

INTERVIEW WITH DR. LAURENCE SHERMAN¹

Matheus RENNÓ²

Daniel TRIELLI³

Matheus Rennó: I am a guest editor for a journal in Brazil now and I made a proposal to talk about: why does crime in Brazil keep increasing as it decreases around the world? And not just Brazil, Latin America as well, right? I have this wonderful graphic produced here. It is the crime rate from Brazil since the 1970s.

Dr. Sherman: Whose is this from?

Matheus Rennó: The World Health Organization. I took the root data, and then I extracted it. Basically, it shows that crime has been rising since the 1970s, on a steady basis, right? And we would like to know from you, your opinion about this. Maybe you know the cause, if you have any ideas about that? In particular, what can the police do as an institution and it is a huge institution in Latin America? To address this issue, in particular, what can the police do to reduce and to prevent crime?

Dr. Sherman: Well, it is interesting that it is a mixed picture insofar as homicide is going up over forty years in Brazil, in general, but in the last 10 years, I believe, in Sao Paulo, it has dropped quite substantially. Now, whether that is an artifact of measurement, or counting, or whether it is a peculiar result of the influence of certain powerful gang members in the prisons. These are all possibilities, but

¹ Transcribed by Patricia Veronica Moreira and Reviewed by Heloísa Sacco and Patricia Veronica Moreira.

² University de Maryland (Umd), College Park – DC – Estados Unidos. Doctorate in Departament the Criminology and Criminal Justice. msantos8@outlook.com.

³ University de Maryland (Umd), College Park – DC – Estados Unidos. Journalist and Graduate Assistant in College Park. dtrielli@gmail.com.

what we need to address, in terms of the police, is the things that they do that produce less murder than if they did not do them and, at least in the Western North Atlantic countries, what we know is the fundamental thing they do is to go out and do patrol, because when they stop doing it under a police strike, you have very big increases in homicides, bank robberies, other things. And the cases so that are pretty clear, when the Nazis arrested all the Danish police, in 1944. Big increase in crime. Even with the Nazi army there, but they were carrying about surveyor crack. In Helsinki, 1976, when the police went on strike, very substantial increases in violent injuries treated in health clinics. And there, you are not relying on police to file homicide reports, because they are on strike, so they cannot reach you. You have got to get the hospital data. Same thing happens in Montreal, in the 1960s; and Boston, in 1919; Liverpool, in 1919. We do not have a single police strike that does not have a big jump in homicide. So, it is called the knockout experiment. It is a way of doing a controlled experiment insofar as the only thing that changes is whether or not the police are out there on the street. But, by extension, it implies that if having less of it is a bad thing, having more of it might be a good thing. And the question then is what we mean by more? So, in one country I will not name, it is not Brazil, but it has favelas. In fact, it has a million people in one particular favela with an enormous amount of homicides heavily concentrated in hot spots. And one of my Latin American colleagues tried to conduct an experiment in adding more police to the hot spots. And what he discovered in the course of the experiment was that he was not getting more police on the hot spots. So, he wanted to talk to the police who work there about why they would not go to spend more time in the hot spots and the arrangement was he would sit at the front of the police station as they can work every day, so he would talk to them and only about half of the police were supposed to be working there ever showed up. So, it is what in some places you call a ghost payroll. People are being paid to be police, but they are not working. So, I could start with that very basic level. There is a lot of people on the payroll in Latin America to be police officers. The fundamental question is how many of them are working. The best way to answer that question is sitting right there inside that phone, it is called GPS. And if you can bio-identify a GPS transponder, so that you know where your police officers are for every minute that they are supposed to be paid, you could go a long way towards improving the percentage of **05:00** time that police are being paid for, in which I do not know that we can say that they are working, but at least they are located in the places that can be targeted in the same way. So, for

