

# Development of Intelligence-led Policing in the United States and Implications for China

Li Wan

School of Criminal Law, East China University of Political Science and Law,  
1575 Wan Hang Du Street, Shanghai 200042, China

\* E-mail of the corresponding author: wanli0315@gmail.com

## Abstract

By examining the background, development path, basic framework, current situation, advantages, and disadvantages of intelligence-led policing in the United States, this study aims to provide reference for the top-level design, development, and improvement of intelligence-led policing in China. Through the use of normative analysis, comparative law, and case analysis methods, along with an analysis of the law enforcement context in the United States at that time, the principles, network structure, operational processes, and performance evaluation mechanisms of intelligence-led policing are analyzed. Based on this analysis, the characteristics and existing issues of intelligence-led policing are summarized. In the 1980s, the United States witnessed a rapid growth in three major categories of crime: cybercrime, terrorism, and organized transnational crime. The passive reactive law enforcement approach based on territorial jurisdiction revealed its limitations in responding to such crime trends. Driven by external pressures and internal demands, U.S. law enforcement agencies began to prioritize the development of proactive and efficient intelligence-led policing. After several decades of exploration, they have established an effective experiential model at both strategic and tactical levels. By drawing from their experience, China has the potential to elevate intelligence-led policing to a higher level, leveraging its own previous innovative experiences, the advantage of scale, and the unity and coordination within the three major intelligence sources systems.

**Keywords:** intelligence-led policing; policing model; development path; police reform

**DOI:** 10.7176/JLPG/133-03

**Publication date:** June 30<sup>th</sup> 2023

## 1. Introduction

As crime patterns continue to evolve, particularly with the increasing severity of cybercrime and terrorism, law enforcement agencies worldwide have gradually recognized the important role and tremendous potential of intelligence-led policing in addressing new forms of crime. Specifically, when facing the highly concealed and geographically transcendent nature of cybercrime, the traditional reactive approach of law enforcement has proven to be inadequate, resulting in numerous cybercrimes that remain outside the scope of judicial proceedings and contributing to the current prevalence of cybercrime. Additionally, following the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the global threat of terrorism has surged. Unlike combating other forms of crime, the key to combating terrorism lies not in post-event investigations and evidence gathering, but rather in proactive intelligence analysis and precise and efficient interception of terrorist activities. If terrorist acts cannot be intercepted beforehand, no matter how effective the subsequent investigation, arrest, and prosecution may be, it will fail to serve as an effective deterrent to the perpetrators of terrorism, as they are often extremists or fanatics driven by religious ideologies. Intelligence-led policing can effectively address these challenges, and promoting its development has become a common consensus among law enforcement agencies worldwide. The United States has advanced and mature experience in the fields of homeland security intelligence and law enforcement intelligence. In recent years, it has made many attempts and explorations in the mutual exchange and promotion of the two, forming relatively scientific systems and operational norms in related areas. Examining and drawing lessons from the development path of intelligence-led policing in the United States holds certain significance for the development and maturity of intelligence-led policing in China.

## 2. Overview of Intelligence-Led Policing in the United States

After human society entered the information revolution, information network technology has profoundly affected crime patterns while promoting social development, and the intensified transformation of crime patterns has caused many discomforts to the traditional reactive policing.

### 2.1 Background

In 1966, Donn B. Parker, a computer expert in Silicon Valley, discovered that someone was using a computer to modify the balance of a bank deposit account, which, according to the information that has been verified, was the world's first case of computer network crime, and the number of cases using computer crime for profit has increased rapidly since then. (Chang 1991) Soon cybercrime has become the number one enemy of police around

the world because of its strong concealment, technology, cross-regional, and widespread nature, and with the rapid development of information network technology, the form and means of cybercrime has also evolved rapidly, bringing great challenges to modern policing born during the industrial revolution.

The September 11 attacks had two profound effects: first, it excited would-be terrorists, and a number of terrorist organizations followed suit, leading to a high incidence of terrorist crime; second, it led to a heated debate about reactive policing, which has a very distinct disadvantage over intelligence-led policing in responding to terrorist crimes.

