects and it is evident that such innovations would have been introduced later, if ever, only with financial support from national budgets. This form of support has been provided both by European Union, for candidate and new member states, but also by other international donors.

Introducing and supporting innovation in justice and home affairs has been one of the most evident positive effect of external funding, but such innovation achieved a maximum of impact when there was a good coordination between donors and beneficiary, coherence with national and European Union strategies, long term supervision and maintaining donor support for the sustainability of the project, funding follow-up initiatives of the projects, building on experience from different phases of the project and even a hand-over of projects and funding support between different donors. This has been illustrated by the case study on introducing the community policing concept over a period of 16 years in Romania, but there are other similar projects that could be analyzed to identify the elements that enhance the impact of external funding on justice and home affairs.

If there is a lesson to be learned from the Romanian experience of external funding in the field of justice and home affairs, provided by the European Union or other international donors, is that the beneficiary state has to take an active stance, to insist on receiving funding for follow up and sustainability initiatives and to maintain an active long term dialogue with the international. The most important thing is to know what to expect from external funding in the justice and home affairs: introduction and support for innovation; adjusting own national policies for this type of support will ensure an increased administrative efficiency and will avoid expectations for external assistance to supplement or even to replace national budgets.

Acknowledgement

This paper is made and published under the aegis of the Research Institute for Quality of Life, Romanian Academy as a part of programme co-funded by the European Union within the Operational Sectorial Programme for Human Resources Development through the project for Pluri and interdisciplinarity in doctoral and post-doctoral programmes Project Code: POSDRU/159/1.5/S/141086.

References

1. Bauman, Z. (1998). *Work, Consumerism and the New Poor*. Open University Press, Buckingham.
2. Box, S. (1987). *Recession, Crime and Punishment*. Macmillan, London.
3. Brand, S., Price, R. and Britain, G. (2000). *The economic and social costs of crime*. Home Office, London.
4. Chalfin, A. (2014). The Economic Costs of Crime. In Wesley Jennings (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Crime and Punishment*, Wiley-Blackwell, London.
5. Cialdini, R.B., Petrova, P.K., Goldstein, N.J. and Team, L. Y. (2004). The hidden costs of organizational dishonesty. *MITS loan Management Review*, **45**(3).
6. Cohen, S. (2002). *Folk Devils and Moral Panics* (3rd ed.). Routledge, London.
7. Garland, D. (2001). *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
8. Hale, C., Fitzgerald, M. (2007). Social Exclusion and Crime. In Abrams, D., Christian, J., Gordon, D. (Eds.). *The Multiprofessional Handbook of Social Exclusion Research*. Wiley, Chichester, 137-158.
9. Home Office. (2001). *Revisions made to the multipliers and unit costs of crime used in the Integrated Offender Management Value for Money Toolkit*, London.
10. Lea, J. and Young, J. (1984). *What is to be Done about Law and Order?* Penguin, Harmondsworth.
11. Murray, C. (1999). *The underclass revisited*. AEI Press, Washington.
12. Olsen, J.P. (2002). The many faces of Europeanization. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, **40**(5), 921-952.
13. Petre, R.T. (2012). External grants as catalyst for new approaches in preventing and combating crime. Case study on an externally funded project aiming at expanding the community policing in rural areas. *Paradigme Social Sciences Journal*, **6**, 91-102.
14. Runciman, W.G. (1993). *Relative deprivation and social justice* (2nd ed.). Gregg Revivals, Hampshire.
15. Shalvi, S., Dana, J., Handgraaf, M. J. and De Dreu, C. K. (2011). Justified ethicality: Observing desired counterfactuals modifies ethical perceptions and behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, **115**(2), 181-190.
16. Sibley, D. (1995). *Geographies of Exclusion*. Routledge, London.
17. Thaler, R.H. and Sunstein, C.R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*. Yale University Press, Yale.
18. Trevor, B. (2001). Social Exclusion. In McLaughlin, E. and Muncie, J. (Eds.). *The Sage dictionary of criminology*. Sage Publications, London.
19. Tutilescu, M., Guran, L., Tobă, P. and Smochină, A. (2007). *7 teme în 7 zile*, Editura Ministerului Internelor și Reformei Administrative, București.
20. Wacquant, L. (2007). *Urban outcasts: a comparative sociology of advanced marginality*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
21. Wang, C.S., Galinsky, A.D. and Murnighan, J.K. (2009). Bad Drives Psychological Reactions, but Good Propels Behavior Responses to Honesty and Deception. *Psychological Science*, **20**(5), 634-644.
22. Wilenski, P. (1981). Efficiency or equity: competing values in administrative reform. *Policy Studies Journal*, **9**(8), 1239-1249.

23. Wilson, W.J. (1987). *The Truly Disadvantaged*. Chicago University Press, Chicago.
24. World Bank. (2003). Report No. 26169-RO Romania Poverty Assessment (In Two Volumes) Volume I: Main Report, Bucharest.
25. World Bank. (2007). *Romania: Poverty Assessment Analytical and Advisory Assistance Program: First Phase Report, Fiscal Year 2007*, Bucharest.
26. Young, J. (1999). *The Exclusive Society*. Sage Publications, London.
27. Young, J. (2007). *The Vertigo of Late Modernity*. Sage Publications, London.
28. Young, J. (2009). Moral panic: Its origins in resistance, resentment and the translation of fantasy into reality. *British Journal of Criminology*, **49**(1), 4–16.
29. Young, J. (2002). Crime and Social Exclusion in Maguire, M., Morgan, R., Reiner, R. (eds.). *The Oxford handbook of criminology* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press, Oxford.
30. European Commission, EUROPE2020 European strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, Available at: http://europa.eu/press_room/pdf/complet_en_barroso___007_-_europe_2020_-_en_version.pdf, accessed on 21.09.2014.
31. European Commission, Funding for Justice and Home Affairs, http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/financing/fundings/mapping-funds/countries/romania/index_en.htm, accessed on 23.09.2014.
32. Eurostat, *Crimes recorded by police*, Available at: <http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu>, accessed 22.09.2014.
33. Metropolitan Police. (2013). *Arrests of foreign nationals by nationality*, Available at http://www.met.police.uk/foi/pdfs/disclosure_2013/feb_2013/2013010000160.pdf, accessed on 21.09.2014
34. Project: Integrated approach for prevention of victimization in Roma communities RO21-MAI-IGPR-PDP- 4, Available at: <http://www.norwegian.mai.gov.ro/en/documents/Fisa%20PDP4.pdf>, accessed on 23.09.2014.
35. Romanian Government Strategy for Inclusion of Romanian citizens belonging to the Roma minority 2011-2020, Available at <http://www.anr.gov.ro/docs/MO6bis.pdf>, accessed on 14.09.2014.
36. Romanian Ministry of Justice, Data on externally funded projects, Available at <http://www.just.ro/MinisterulJusti%C8%9Biei/Organizare/ProgrameInternationale/tabid/201/Default.aspx>, accessed on 23.09.2014.
37. Romanian National Public Order Strategy 2010-2013, Available at: <http://www.mai.gov.ro/Documente/Strategii/Strategia%20nationala%20de%20ordine%20publica%202010-2013.pdf>, accessed on 10.09.2014.
38. Romanian Police, Data on externally funded projects, Available at: http://www.politiaromana.ro/biroul_implementare_programe.htm, accessed on 23.09.2014.
39. Swiss-Romanian Cooperation Programme, Available at: <http://www.swiss-contribution.admin.ch>, accessed on 20.09.2014.