example, if you want to reduce homicide very precisely, you should be using GPS to find out exactly where the homicide occurred. Too especially important in favelas, we do not have street addresses or house numbers in the same kind of precision that we expect in Europe, notwithstanding the fact that they do not have it in Japan. Well, they do exist that the houses are numbered in the order in which they are built. So, they are very hard to find. The question then of what the police do, other than in fact stand guard in these hot spots, which according to Schargrodsky's research with Di Tella, in Buenos Aires, they did after the Jewish temples were bombed and, wherever Jewish temple in Buenos Aires had a 24 hour guard. There was a radiating effect of deterrence around those temples, so there was no crime at all. Well, I should not say that, but there is certainly substantial reductions in crime from before the guards were there and in comparison to other similar parts of Buenos Aires that did not have stationary police. Now, I have argued that the evidence for 24 hour constant patrolling of a certain location being necessary as opposed to intermittent control is very weak. We do not have any idea exactly how much police dosage percentage of the time, in which homicides might occur, that the police need to be present. What is the optimal level? And so, one thing Latin American police could do or Brazilian police could do is to experiment with different levels, just kind of like how much aspirin you need to take to prevent heart attacks. If you have too much aspirin, you get stomach bleeding; if you do not have enough aspirin, then you might get a stroke or other blood thickening diseases. So, the question for policing is in a quantitative sense, how much is enough? What is the dosage response curve to get the homicide rate down? And it may vary depending on whether they go downtown to a business district, or a suburban neighborhood with a commercial area where there is a lot of shooting. The answers will be predictably complex and that is why you need not just one experiment, but many. But, it requires a commitment to learning a culture of curiosity that has not historically been associated with any part of the legal system, not just the police. And, I just spoke at the annual meeting of the Society for Evidence Based Policing, in England, where there is over 200 police officers coming to a two-day conference, that is called Promoting a Culture of Curiosity and Policing. So, to simplify the first thing, police could do to help fight homicide is to be curious, not just about who done it, but how do you prevent it? And the curiosity about the question of prevention is the driving force for reducing homicide much as it was for Sir Robert Peel in creating the Metropolitan Police in London at taxpayer expense, but massive opposition. Rich people did not want to pay taxes to have the police.

They wanted body guards which they paid for; they did not want to protect anybody else, even though they were getting robbed in the streets themselves. But, you know, rich people do not like taxes.

Matheus Rennó: I am glad that changed over the years.

Dr. Sherman: Well, it certainly has changed in Britain and I do not think any rich people anymore would want to get rid of the police force just to save taxes. They are convinced. It took while. It took about 50 years in England to convince them. And even though the long term homicide rate drop in England is very clear, from about the 1832 to 1900, but the curiosity about how you do that is more than just where do the police go to prevent stranger robberies that resulted in murder or acquaintanced disputes outside of pubs or taverns where people are drunk and they will kill each other if somebody does not break up the **10:00** fight. These are obvious ways in which the police can prevent murder. What is not so obvious is how you deal with technological changes, like the rise of the motorbike and Uruguay is a very good example of this. My Ph.D. student who is the director of research for the Ministry of Interior whose name is heavier than Angelo or Don Angelo has found much to the contradiction of prevailing sociological theories of crime that some of the standard cross-sectional predictors of lower homicide rates has been happening in Uruguay, in the theoretical direction of an advantage, less inequality, less unemployment, higher education, more female workforce participation and with all of these positive changes in society. Since the end of the military dictatorship, what you have seen is not less homicide, but more, and one of the indicators that has gone along with more economic prosperity, more economic equality is that a much higher percentage of the population has a motor vehicle and it gives rise to the kind of crime that could not happen when criminals did not have motorcycles and, particularly, the use of two people on a motorbike all night going by somebody to grab a purse or to shoot them in the head and steal their motorbike. So, one person is holding onto the handlebars while the other person is shooting the murder victim, and then jumping off and driving off with motorbike. These are sort of unintended consequences of increased economic prosperity that need to be identified in a highly data driven way. And one of the frustrations in Uruguay, which has developed a very advanced I.T. system that can integrate GPS data on where the police are with where the crime is happening, one of the frustrations is that the detail that is digitally coded in the homicide reports, is not very granular, there

is not much filling out of a lot of the form questions that are already there, like whether the murder was on a motorbike and moving at the time. That would be very important question, probably; it has been for at least 10 years. But, as far as I understand it, you cannot retrieve that from the data, so, maybe, the second thing for the police to do. So, number one, be curious; number two, pursue that curiosity by increasing data collection about homicide and trying to get much more of an understanding of the dimensions of the homicide event and the homicide victim-offender relationships. So, to the extent that there might be more domestic homicide in the rise of female participation in the workforce where women are now economically independent, they can throw the men out. That may be causing homicides, I do not know. I think you have to understand that context and they probably should not be just write a story about it, but should boxes to tick. We need the boxes to go to digital information. And, I do not think that exists in Latin America, I know there are some observatories for crime in various places that are funded by various development groups, but they tend to have a pretty rocky relationship with the police, because the police view them as a kind of threat and understandably, so, which may mean that instead of having these institutions exist outside the police. The point really is to invade the police agencies or better yet, the way we say that Cambridge is that we want the police to invade the university. We want the police to merge with the values of open and truthful inquiry into drawing conclusions wherever the data support them. Not something the president of the United States particularly believes in, but which universities are still committed to.

