

Global Integration and International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol)

Sheriff Ghali Ibrahim¹, Mohamed Lamin Yansaneh²

^{1,2}Department Of Political Science And International Relations, University Of Abuja, Abuja

Abstract

The paper investigates the nature, functions and successes of the international criminal police organization (INTERPOL) and analyzes how it affects global security. From the secondary methodology, findings show that, the organization is effective in tackling cross-border crimes and hardened criminals around the world. The paper concludes that, to keep Interpol as politically neutral as possible, its charter forbids it, at least in theory, from undertaking interventions or activities of a political, military, religious, or racial nature or involving itself in disputes over such matters. Its work focuses primarily on public safety and battling terrorism, crimes against humanity, environmental crime, genocide, war crimes, organized crime, piracy, illicit traffic in works of art, illicit drug production, drug trafficking, weapons smuggling, human trafficking, money laundering, child pornography, white-collar crime, computer crime, intellectual property crime and corruption. The paper recommends that, for the work of INTERPOL to be effective and efficient member Countries should be willing to update the Interpol databases and at the same time be able to check against the Interpol criminal data bases regularly, this will enable them to be able to arrest dangerous criminals on the run.

Keywords: *international; criminal; police; force; security; integration*

Introduction

International Criminal Police organization is intergovernmental organization that facilitates cooperation between the criminal police forces of 190 countries. Interpol aims to promote the widest-possible mutual assistance between criminal police forces and to establish and develop institutions likely to contribute to the prevention and suppression of international crime. Headquartered in Lyon, France, it is the only police organization that spans the entire globe.

Interpol traces its history to 1914, when a congress of international criminal police, attended by delegates from 14 countries, was held in Monaco. In 1923, following a significant increase in international crime that particularly affected Austria, representatives of the criminal police forces of 20 countries met in Vienna and formed the International Criminal Police Commission (ICPC) that year. The ICPC's headquarters were established in Vienna, and the head of the Vienna

police, Johann Schober, became the organization's first president. The ICPC flourished until 1938, when Nazi Germany annexed Austria; the ICPC's records were subsequently relocated to Berlin. The outbreak of World War II effectively ended the ICPC's activities. After the war the ICPC accepted an offer from the French government of a headquarters in Paris together with a staff for the General Secretariat consisting of French police officials. The ICPC was thus revived, though the loss or destruction of all its prewar records required that it be completely reorganized. In 1949 the ICPC was granted consultative status by the United Nations. From 1946 to 1955 its membership grew from 19 countries to 55. In 1956 the ICPC ratified a new constitution, under which it was renamed the International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol). The organization moved to its present headquarters in Lyon in 1989 (Crank, 1994).

Interpol was initially a European organization, drawing only limited support from the United States and other non-European countries (the United States did not join the ICPC until 1938). Under the leadership of French Secretary General

Jean Népoté (1963–78), Interpol became increasingly effective. By the mid-1980s the number of member countries had risen to 190, representing the entire world's inhabited continents.

In the 1970s the organization's ability to combat terrorism was impeded by Article 3 of its constitution—which forbids “intervention or activities of a political, military, religious or racial character”—and by a 1951 resolution of the General Assembly that defined a “political” crime as that whose circumstances and underlying motives are political, even if the act itself is illegal under criminal law. One source of these obstacles was removed in 1984, when the General Assembly revised the interpretation of Article 3 to permit Interpol to undertake antiterrorist activities in certain well-defined circumstances (Crank, 2003).

Interpol was reorganized in 2001 following the September 11 attacks on the United States. The new post of executive director for police services was created to oversee several directorates, including those for regional and national police services, specialized crimes, and operational police support. Its membership of 190 countries provides finance of around US\$59 million through annual contributions (Crank and Rehm 1994) (By comparison, Europol receives \$90 million annually). The organization's headquarters are in Lyon, France. In order to maintain as politically neutral a role as possible, Interpol's constitution forbids its involvement in crimes that do not overlap several member countries, or in any political, military, religious, or racial crimes. Its work focuses primarily on public safety, terrorism, organized crime, war crimes, illicit drug production, drug trafficking, weapons smuggling, human trafficking, money laundering, child pornography, white-collar crime, computer crime, intellectual property crime and corruption. In 2005, the Interpol General Secretariat employed a staff of 502, representing 78 member countries. Women comprised 42 percent of the staff. The Interpol public website received an average of 2.2 million page visits every month. Interpol's red notices that year led to the arrests of 3,500 people (Crank and Langworthy, 1992).