Although organized crime has a long history, the dramatic increase in organized crime groups since the 1970s has posed a great challenge to the U.S. police, especially with the continuous development of the Internet, cyber organized crime can quickly endanger a large number of victims worldwide at a very low cost, and the greater concealment of cyber organized crime, a significant portion of victims are unable to report to the police because they are unaware of their victimization, which largely reduces the cost of crime.

Organized crime groups from poor and disturbed communities have been a major problem for U.S. police. Small and homogeneous criminal groups can quickly develop into national organizations, and in the context of accelerated globalization, a significant number of these national organizations have become organized transnational crime organizations, with drug and human trafficking being the most prevalent and damaging of the crimes involved. Organized crime has been discussed and seen as a threat since the 1920s, while it did not receive sufficient police attention until the 1990s when transnational organized crime involving drug and human trafficking shipments began to grow dramatically. (Gill 2018)

In addition, modern policing is based on the geographical division of jurisdiction, and later criminals usually come to take advantage of such geographical jurisdictional boundaries, more inclined to criminal activities in areas close to jurisdictional boundaries, with the end of the Cold War after the acceleration of the globalization process, transnational crime also increased rapidly accordingly. And traditional reactive policing in the fight against cybercrime, terrorist crimes, transnational organized crime and other crimes appear many drawbacks. This has led to a growing call for police reform in the United States and an increasingly urgent need for reform. U.S. police began to seek a more proactive policing model. Intelligence-led policing, which is more responsive to current crime patterns and social governance needs, has gradually become a new policing paradigm favored and promoted by the U.S. police.

## *2.2 Definition and Components*

In the early 1970s, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals in the United States proposed that every law enforcement agency, regardless of size, should immediately establish a system to collect and analyze data (Ratcliffe 2008). The purpose was to enhance the overall intelligence gathering and analysis capabilities of the law enforcement system, thereby guiding policing through intelligence and improving policing efficiency. Although the establishment of this system was initially hindered due to concerns about severe infringement on personal privacy and information, it marked the beginning of intelligence-led policing in the United States. Since then, intelligence-led policing has been continuously explored, and discussions about its concept have never ceased, but a clear definition has yet to be formed.

In 2007, the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) in the United States introduced a memorandum outlining the use of intelligence-led policing procedures to guide the collection and review of information related to violent crime for grant purposes. In this memorandum, the BJA recognized the foundational concepts of intelligence-led policing, which included two points: first, intelligence-led policing builds upon problem-oriented policing and the lessons learned from CompStat; second, it is suitable for application in complex and dangerous environments where crime takes various forms, involving not only law enforcement agencies but also multiple jurisdictions, non-governmental organizations, and businesses. Based on these two points, the BJA defined intelligence-led policing as "a collaborative law enforcement paradigm that combines problem-oriented policing, information sharing, intelligence management, and police responsibilities" (Carter and Phillips 2015). Building upon this definition, American scholars Dennis L. Carter and Jeremy G. Carter provided a more specific definition of intelligence-led policing as "the collection and analysis of information about crime and the conditions that cause crime, resulting in actionable intelligence to assist law enforcement agencies in addressing threats, formulating relevant strategic plans, and eliminating or reducing those threats" (Carter and Carter 2009). This definition captures the essential attributes of intelligence-led policing and has been widely accepted by the government and academia.

The concept of intelligence-led policing originated in the United Kingdom, but it is widely recognized that the United States has achieved a higher level of development in intelligence-led policing. To understand why the United States excels in intelligence-led policing, it is necessary to examine its key components. Based on existing literature, the author has identified nine major components of intelligence-led policing in the United States (see Table 1). During the 1960s to 1980s, the United States experienced a significant increase in crime rates, disrupting the previous balance between crime and law enforcement. This situation resulted in a substantial

shortage of law enforcement personnel, which further diminished the deterrent effect of the police on crime and led to a further increase in crime rates. When the public perceived the rise in crime rates, there was a demand for increased police resources. However, it was evident that the rate of police recruitment could not keep up with the surge in crime (Ratcliffe 2008). Against this backdrop, intelligence-led policing emerged with the strategic goal of enhancing policing efficiency and shifting from a reactive approach to a proactive one. Initially, in its country of origin, the United Kingdom, it was employed as an operational strategy for localized police activities. However, in the United States, it gradually evolved into a comprehensive deployment across all aspects of policing. The other seven components were gradually formulated through the exploration of daily police activities.