Matheus Rennó: I could not help, but smile when you say that, because we are a long way to that in Brazil. Like, the transparency and truthfulness of police reports are still being debated, you know.

Dr. Sherman: But, that is a good sign. At least, that is being debated, right?

Matheus Rennó: Right. I mean, it has been debated, you know, not being debated, but being yelled at each other, basically.

15:00

Dr. Sherman: I did not hear that in 2002 and 2003, when I was there for the World Congress on Criminology, in Rio. I did not hear people challenging. What I did hear was that homicide was being counted as murder, if somebody

was identified as the murderer. And, if there was a bullet-riddled body and they did not know who did it, well, it was just a death. They kept the homicide numbers down. That was not even being criticized; it was just stated as a fact that is the way we counted. The claim was it is not just Brazil; it is everybody in Latin America. I do not know if that is true. Clearly, you cannot count homicides that way, because then you are measuring police success in investigations rather than the risk of death to a citizen by violence. That is the thing to count, which is why the crime harm index is an interesting way to incentivize the police. And, it is interesting that the Uruguayan police who constitute 1% of the population of Uruguay, so, certainly, lots of them; thirty thousand of three million, or so. Police in Uruguay really like the idea of a crime harm index, so, that it would give them a real win, if they could get homicide down or rape, or, I say that much rape, but mostly homicide. And, so how the crime harm index works is that you multiply each offense type by the gravity of the sentence, how serious the sentences of the law or the sentencing guidelines in the United States would set down. And this is what we have now recommended in Britain with the Cambridge crime harm index based on the English sentencing guidelines, and the police are embracing it with abundant passion. They love this because it frees them from having to deal with very low detection rates on burglaries, on car break-ins, on things that are very high volume, not very serious, very hard to solve and which could take up all their time, so they could never do anything about homicide. So, I think the third thing about homicide the police have to do is to clearly make it a priority to have everybody understand that you have to make a choice, between concentrating resources on the high heart rare events and doing very little about the high volume events that affect far more people directly, but to explain to those people whose burglaries are being solved, that this is the rational decision, if you want to live in a society with fewer bullets whizzing around and where you are less likely to get killed as a bystander. So, I do not even know how many bystander killings there are in Latin American cities, but I suspect that it is not zero. The densely populated is enough for two guys have a shootout; other people are going to die. And, that is why homicide affects everybody. Even rich people who are in secure locations, when they get in their car and they drive down the street, they can have a bullet come through the window.

Daniel Trielli: So, it seems to me that the idea behind the crime harm index, which is to invest in high level rare events and the invest in high volume low

harm events seem to reduce. But even reducing, it seems to go counter the theory of the broken windows.

Dr. Sherman: The theory is wrong. There is no evidence that you reduce homicide by going after the little stuff. And lots of criminologists have tested that dimension of the theory.

Daniel Trielli: Because, it is a pet theory for a lot of people.

Dr. Sherman: Well, they like the idea. But, number one, can you deliver it? When was the last time you saw a street in Latin America that did not have any graffiti or rubbish on the street or people jaywalking, or soliciting for prostitution or selling drugs? I mean, it is very hard to deliver those things unless you have a cultural support anyway. So, you are not going to turn Rio into Geneva without that, the police cannot do it, by arresting everybody. **20:00** It is almost like deporting all the illegal immigrants in the United States. It would take up a very substantial portion of the budget. Forget health care. So, there is this myth that we have the capacity to deliver zero tolerance for broken windows policing, regardless of whether the theory is correct. We do not have the capacity and, if you cannot do something, then you need to take that option off the table.

Matheus Rennó: If you did, theoretically, I agree with you, would it affect the behavior of people?