Operation

Each member country maintains a National Central Bureau (NCB) staffed by national law enforcement officers. The NCB is the designated contact point for the Interpol General Secretariat, regional bureaus and other member countries requiring assistance with overseas investigations and the location and apprehension of fugitives. This is especially important in countries which have many law-enforcement agencies: this central bureau is a unique point of contact for foreign entities, which may not understand the complexity of the law-enforcement system of the country they attempt to contact. For instance, the NCB for the United States of America is housed at the United States Department of Justice (DOJ). The NCB will then ensure the proper transmission of information to the correct agency. And the NCB for the federal Republic of Nigeria is housed at the Force C.I.D. headquarters in Abuja. Interpol maintains a large database charting unsolved crimes and both convicted and alleged criminals. At any time, a member nation has access to specific sections of the database and its police forces are encouraged to check information held by Interpol whenever a major crime is committed. The rationale behind this is that drug traffickers and similar criminals have international ties, and so it is likely that crimes will extend beyond political boundaries (Crank and Rehm, 1994).

In 2002, Interpol began maintaining a database of lost and stolen identification and travel documents, allowing member countries to be alerted to the true nature of such documents when presented. Passport fraud, for example, is often performed by altering a stolen passport; in response, several member countries have worked to make online queries into the stolen document database part of their standard operating procedure in border control departments. As of early 2006, the database contained over ten million identification items reported lost or stolen, and is expected to grow more as more countries join the list of those reporting into the database (Crank and Rehm 1994).

A member nation's police force can contact one or more member nations by sending a message relayed through Interpol offices.

Member States and Sub-bureaus

Sub-bureaus shown in *italics*(Crank and Langworthy, 1996):

Afghanistan	Cyprus	Latvia	Russia
Albania	Czech Republic	Lebanon	Rwanda
Algeria	Denmark	Lesotho	St. Kitts and Nevis
<i>American Samoa</i>	Djibouti	Liberia	St. Lucia
Andorra	Dominican Republic	Libya	St. Vincent and the Grenadines
Angola	East Timor	Liechtenstein	São Tomé and Príncipe
<i>Anguilla</i>	Ecuador	Lithuania	Saudi Arabia
Antigua and Barbuda	Egypt	Luxembourg	San Marino
Argentina	El Salvador	<i>Macau</i>	Senegal
Armenia	Guinea	Madagascar	Serbia
Aruba	Eritrea	Malawi	Seychelles
Australia	Estonia	Malaysia	Sierra Leone
Austria	Ethiopia	Maldives	Singapore
Azerbaijan	Fiji	Mali	Slovakia
Bahamas	Finland	Malta	Slovenia
Bahrain	FYR Macedonia	Marshall Islands	Somalia
Bangladesh	France	Mauritania	South Africa
Barbados	Gabon	Mauritius	Spain
Belarus	Gambia	Mexico	Sri Lanka
Belgium	Georgia	Moldova	Sudan
Belize	Germany	Monaco	Suriname
Benin	Ghana	Mongolia	Swaziland
<i>Bermuda</i>	<i>Gibraltar</i>	Montenegro	Sweden
Bhutan	Greece	<i>Montserrat</i>	Switzerland
Bolivia	Grenada	Morocco	Syria
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Guatemala	Mozambique	Tajikistan
Botswana	Guinea	Myanmar	Tanzania
Brazil	Guinea-Bissau	Namibia	Thailand
<i>British Virgin Islands</i>	Guyana	Nauru	Togo
Brunei	Haiti	Nepal	Tonga
Bulgaria	Honduras	Netherlands	Trinidad and Tobago
Burkina Faso	<i>Hong Kong</i>	Nicaragua	Tunisia
Burundi	Hungary	Niger	Turkey
Cambodia	Iceland	Nigeria	<i>Turks and Caicos</i>
Cameroon	India	Norway	Turkmenistan
Canada	Indonesia	Oman	Uganda
Cape Verde	Iran	Pakistan	Ukraine
<i>Cayman Islands</i>	Iraq	Panama	United Arab Emirates
Central African Republic	Ireland	Papua New Guinea	United Kingdom
Chad	Israel	Paraguay	United States
Chile	Italy	Peru	Uruguay
People's Republic of China	Jamaica	Philippines	Uzbekistan
Colombia	Japan	Poland	Venezuela
Comoros	Jordan	Portugal	Vietnam
Republic of the Congo	Kazakhstan	<i>Puerto Rico</i>	Yemen
Congo (Democratic Rep.)	Kenya	Qatar	Zambia
Costa Rica	Republic of Korea	Romania	Zimbabwe
Côte d'Ivoire	Kuwait		
Croatia	Kyrgyzstan		
	Laos		