### *2.3 History and Current Status of Intelligence-Led Policing in the United States*

The development of technology has significantly influenced the transformation of policing operations. While cutting-edge technologies in the information age empower societal advancements, they also provide criminals with convenience. Criminals who possess these technological tools can exploit the information gap between themselves and victims, significantly increasing criminal profits while reducing the costs of crime. The widespread coverage of the internet has also led to a significant increase in the number of crime victims, and the covert nature of technology poses a significant challenge to traditional policing models. The reason why technology-enabled crime possesses a high level of concealment lies fundamentally in the information gap between law enforcement agencies, victims, and criminals. The immediate priority for law enforcement agencies is to bridge and reverse this information gap. The impact and reflection of the September 11th attacks in 2001 made US law enforcement agencies profoundly aware of the urgency to address this information gap. The most direct means for law enforcement agencies to bridge this gap is through reliance on their own intelligence systems. In March 2002, over 120 criminal intelligence experts from across the United States participated in the "Intelligence Summit" organized by the International Association of Chiefs of Police. The summit reached a consensus that law enforcement agencies should focus on the collection and analysis of criminal intelligence, and through the integration of criminal intelligence, enhance their ability to predict and control existing and potential criminal activities (McGarrell et al. 2007). In 2003, the Global Intelligence Working Group was established in the United States, which immediately proposed the National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan (NCISP). This plan stated that "all agencies, especially law enforcement agencies, regardless of size, must have a minimum capability for sharing criminal intelligence" (Bureau of Justice Assistance 2003). This plan was regarded as a blueprint for law enforcement officers in the United States to establish and strengthen their intelligence functions. It included 28 recommendations reviewed by law enforcement officials and experts at various levels (including local, state, and federal), including minimum standards for intelligence analysis. Since then, law enforcement agencies at all levels in the United States have rapidly increased their investments in intelligence collection, analysis, and assessment. Intelligence-led policing in the United States has entered the fast lane of development, transforming from a specialized police function primarily targeting terrorism and homeland security into a comprehensive guiding principle.

As required by the National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan, law enforcement agencies of all sizes in the United States have gradually developed the capability to collect and share criminal intelligence and conduct analysis since the beginning of the 21st century. Intelligence-led policing in the United States is also transitioning from being an operational strategy guiding localized police activities to becoming a strategic framework for all police operations (Belur and Johnson 2018). It is worth noting that although intelligence-led policing in the United States has accumulated extensive practical experience from the strategic to tactical levels, there still exists a significant gap between its implementation and theoretical concepts. Some scholars even describe this gap as a "chasm." (Innes et al. 2005) The U.S. law enforcement environment is complex, with nearly 20,000 law enforcement agencies spread across federal, state, and local governments. Organizational structure-wise, this poses considerable challenges to the implementation of intelligence-led policing, particularly in the absence of any direct incentives for police officers to collect and share intelligence.

## **3. Principles, Network Structure, Operational Process, and Performance Evaluation of Intelligence-Led Policing in the United States**

### *3.1 Principles of Intelligence-Led Policing in the United States*

Firstly, the principle of comprehensiveness should be followed. With the continuous development of information network technology, almost all police activities are inevitably associated with intelligence. The development and utilization of criminal intelligence resources, as well as the construction and management of police intelligence systems, need to adhere to the principle of comprehensiveness. The comprehensive principle means adopting a comprehensive perspective to view the criminal intelligence system. In the United Kingdom, the application of intelligence-led policing focuses on identifying habitual offenders and long-term criminals while neglecting the identification and prevention of other types of offenders. In some other countries, intelligence-led policing is