Dr. Sherman: Well, there is no evidence that it is going to reduce homicide. There is wonderful experiments that show that if you go to a nice country like the Netherlands and you put a paper on the floor of the parking lot, that you have people who come out and find a piece of paper in their windshield, underneath the windshield wiper, that if they take that piece of paper, they are going to throw it down on the ground. But, if you have a completely pristine parking garage and there is no paper on the ground, you also do the same thing, then people will take the piece of paper and they put it in their car. They do not make a mess. So, all we know is that if there is already a mess, people are more likely to make a mess themselves. But, that does not have anything to do with homicide. And so, we need to think in terms of much more of a specific set of causes for a homicide than for crime in general, just the way you would think about what is the cause of leukemia, as opposed to disease in general? Leukemia

does not have the same causes as the Zika virus. So, you do not come up with one strategy to deal with both Zika and leukemia, and in policing, a homicide specific strategy needs to go with homicides specific causes. So, what are those causes? That brings us up to number four, causes of homicide are increasingly apparent in social network research as being connected to the relationships of violent young men to each other and to rival social networks. You can, in Andrew Papachristos' work, at Yale, mostly with Chicago data; you can predict who is going to be murdered by their network position in relation to prior patterns of murder. So, there is an advanced neural science to this network modeling exercise that can predict homicide with the kind of science and engineering that Brazil has. There is no reason why that capability should not be trained on the data that can be assembled from police intelligence reports about the associations of people who get arrested together, who are seen together, who are known to have been in fights or challenging other gangs. And, if you take your network data seriously, as you would if you were trying to stop the spread of syphilis or typhoid or other contagious infectious diseases, then you can try to stop the spread of infection. And, there is a variety of ways to do that that has been sort of tried out in the U.S. It is called pulling levers and you try to give very specific threats to take away privileges from an entire network of people who might be about to retaliate against another network, that just shot and killed one of their members. So, you target your deterrence on the people who are most likely to commit the next homicide. And, you can even target it within the network on the people who are most likely to be influenced by police pressure. The thing is to do that in a way that is not just deterrent, but possibly persuasive. So, I think the police starting point is we will scare them. We will show them who is boss, we will prove that we are bigger than them. Well, with young men that just invites people to say: 'oh yeah, you cannot scare me. And, I would rather die than admit I am scared'. So, just talking tough with them or even beating them up is not going to do as much I would hypothesize as trying to co-opt them to persuade them to join in with some larger effort that will give them a sense of meaning and, maybe, that is creating some sort of local governance of territories within favelas. Maybe, it is having a peace conference in order to map out, this is our territory and this is your territory. We promise to stay out of your territory. We will have a border with the border guard between the third, whatever it takes to create little nation states that are capable of doing what Europe eventually got around to doing, which was to stop killing each other over border disputes. And, I hope Europe stop doing that now. Not entirely, but...

Daniel Trielli: But, that also would entail a shifting in the mind frame of police in Brazil as to relinquishing power or the idea that they have a problem.

Dr. Sherman: It does not relinquish the power, but it increases the power. What you really need to sell, I think, is the idea that police should add soft power. So, this I think this worked at number four, add soft power to harden power. They have got plenty of hard power. They have got the tanks, they have got the machine guns and so for, and what is increasingly effective in all parts of the world right now is soft power. Soft power relies on symbols, it relies on heroes. It relies on sports stars or celebrities. It relies on somebody who is able to reach, not only the potential offenders, but their families, their girlfriends and their mothers, and to have a cultural resonance around the idea of peace that it is a bigger man who is the one who makes the world safer rather than just making more dangerous.

Matheus Rennó: How to do that?

Dr. Sherman: Well, I think that you should ask the Brazilian men not me, but I can say that in this country, there is some success claimed for what is called the violence interrupters and these are guys who are former criminals, who are older and who take advantage of the kind of, I do not know, whether it is even genetic, there may be some biological respect for age and experience that young men who are younger men have for older men, especially, if the older men have lived lives just like their own. So, I do not think it helps to have, you know, a billionaire to take over a police district, especially, if you are trying to persuade young men born into poverty. But, if you have another older man born into poverty, which is what they have done in Chicago and, that person is assigned to go to a network of offenders who are about ready to kill people in another network and can start the dialogue in effect to prevent the war from developing forward. The qualitative evidence suggests that can work in some cases. What is not clear and it is very frustrating; it is not clear how you identify the situations and really whether you can do it without the police. And, I think that the claim in Chicago has been that they have done it based on local neighborhood knowledge rather than with the police. That is probably a mistake, because the police do not want to share their intelligence with anybody. But, if the police were equipped with violence interrupters who were trained to do those kinds of negotiations and the police could dispatch

