owner (management and disposal of the given property) belongs to one person (the trustee), and the other part of the powers (obtaining benefits from the operation of the property, Income) – to another person or persons (one, several, or many beneficiaries).

**A STRATEGIC VIEW OF CRIME FIGHTING**

The core mission of the police is to control crime. No one disputes this. Indeed, professional crime fighting enjoys wide public support as the basic strategy of policing precisely because it embodies a deep commitment to this objective. In contrast, other proposed strategies such as problem-solving or community policing appear on the surface to blur this focus.

Professional crime-fighting now relies predominantly on three tactics:

1) motorized patrol;
2) rapid response to calls for service; and
3) retrospective investigation of crime [1, p. 138]. Over the past few decades, police responsiveness has been enhanced by connecting police to citizens by telephones, radios, and cars, and by matching police officer schedules and locations to anticipated calls for service.
For now, however, the greatest potential for improved crime control may not lie in the continued enhancement of response times, patrol tactics, and investigative techniques.

Rather, improved crime control can be achieved by:

1) diagnosing and managing problems in the community that produce serious crimes;

2) fostering closer relations with the community to facilitate crime solving; and

3) building self-defense capabilities within the community itself. Among the results may be increased apprehension of criminals.

While police executives can produce increased levels of arrest and local reductions in crime through the creation of special programs, they are frustrated because they do not know how to produce reductions in citywide levels of crime.

The main reason for this might be that their main force is not engaged in a serious crime-fighting effort even though it seems that it is. After all, it would be unreasonable to imagine that any single small program, typically engaging less than 5 percent of the force, could have much impact on aggregate levels of crime. The important question is what is the remaining 95 percent of the force doing?

For the most part, the answer is that they are deployed in patrol cars, responding to calls for service and investigating crimes after they have occurred. These tactics have only limited effectiveness. What remains unanswered is the consequence of shifting a whole department to a radically different style of policing.

Moreover, the answer is hard to determine, since the period of transition would be quite awkward. In the short run, were officers taken from patrol and detective units to do problem oriented or community policing, it is almost certain that response times would lengthen at least until the problem solving efforts reduced the demands for service by eliminating the precipitating problem that was producing the calls for service [2, p. 20]. And even though an increase in response times does not necessarily indicate a real loss in crime-fighting effectiveness, it would be perceived as such because the public and the police have learned to equate rapid response to crime calls with crime control effectiveness.

What is tempting, of course, is to avoid choosing among these strategies, and to adopt the strengths of these various approaches while avoiding their weaknesses. This would be reflected in decisions to establish special units to do problem-solving or community policing within existing organizations whose traditions and main forces remained committed to reactive patrol and retrospective investigation. But it may not be this easy.
Indeed, experience demonstrates that it is not. Previous initiatives with team policing or split force policing succeeded in building capacities for both styles of policing within the same department, but tended foster eventual competition and conflicts [3, p. 229].

The problem solving and community policing aspects have usually eventually yielded to administrative demands to keep response times low, or to officers’ desires to avoid the demanding engagement with the community. The reason seems to be partly a matter of resources—there has never been enough manpower to maximize performance in both domains at once. But it also seems to be a matter of administrative style and structure. Problem-solving and community policing both require a greater degree of decentralization than does the current policing strategy.

They depend more on the initiative of the officers. And they reach out for a close rather than a distant relationship with the community. These are all quite different than the administrative emphases of the current strategy which prescribe centralization, control, and distance from the community.

So while logic and evidence suggest the crime control potential of adding problem-solving and community policing to the concept of rapid response and retrospective investigation, it is hard to add these functions without increasing the resources and significantly changing the administrative style of a police organization. That is hard for a police chief to decide to do without convincing evidence that it would work.

The only things that make such a move easy to contemplate are:

1) a deep sense that the current strategy and tactics have reached their limits;
2) the plausibility of the idea that increased effectiveness lies in working on proximate causes and mobilizing communities; and
3) the little bit of evidence we have that the alternative approach works [4,p. 97].

A few departments, such as Houston, Newport News, Baltimore County, and Philadelphia, have committed themselves to these alternative approaches. If they succeed over the next 3 to 5 years in reducing serious crime as well as in attracting citizen support, then the field will know that it has a better strategy of policing available than is now being used.

Conclusions. We are convinced that fighting crime is indeed a social form activity, one of the main tasks of which is to counteract this negative phenomenon. It is clear that it needs to be properly addressed an organization, which, in turn, is considered to be the most important condition for it efficiency.
Combining the efforts of the state, represented by law enforcement agencies, and civil society will produce the expected results.

However, this will not be enough if we do not coordinate and coordinate actions, which is primarily due to the presence of common goals and objectives in the field of struggle with crime. Thus, the fight against crime as a form of socio-legal activity is that properly formulated goals determine the main directions of struggle against this phenomenon, act the mobilizing factor is the criterion for evaluating the effectiveness of law enforcement agencies in the fight against crime.
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PROPERTY FRAUD IN THE USA

Property, an object of legal rights, which embraces possessions or wealth collectively, frequently with strong connotations of individual ownership. In law the term refers to the complex of jural relationships between and among persons with respect to things. Because property law deals with the allocation, use, and transfer of wealth and objects of wealth, it must reflect the economy, family structure, and politics of the society in which it is found. Finally, because it deals with such fundamental issues as the economy and the structure of the family, property law also reflects the politics of the society in which it is found.

What distinguishes the Western property system from the systems of most, if not all, other societies is that its category of private property is a default category. The legal concept of property in the West is characterized