seen as a policing model applicable only to homeland security and counterterrorism. Practice has proven that this concept is not conducive to the development of intelligence-led policing. This is because those who pose a threat to homeland security and engage in terrorism-related crimes often engage in a significant amount of preparatory activities before committing crimes, and these preparatory activities often involve other types of crimes. Offenders have relatively weak counter-surveillance awareness during this stage, making it easier for criminal intelligence to come into the view of law enforcement agencies. Therefore, intelligence-led policing should be regarded as a comprehensive framework that encompasses all criminal-related intelligence, based on community policing and problem-oriented policing. Its design and operation should adhere to the principle of comprehensiveness. (Peterson 2005)

Secondly, the principle of information sharing should be followed. Information sharing is an important means to enhance the intelligence collection and analysis capabilities of intelligence agencies, and it is also a fundamental principle of intelligence-led policing. At the national level, since the 21st century, the boundaries between national security information and criminal information have become increasingly blurred. At the societal level, new types of crimes, such as cybercrime, pose greater threats and panic to the public than traditional crimes, and these new types of crimes often involve multiple domains. Therefore, the fusion and sharing of intelligence among different domains and organizations are particularly important. However, barriers to information sharing between regions and departments have always been a bottleneck for improving the efficiency of law enforcement. Overcoming these information-sharing barriers is a crucial goal of intelligence-led policing, which aims to improve law enforcement efficiency. Therefore, the principle of information sharing should be integrated into the process of intelligence-led policing.

Thirdly, the principle of proportionality should be followed. Ideally, the richness of intelligence sources should be directly proportional to the expected effectiveness of intelligence-led policing. However, personal information and privacy are important components of intelligence sources, and their collection and use are subject to ethical and legal restrictions. Managing the conflicting relationship between intelligence collection and privacy is an important issue in intelligence-led policing, and the principle of proportionality is designed to address this. Specifically, the purpose of utilizing intelligence information should be proportionate to the sensitivity and potential harm of the intelligence itself. While achieving the set goals, the least invasive methods should be chosen to minimize infringement on personal privacy and rights.

### *3.2 Operational Process of Intelligence-Led Policing in the United States*

The process of intelligence-led policing in the United States starts with the federal government's response to threats and other strategic needs. Through predetermined criminal intelligence analysis procedures, strategic intelligence and tactical intelligence are produced. Strategic intelligence is provided to senior law enforcement personnel for policy prioritization, strategic planning, resource allocation, etc., while tactical intelligence guides the daily activities, policing operations, and routine criminal investigations of mid-level law enforcement personnel. Ultimately, the effectiveness of intelligence is demonstrated in various aspects, including daily policing, significant events, community policing, serious crimes, counterterrorism operations, and other matters. This operational process is not a linear assembly line but a spiral and cyclical system where each stage mutually influences the other stages. The previous stage is not merely the output of the next stage, and the next stage also provides feedback to the previous stage, influencing its execution effectiveness.

This model is designed from the perspective of the federal government, and for the entire operational process to function smoothly, it relies on the specific operations of each law enforcement agency. Different law enforcement agencies vary in size and characteristics, and there is no unified operating model. Therefore, it is necessary to establish corresponding principles and provide regular strategic and tactical guidance for these agencies to ensure the implementation of the entire process.

## **4. Characteristics and Issues of Intelligence-Led Policing in the United States**

### *4.1 Characteristics of Intelligence-Led Policing in the United States*

#### **Comprehensive and Systematic Approach**

With the increasing channels for acquiring decision-making information, relying solely on experiential methods for police action decisions is no longer viable. Decisions made by police chiefs and senior executives in the United States are subject to more scrutiny, mainly regarding whether their decisions are supported by sufficient intelligence information (Flood and Gaspar 2009). Law enforcement leaders recognize that the essence of intelligence-led policing is the need for a process or method for designing more objective priorities and strategies, effectively managing the information they possess, and utilizing this information for strategic decision-making and actions. Therefore, intelligence-led policing in the United States emphasizes the impact of intelligence production on policing decisions and expands the scale of intelligence sharing through information sharing systems. It allows for connectivity between various intelligence information systems and repositories at the local, state, tribal, regional, and federal levels using information network infrastructure. The current intelligence-driven

policing in the United States is not just an information exchange added to the organization but strategically integrates intelligence analysis with the overall tasks of the organization.(Carter and Phillips 2015)