the violence interrupter to a particular target group and individuals, then you might get a higher percentage of the situations that are homicides about to happen. And, I think that is probably a valuable way to proceed towards homicide prevention, through the infectious disease model, which is not as easy as having somebody who has just been tested positive for HIV. List the names and address of everybody that had sex with them the past six months or a year, which in some cases is pretty harsh, isn't it? It not only tests their memory, but whether they ever knew in the first place who they are having sex with. And yet, it is about the best you can do for infectious disease control. And, it may be that this violence interrupter idea is not the same thing as giving people a drug to prevent the development of AIDS, in response to HIV infection. We do not ever randomized trial to show that the violence interrupters work, even in Chicago or even in **30:00** the United States. We have suggestive evidence, like Boston where they started to do something like that that involved African-American ministers. So, people who were the Church leaders of these segregated communities, they got heavily involved in calling in a whole gang to a church basement with the police and the minister was giving authority to the police to say, if this other gang that you hate has somebody murdered, we are going to come down on you like a ton of bricks. You are not going to be able to walk across the street without getting arrested for jaywalking. Those of you who are on probation will get you when you are out at night trying to go see your girlfriend; we are going to put you behind bars. We are going to do everything possible to make your life miserable. If you shoot somebody on the other side and if somebody on the other side gets shot, we are going to blame you no matter who does it. So, you might want to protect those people. And those kinds of meetings, which you can read in various journalistic descriptions, New York magazine had an article about 15 years ago, 18 years ago now, that is a kind of cultural or soft power approach, in which the police integrate themselves with cultural leaders. Now, is the church so bankrupt in Latin America that you cannot do that with local priests? I do not know, maybe, some of the fundamentalist or evangelical churches. There is another word which is, I think, it is about the end of the world, the apocalyptic churches and Jehovah's Witnesses. Some of them have amazing power with their constituents. Whether that would reach into the homicide networks is another question. But, religion has always been a strong force in Latin America, probably, a much stronger force than the rule of law and yet, not without its own problems of corruption and legitimacy. So, that

is why you should not ask me the question of how to do our soft power. What I think needs to be done is for Brazilian social scientists, like you, to take not only social science theory, but recent innovations in advanced economies. And, to think about how much of that is nudging people with soft power. And, how much we can do by making it automatic, that people do not get involved in retaliatory violence. And, one really interesting idea, which such strike, strike to some people is unethical. But, Brazil is a wonderful place to do this. If you have somebody who has been in prison and I do not know how many people go to prison in Brazil, but presumably a fair number come out of prison and then go kill somebody. So, they are part of the homicide problem. If you take David Kirk's evidence from the hurricane in Louisiana where all these people came out of prison, but they could not go home, because the home, the whole neighborhood was under water. So, they want different places across Louisiana, and the further away they went, the lower the chance they had of coming back to prison. And, this affects over three years. If you took people who were gang members in Sao Paulo, and if you could do it without the gang bosses stopping you, when they come out of prison do not send back to São Paulo, send them to Minas Gerais, send them anywhere, but São Paulo. And, you know, make the further the better. They just have to find a new life. Oh, and by the way, maybe, you should set them up with a job. A place to live or a church, maybe, have the local priest to be their sponsors, maybe, you know, subsidize the churches to hire people who would be in effect probation officers whose job, it is not to catch the offender doing something wrong, but to support the offender to get involved in a law abiding life. So, why should the police do these things? The police are guys with uniforms and guns who lock people up. And, that is really where you need some heroic police leadership, people like August Vollmer who will say we have to embrace science. We have to understand our main job is crime prevention. Our job is to stop people from breaking the law. And, the way we stop people from breaking the law involves many more techniques besides arresting and then, prosecuting. We need a bigger toolkit. Let us just put more tools in our toolkit. You want body, cameras, you want GPS. You want tanks, you want helicopters. Good. Let us just keep getting more tools. And one of the best tools we have is soft power. Let us have a whole soft power toolkit and that requires, you know, innovative partnerships between social scientists and the police, and, better yet to make police themselves social scientists. So, we had couple of police captains from São Paulo who wanted to study Cambridge and university would not let us

admit them, because their English was not good enough. They understood me. So, I do not know, it is frustrating. I am thinking of opening a private university where I do not have an English language. That could work.

Daniel Trielli: So, this brings us to a question that we had about the attitudes of police in Brazil, which are quite polarized. There is a crowd of people that says that police, they are the guys with the uniforms and the guns, they are supposed to and they even go, like there is a big slice of society that says, you know, a good criminal is a dead criminal. The police are supposed to just kill criminals. If you are a criminal, you are not a good citizen, and therefore, you are doomed for all life. And, there is another slice of society that rails against the police brutality and maybe excessively tries to stop any reasoning of good policing and effective policing.

Dr. Sherman: All policing is bad.

Daniel Trielli: Right. Exactly.

Dr. Sherman: Versus all policing is good, right?

Daniel Trielli: How do you break away from that? How do you break that dichotomy?

Dr. Sherman: Talk about the Enlightenment, talk about reason, talk about facts that we do not put a man on the moon, by saying good or bad, we do with the math, we do with experiments, with all of the ways that we know how to do complicated things, in medicine and engineering. Brazilians know how to build skyscrapers. It is very technically complicated work. People tend not to have opinions about what sort of steel is used, but people who build skyscrapers certainly do and the people who regulate the buildings care about it, because they do not want the skyscrapers to fall over. So, I think that the first condition has to be persuading the public that there is a technical body of knowledge about crime prevention that is of the same order of complexity as building construction advanced agriculture. I like to say brain surgery. It is not quite there yet, but there is a lot of brain surgery that is really guess work and we are learning through experience, which is certainly in the case of policing, but there is a growing science and somebody has got to talk the public into understanding

that perhaps, starting with the police themselves, who really do not want to bother to learn at all, because it is very threatening if you are in charge and somebody comes along and says: 'you know, you do a much better job, if you use all this knowledge', and they have no idea what the knowledge says. Which is why I am convinced the best way to change the police around the world is to educate their leadership. And, that is why I spend almost every minute of every day doing, except when I am doing exams for undergraduates in the university. And even then, I am trying to get them to become aware, because I got some cops in the class, who knows, I do not know, where that could go.

Daniel Trielli: But, do you think that discussion that we know that that happens in Brazil, that dichotomy, you think that is common throughout the world, especially in countries with high crime indexes?

Dr. Sherman: I am sorry, that what happens?

Daniel Trielli: This dichotomy between, you know, good or bad policing.

Dr. Sherman: And, look, it happens here. And, we have a problem right now with President Trump trying to do things, like hire 10000 ICE agents overnight, when all the knowledge we have is that if you want to add 10000 police to any organization to do it right, you would probably take 10 years, because when you hire lots of people very fast, their misconduct rates are through the roof. ICE, in particular, only gets applicants from people who live along the border. Well, CPB and the inspector general who worked there under both Bush and Obama said they had a continuing problem of people trying to get into the police who were, actually, Mexican drug gang members. And, the reason the gang wanted them to work for police was to tip them off about where the police were going to be, what the raids were going to be, a total corruption of the police, in which they managed to prevent, by knocking back, around 90% of the applicants could not pass the background check and they did it thoroughly. And so, you cannot change or even grow a police institution rapidly without appreciating the complexity and dangers of doing that, and even with the police force you have, the salaries may be way too low, the education requirements may be way too low. And, there needs to be some lobbying, some politics in favor of a more educated police force, which is turning out to be coming from inside policing itself in Britain. So, the college policing is recommending, I think, you were there when

we started this last year, Matheus. They are going to require a university degree to be the lowest level of police, after three years, so they get hired, they have to have a year or so of college or university education before they hire. But within three years to be able to keep their job, they have to have the bachelor's degree in Policing. And, that is right up with the Danish standard, where they do it in a Danish police college. The Dutch do the same thing. So, the only people go there are police. But, the British system is going to be that you go to a regular university, like in Maryland, and instead of taking a bachelor's degree in criminal **40:00** justice or criminology, you take a bachelor's degree in policing. And so, it includes much more specifics about the war, forensic evidence, a little bit of the operational stuff, but not that much. It is more about the context and what they really should be teaching is evidence based policing, which nobody is doing it. That is not even on the plan, too much extend in Britain. But, I think, it is the way that things are going to head. And, if only because the police recognize that they get more prestige and more respect and probably higher salaries, if they are leading an educated professional and not just a group of bureaucrats whose main job is to be the muscle rather than the brains.

Matheus Rennó: One of the reasons that Crocker's proposes for the British police is to be so much more effective than the American police, is that they can be fired. They could be fired at least. Today, the Brazilian police rarely can be fired, only on extreme occasions or at least, they are already fired, for any reason. Do you think that is an issue? How do you address that?