#### *High Executability*

Police reform in the United States started early, especially with the development of community policing and problem-oriented policing, which preceded intelligence-led policing. Rather than being a relationship of replacement, they have a mutually influential relationship, laying the foundation for the emergence and development of intelligence-led policing. The practice and development of community policing provided a structural foundation for intelligence-led policing, while problem-oriented policing largely caused a shift in the mindset of law enforcement officers, establishing a cognitive basis. Community policing shares commonalities with intelligence-led policing in several aspects. First, both community policing and intelligence-led policing rely on two-way communication with the public. A key strategy of community policing is providing the public with information on criminal activities and signs, along with explanations of how to handle information related to potential threats. Second, both community policing and intelligence-led policing depend on information analysis and the transformation of information into actionable intelligence. Whether it involves a patrol officer analyzing a series of break-ins or intelligence analysts conducting link analysis to assess the funding sources of terrorists, this process is vital. Third, both community policing and intelligence-led policing involve a significant amount of personal information and privacy, so handling the relationship between public authority and individual rights is a common challenge they face.(McGarrell et al. 2007) Fourth, the promotion of community policing has led to a decentralization trend in the organizational structure of U.S. law enforcement agencies. Frontline police officers who directly engage with communities have gained more discretion, allowing them to gather more valuable criminal intelligence through their experience. The development of problem-oriented policing has freed police officers from the mindset of passive reaction and encouraged a more proactive working mode. These foundations contribute to the high executability of intelligence-led policing in the United States.

#### *Breaking Down Geographic and Departmental Barriers to Some Extent*

Geographic and departmental barriers pose significant obstacles to intelligence information sharing among government agencies in various countries, including the United States. In 2003, the establishment of the National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan was driven by the recognition within U.S. law enforcement and intelligence agencies, following the "9/11" terrorist attacks, that increased sharing and integration of information and intelligence between law enforcement and intelligence agencies before such tragic events could potentially prevent them. Thus, one crucial mission of this plan was to address the "longstanding barriers to intelligence sharing." After the implementation of this plan, cooperation between U.S. law enforcement agencies and national security intelligence agencies became closer in terms of intelligence sharing, particularly in counterterrorism and major crime cases (Whelan and Dupont 2017). From this perspective, the friction between law enforcement agencies and national security intelligence agencies has been diminished to some extent.

#### *4.2 Issues of Intelligence-Led Policing in the United States*

Regarding the problems and obstacles faced by intelligence-led policing in the United States, scholars have identified several main issues. Some argue that the main problem lies in the police's insufficient understanding of intelligence analysis (Cope 2004). Others point to organizational structure issues (Sheptycki 2004), while some highlight the traditional police culture as the primary barrier. Many law enforcement officers, especially those in higher positions, have grown up in a traditional policing model and are more inclined to believe and adhere to a reactive approach rather than embracing the potential impact of intelligence-led policing reforms (Belur and Johnson 2018). In summary, the current issues can be categorized into three main areas: data sources, analytical efficiency, and decision-making processes.

#### *Data Source Issues*

The most evident problem concerning data sources is the lack of common standards for collecting, retaining, and disseminating intelligence information. This leads to two major issues: first, the most crucial source of intelligence data is the experiential perception of frontline police officers during their daily activities. Standardizing the conversion of these experiential perceptions into widely shareable and analyzable intelligence requires common guidelines. Otherwise, the valuable experiential knowledge of frontline officers remains confined to their minds and fails to reach its full potential. Second, ensuring data quality requires standardized measures. Research has found that many law enforcement intelligence analysts consider a significant portion of the collected data to be lacking in completeness and accuracy, which poses significant challenges to their analytical work and limits the effectiveness of intelligence utilization (Chan and Bennett Moses 2017). Additionally, the primary sources of intelligence in intelligence-led policing come from law enforcement systems, national security systems, and relevant corporate organizations. As the United States emphasizes local autonomy and checks and balances, establishing a centralized intelligence collection system among these three major sources is challenging. There are significant barriers to sharing intelligence information between states and between states and the federal level. Currently, the United States still lacks a coordinated intelligence generation

and sharing process led by the federal government. Moreover, some laws and policies overly restrict law enforcement agencies' access to information, resulting in certain data and information not entering their purview and being transformed into actionable intelligence.

#### *Analytical Efficiency Issues*

The problems in intelligence analysis can be attributed to three main aspects. First, from a technological perspective, there is a lack of connectivity among national intelligence data systems, equipment, law enforcement agencies, and other organizational entities (such as corporations). Many law enforcement agency databases have become information silos. Second, adequate training for analysts and management personnel is crucial for intelligence-led policing (Evans and Keibell 2012). Many intelligence analysts believe that training is more important than increasing the number of analysts in improving intelligence analysis efficiency. However, the current training provided by law enforcement agencies in the United States is inadequate (Burcher and Whelan 2019). Third, working relationships among law enforcement agencies in different regions are hindered by self-interest considerations, leading to a reluctance to share relevant intelligence information with competitive departments. This, to some extent, hampers the improvement of analytical efficiency.

#### *Decision-Making Issues*

The correctness of decision-making within law enforcement agencies regarding intelligence directly impacts the ability of intelligence to effectively predict, prevent, and combat crime. Undoubtedly, this is a crucial aspect at every stage of intelligence-led policing. However, there are certain issues with the decision-making processes concerning intelligence within US law enforcement agencies. The decision-makers, who hold the authority, are influenced by a reactive and traditional policing mindset, resulting in a severe lack of sensitivity and emphasis on intelligence. Consequently, the intelligence work within law enforcement agencies becomes a mere formality, as described by a US scholar: "Police officers are currently in a situation where a significant amount of their work time is spent on crime statistics and report writing. However, most of these data and reports are not intended for operational use but rather serve other government departments. Ultimately, the data and reports that require substantial police resources do not contribute to reducing crime rates." (Ratliff 2002) The focal point of intelligence-led policing should lie in utilizing intelligence for prevention, disruption, and combating of crime. This necessitates that senior law enforcement personnel base their decision-making on the foundation of intelligence analysis. However, the current decision-makers in US law enforcement agencies have not achieved this. The majority of their decisions still rely on past policing experiences, without the necessary influence of crime intelligence. (Sanders and Sheptycki 2017)

### **5. Insights from the Development of Intelligence-Led Policing in the United States for China**

Every model has room for improvement. It is essential to objectively evaluate and adapt it to local circumstances while drawing lessons from it in order to achieve the development and enhancement of intelligence-led policing in China with minimal cost and maximum efficiency.

#### *5.1 Top-level strategic design is crucial for the development of intelligence-led policing.*

Currently, the concept of intelligence-led policing is gaining prominence in the field of Chinese law enforcement. Law enforcement agencies at all levels have recognized the potential of intelligence-led policing in the realm of crime management, given the significant changes in the nature of criminal activities today. From the development experience of intelligence-led policing in the United States, it can be observed that merely using it as an operational strategy in specific law enforcement activities is not conducive to its sustainable development. Its value and advantages can only be effectively realized when it is employed as a strategic framework applied comprehensively throughout the entire law enforcement process.