Dr. Sherman: I think you have a number of dimensions that, from the very earliest days, the British police were firing police, British police leaders were dismissing officers for drinking on duty and everybody drank during the workday in 1830, in Britain. And, I do not have the exact estimate, but it is something along the lines of 80% of the first cohort of constables was fired, mostly for alcohol. So, if you take that as your starting point that, we have a standard and nobody gets to keep a job, once they meet that standard. Then, you can go to the next step, which Britain did not get to until four years ago. That is called a national register of people who are barred from ever becoming a police officer, which means, if you get fired in São Paulo, you cannot go to Rio and get a job, if you get fired in London, you cannot go to Manchester and get a job. We had an officer, in fact, convicted of negligent homicide who had been fired in Surrey, and then hired in London. And, that was a nice powerful case

to justify establishing this register. So, this register exists, it has been in Florida for 20-25 years. Once you are fired as a police officer anywhere in Florida, it has to be reported to the State Department of Law Enforcement. And then, your social security number or your identifiers say this person's fingerprints that this person may not ever be a police officer, peace officer in the state of Florida. So, if you look into that kind of technology based system for eliminating people who have already been proven to be untrustworthy with the powers of police, that is probably a good starting point, rather than trying to raise salaries, rather than trying to change the discipline. I mean, some people do get fired in Brazil, right? So, if you can, I do not know, if there is a big problem there going someplace else, but, symbolically, the idea that when you are fired, you are fired forever from police, and you cannot just go to another force, that might be very important, especially, if you have got two or three local police forces, in some of these, you could get a state in a city, a regional force or whatever. So, yeah, what else could you do? You could have one state, they could afford it. Try something like a 25% increasing, starting salary and bump everybody up at the same time, rather than adding to the number of police officers. Politically, it is very popular to say we want more police. I do not think it is that hard for a populist politician to say. The problem is that the way my opponents, the current government, the way they are running things, they are paying for all these police that they are not showing up for work. So, you can make a big scandal out of that ghost police work. I want to pay the police officers more money, but we will have fewer people getting the money, who are not working. So, that is how we will pay for. We will just cut the current police force down to the real level that you are already getting. So, cut the cost will take some of that money and we will invest it back into higher salaries. So, we can recruit a whole new group of police. And, by the way, we will give them even more money, if they have a university education in law or social science and if we get enough of those, then we will not hire anybody else. But, if we do not get enough of those, we will also hire high school ones, so, you do not have to have the degree to get hired, but you get preference for having the degree. And, you know, there is at least 10 applicants for every police constables job in Britain. I do not know what it is in Brazil. But then, they started about. Police officers started the same as teachers about 20000 pounds a year, which is \$25000 US. And, it is very expensive to live there, but there is a national health service, there is lots of other safety net things, so, it is hard to make a comparison. But, experimenting with more money, more education, more discipline, those are all good things. But, I would

not start there, because you know there is a lot of crooks with a heart of gold. There is a lot of really bad people, there is a lot of police officers who have done really bad things and like good Catholics, you know, they can get forgiven and go on and do good things. And, what do they do, if they can get really excited about effective police work? Because, I think, they get very cynical very early on. They do not have much capacity to make communities safe, they have to fight with the politicians, and they have to fight with the gangsters. So, they just give up and they fight for their own interests, but you can still touch their heart, you can still say: 'wouldn't you like your children to live in a safer community? Wouldn't you like your mother to live in a safer community? And you can make that difference'. So, I am very happy to rehabilitate criminals, including police.

Matheus Rennó: That is my next question, like if you were to become the police chief, like I understand your proposal that we need to learn more, but you do not have time to do that. So, if it was to happen today, what would you prioritize?

Dr. Sherman: I would prioritize hot spots policing, and then training for how to do it. What do you do in the hot spot? How do you interact with people? How do you speak to them? Can you be polite, can you be respectful, can you be persuasive? And, can you be very vigilant about they are carrying guns and try to make hot spots effectively gun free zones? And, why are hot spots hot? It is because lots of people go there. So, you could experiment even with access to hot spots, ways of cutting off areas with lots of pedestrians from any automobile access, which is good, even for motorcycles. They cannot come in and steal lady's purses or handbags. That could help to reduce the homicide rates. So, the first thing is to map where and when the murders are happening, and then to throw lots of police at the times and places where the murders are happening. The second thing is to **50:00** figure out who is getting murdered and who is doing the murdering. So, the victim and the offender analysis lead you to networks and ways of intervening in networks. And, I suppose the third thing is to be constantly pounding the drum about this is complicated stuff. It is not just like fighting a war. It is more like combating an epidemic and we need all the powers of Public Health. You might even retain the Director of Public Health, which is happy to own the violence problem and many public health practitioners want to see violence like an epidemic or an infectious disease. So, if you ally with doctor this and doctor that, they are all there in their white coats and they are