#### *5.2 Emphasize the integration of indigenous law enforcement experiences.*

Similar to the United States, China has accumulated rich innovative experiences throughout its exploration of law enforcement. Unique Chinese law enforcement experiences such as the "Maple Bridge Experience" have played an important role domestically and garnered international attention. Although intelligence-led policing was not originated in China, the exchange of law enforcement models among different countries has become a norm. However, such exchanges are not meant to be blindly copied, as the reality is that different countries have distinct national conditions and law enforcement foundations. The intelligence-led policing model proposed by the United Kingdom undergoes modification and development when implemented in the United States. When developing our own intelligence-led policing, we should integrate our previous innovative experiences, such as community policing and problem-oriented policing, which have been developed for many years in China. As German scholar Scheider pointed out, intelligence-led policing is an innovation, and despite being a new model for law enforcement, the lessons learned from past law enforcement innovations are crucial for its successful adoption (Scheider et al. 2009). While the United States has a longer history of technological development, including computer technology and information network technology, and a more extensive experience with computer-assisted statistical policing (Compstat), its intelligence-led policing practices primarily focus on

enhancing the technical capabilities of law enforcement agencies. On the other hand, China possesses internationally recognized advanced and abundant experiences in police-civilian cooperation. Frontline police officers in China, especially community police officers, tend to gather intelligence through daily interactions with the public. The law enforcement practices of various countries have proven that intelligence derived from such routine activities often yields unexpected results, and China possesses inherent advantages in the collection and analysis of this type of intelligence.

### *5.3 Leverage the advantages of unity and coordination.*

From a theoretical perspective, the concept of centralized governance and strong leadership in China plays a significant role in promoting unity and coordination in the intelligence system. The Chinese government's ability to integrate the intelligence resources of law enforcement systems, national security systems, and relevant corporate organizations is supported by a top-down approach, allowing for effective coordination and collaboration among these entities. Looking at practical cases, the implementation of China's intelligence-led policing initiatives, such as the Golden Shield Project (also known as the Integrated Joint Operations Platform), showcases the country's capability to integrate and analyze vast amounts of data from multiple sources. This project aims to enhance public security and combat crime through advanced surveillance and information-sharing systems. The centralized nature of this project allows for improved coordination and intelligence sharing among various law enforcement agencies. Moreover, data from comparative studies can shed light on the differences between China and the United States regarding intelligence system unity and coordination. For instance, research examining the National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan in the United States has highlighted challenges related to fragmentation and lack of coordination among law enforcement agencies. This fragmentation can hinder effective intelligence sharing and coordination efforts across different jurisdictions. In contrast, China's intelligence system benefits from a more centralized structure, where the central government has the authority and resources to integrate intelligence resources from multiple entities. This centralized approach, combined with advancements in technology and data analytics, contributes to a higher degree of unity and coordination within China's intelligence-led policing efforts. It is important to note that while China may exhibit a higher degree of unity and coordination in its intelligence system, there are also concerns related to privacy, data protection, and potential abuse of power. The balance between efficient intelligence sharing and protecting individuals' rights and privacy remains a critical aspect to consider and address in the development and implementation of intelligence-led policing initiatives.

In conclusion, when comparing the intelligence systems of China and the United States, it is evident that China's centralized governance and strong leadership contribute to a higher degree of unity and coordination. Theoretical perspectives, practical cases, and comparative data support this observation. However, it is essential to consider the potential implications and challenges associated with such centralized systems to ensure a balance between effective intelligence-led policing and safeguarding individual rights and privacy.

### **Acknowledgments**

The author would like to thank Prof. Yongquan Wang and Prof. Geping Qiu for providing some of their experiences and useful insights about intelligence-led policing practices in China. Three anonymous commentators provided helpful and constructive comments that improved the manuscript substantially, for which the author is also grateful.

### **References**

- Belur, J., and Johnson, S. (2018), "Is crime analysis at the heart of policing practice? A case study", *Policing and society*, Taylor & Francis, 28, 768–786.
- Burcher, M., and Whelan, C. (2019), "Intelligence-led policing in practice: Reflections from intelligence analysts", *Police quarterly*, Sage Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA, 22, 139–160. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109861111879689>.
- Bureau of Justice Assistance (2003). "National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan", Available at [https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/media/document/national\\_criminal\\_intelligence\\_sharing\\_plan.pdf](https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/media/document/national_criminal_intelligence_sharing_plan.pdf).
- Carter, D. L., and Carter, J. G. (2009), "Intelligence-led policing: Conceptual and functional considerations for public policy", *Criminal justice policy review*, SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA, 20, 310–325.
- Carter, J. G., and Phillips, S. W. (2015), "Intelligence-led policing and forces of organisational change in the USA", *Policing and society*, Taylor & Francis, 25, 333–357.
- Chan, J., and Bennett Moses, L. (2017), "Making sense of big data for security", *The British journal of criminology*, Oxford University Press, 57, 299–319.
- Chang, Y. (1991), "Review and Forecast of Cybercrime," *Science of Law - Journal of Northwest University of*

Political Science and Law, 38–41.