talking about how to prevent bloodshed, then you get the television image of the police as caring about saving lives. And, I do not know how much of that message right now gets through; the police may not want to say we are here to save lives. They may want to say we are here to fight back against the enemy. And, you know, soldiers are not supposed to save lives; they are supposed to win battles. That is the first thing I would do is change the narrative. We are not fighting a war. These are our own citizens. We are not at war with them. We want to make them safe as well as everybody else. And, safe and healthy means that we are going to ally ourselves, not with the military but with public health agencies.

Matheus Rennó: As an expert, as a foreign expert, right? From another country. Do you think you could contribute to that process and how so? I mean, you know for police stations or do you think we, as experts or you see us as experts?

Dr. Sherman: Well, I think the key is to generate a professional social movement among police officers, so that they themselves understand what policing can be and they want to do it. Much like John Maynard Keynes created a revolution along economists, which helped, we think, to get us out of the depression and may have helped save us from a depression in 2008, because Keynesian economics came back in. And, what did he replace? He replaced the doctrine of no deficits of high interest rates of fiscal restraint as a way to deal with recession. And, it was exactly the opposite, it was making things worse. So, when he turned it over, he said: 'no, deficits are good. Having more capital and money flowing is good'. So, lower the interest rates increase the budget and you will get the economy to recover. People say, it did not really happen until World War II, but the truth is that Roosevelt could not get the Congress to really go into deficit very much, because all of the economic theory of the Congress was the old school. And so, here we have old school policing, which is be tough guys and go out and fight with criminals, and that is not getting us anywhere. What we need is a group of Keynesian police, you know, police who want to flip the narrative and to say it is not about being tough with the tough guys about being smart and we are going to be smart in all these ways involved advanced data analysis and highly knowledgeable police strategists as well as tacticians. And when it gets down to something like you can increase the burglary detection rate, if you have the forensic technician spend about 50% more time at the burglary scene than they are allowed to in Brisbane. That is very specific tactical stuff and police like that. They like to know the answers to questions, like how much

time is enough to investigate a burglary? And we could not tell them that two years ago, but now one of my master's students who I talked to yesterday has not only published his randomized trial that demonstrates that he is now fighting the battle to change the policy, so that the detectives can spend more time at the crime scene. And this kind of cultural change within the police organization where research is taken much more seriously is never easy, but it is not going to be won by academics. It is going to be won by the police who themselves have been convinced by their university experience that evidence based policing makes much more sense than opinion based policing.

Matheus Rennó: So, do you think our main role is education?

Dr. Sherman: I think the best thing that universities can do is to promote both the production of new knowledge and the application of new knowledge, including knowledge about application, and therefore in universities, I did not used to think this, I used to think that we were just shovels and all that. What we know about policing from research, we just shovel it into the police leaders and they would go back and apply. That does not work nearly as well as getting them to do a piece of research. So, I think when you say education, I think, you have to add this notion of education and demonstration of research, education based on research, and then research based on training and having to do it right. That is what gets medical research done, because doctors have a stake in getting published, in peer reviewed journal articles, which you cannot say is true lawyers. You cannot say is true for lots of other professions. Accountants really have no skin in the game, because it is not in the nature of those professions to be improved by new knowledge. So, it is more of the more scientifically based professions, like medicine, agriculture, engineering that is where becoming a real expert through research is a pathway to earning more money and professional promotion and advancement. And so, what we want to see is a whole generation of police who rise to the top, because they embraced research and we are seeing that in Britain and Australia, certainly, not in the US.

Daniel Trielli: I just want to briefly talk about a point that I was mind running...

Dr. Sherman: Oh, I am late for my meeting. Last point?

Daniel Trielli: Gun free zones, you mentioned that. How do you used to like, there is an ongoing rise of debate of gun owning by private citizens in Brazil? How do you feel about that?

Dr. Sherman: Well, you get a picture fight. I would start with promoting gun free zones. Even people who own guns like them. And, I am happy to continue this into part two, at some point.

Matheus Rennó: Sure, we understand you are very busy. Thank you so much.

Recebido em 05 de abr. de 2017

Aprovado em 02 de maio de 2017