- Cope, N. (2004), “‘Intelligence Led Policing or Policing Led Intelligence?’ Integrating Volume Crime Analysis into Policing”, *British journal of criminology*, Oxford University Press, 44, 188–203.
- Evans, J. M., and Kebbell, M. R. (2012), “The effective analyst: a study of what makes an effective crime and intelligence analyst”, *Policing and society*, Taylor & Francis, 22, 204–219.
- Flood, B., and Gaspar, R. (2009), “Strategic aspects of the UK national intelligence model”, *Strategic thinking in criminal intelligence*, Sydney: Federation Press, 37–52.
- Gill, P. (2018), *Rounding up the usual suspects?: developments in contemporary law enforcement intelligence: developments in contemporary law enforcement intelligence*, Routledge.
- Innes, M., Fielding, N., and Cope, N. (2005), “‘The Appliance of Science?’ The Theory and Practice of Crime Intelligence Analysis”, *British journal of criminology*, Oxford University Press, 45, 39–57.
- McGarrell, E. F., Freilich, J. D., and Chermak, S. (2007), “Intelligence-led policing as a framework for responding to terrorism”, *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, Sage Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA, 23, 142–158.
- Peterson, M. (2005), *Intelligence-led policing: The new intelligence architecture*, Bureau of Justice Assistance Washington, DC.
- Ratcliffe, J. (2002), “Intelligence-led policing and the problems of turning rhetoric into practice”, *Policing and Society*, Routledge, 12, 53–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439460290006673>.
- Ratcliffe, J. H. (2008), *Intelligence-led policing*, Cullompton, Devon: Willan Publishing.
- Sanders, C. B., and Sheptycki, J. (2017), “Policing, crime and ‘big data’; towards a critique of the moral economy of stochastic governance”, *Crime, law and social change*, Springer, 68, 1–15.
- Scheider, M. C., Chapman, R., and Schapiro, A. (2009), “Towards the unification of policing innovations under community policing”, *Policing: An international journal of police strategies & management*, Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Sheptycki, J. (2004), “Organizational pathologies in police intelligence systems: Some contributions to the lexicon of intelligence-led policing”, *European journal of criminology*, Sage Publications London, Thousand Oaks CA, and New Delhi, 1, 307–332.
- Whelan, C., and Dupont, B. (2017), “Taking stock of networks across the security field: A review, typology and research agenda”, *Policing and society*, Taylor & Francis, 27, 671–687.

**Li Wan** was born in Xiangyang City, Hubei Province, China, on April 30, 1988. He obtained a Bachelor's degree in Communication Engineering from People's Public Security University of China, Beijing, China, in 2011, and earned a Master's degree in Law from Fuzhou University, Fujian Province, China in 2020. Now he is a doctoral candidate in the field of Criminal Justice at East China University of Political Science and Law in Shanghai, China. His major field of study is cyber security and intelligence-led policing.

Table 1: Elements of Intelligence-Led Policing in the United States

Elements	Requirements
Strategic Objectives	Enhance policing efficiency, shift from reactive to proactive
Strategic Deployment	Applied comprehensively across all policing activities
Organizational Structure	Organizational structure serves intelligence production
Sources of Intelligence	Integrity, reliability, and availability
Tactical Objectives	Increase success rates in crime prevention, deterrence, and enforcement
Key Focus	Habitual offenders and serious offenders
Process Design	Integrate analysis and decision-making
Requirements for Decision-makers	Value and understand intelligence
Requirements for Operatives	Effective training for personnel involved in the entire intelligence process, regular strategic and tactical meetings