Non-member countries

Samoa
Solomon Islands
Kiribati
Vanuatu
Vatican City

Palau

Federated States of Micronesia Tuvalu
North Korea

Theoretical Framework

One of the important developments in police theory and research is the recognition of the institutional contexts in which departments participate. A body of theory, organized under the rubric of the “theory of institutionalized organizations”, provides a theoretical framework for the conceptualization and empirical assessment of policing contexts and their relationship to police organizational structures and practices. This work is viewed from the point of inter-governmentalist and institutional theory or better still from the neo-functional view point. Research on the police has traditionally been normative. This means that it has been oriented toward what might be called “best procedures”, seeking programs, strategies and tactics that produce the best possible crime prevention or suppression results. It had been believed that, through the scientific study of police work, predictable ways of dealing with recurring problems could be identified. The limitations of the normative perspective began to be recognized in the late 1980s. Langworthy (1986) argues that the search for effective structures or “best practices” failed to account for the mediating effects of context.

What might work well for some agencies, he noted, might not work for others at all. When developing local organizational policy, agencies should not assume that general principles of law enforcement will work for them. They should take into consideration a wide range of factors having to do with the community setting. His work has been described as the bridge between traditional normative perspective on police organizations and the new institutionalism (Katz, 2001). Institutional theory was first used by police theorists and researchers in the 1990s. Crank and Langworthy (1992) argue that reform failure among the police often failed because reformers failed to account for the constraining or enabling effects of the institutional environment on police organizations. They stated that:

A police department participates with other powerful actors, called sovereigns, in its institutional environment, and it receives legitimacy from these sovereigns. Sovereigns are those actors whose views are significant, that is, they are entities that have the capacity to affect the fundamental well-being of the organization (Crank and Langworthy, 1992:342).

Departments select particular goals, strategies and tactics because they helped maintain legitimacy with influential groups and constituencies. To “look and act” like police departments, they engaged in “myth-building” processes. Myths were defined as “widespread understandings of social reality”. These understandings have the ring of “truth” to them. They are advanced by police departments in a “dramaturgy of exchange” through which police departments ceremonially demonstrate their moral legitimacy qua police. In 1994, Crank used an institutional perspective to describe the community policing movement. The Kerner and Crime Commission reports in the 1960s, both highly critical of “professional” police practices, de-legitimized the police professionalism movement. The professionalism movement was grounded in the legitimating “myths” of autonomy from municipal life and “aloof” professionalism in the fight against crime. The 1960s, characterized by sharp increases in crime, the Vietnam and civil rights protests (and television images of police brutality), resulted in widespread perceptions that the police were either ineffectual or actually contributed to these problems.

Results and Discussion

Interpol occupies an odd position in the cultural consciousness. On the one hand, the organization has inspired countless airport novels, boys’ own magazines and B-movies. Whenever it appears in the news – whether investigating the use of stolen passports on the missing flight MH370 or tracking down drug barons in Spain – it evokes certain

glamour. On the other hand, most people have only a general idea of what Interpol actually does. We know it is an international crime fighting outfit, operating above national borders. But how does it work? Is it really as secretive as it appears? What are the legal checks and balances to which it is subjected? And should we be concerned about allegations that it has become the lapdog of authoritarian regimes?

The concept of an international policing organization was floated in April 1914, at the First International Congress of Judicial Police in Monaco. At the time, the pre-eminent French criminologist Henri Donnedieu de Vabres wrote that criminals were increasingly able to evade capture by simply leaving the country. The problem was worsening, due to “the progress of automobilism, even aviation”. A global solution was needed: “The internationalism of crime should be opposed by the internationalism of repression” (Crank, 1994).

The First World War forced the idea to be put on hold. But in 1923, at the Second Judicial Police Congress, the International Criminal Police Commission (ICPC) – a forerunner of Interpol – was set up in Vienna. According to its founding statutes, it operated “to the strict exclusion of all matters having a political, religious or racial character”. It had no legal authority over member states, and existed merely to collect and catalogue intelligence, and coordinate communication between different international police forces. To this day, Interpol adheres to these principles. Contrary to popular perception, the organization does not have its own prisons or carry out arrests. Instead it acts behind the scenes, collating masses of intelligence and coordinating police efforts internationally. It also refuses to get involved in cases of a political nature (such as that of Julian Assange). Perhaps this explains its mystique. Its work goes unnoticed, eclipsed by the national police forces that make the arrests and headlines; Interpol rarely receives more than a line or two in news reports. The organization is a ghostly presence, informing operations on the ground but never getting its hands dirty.

Despite Interpol’s unimpeachable reputation, it has had its fair share of darker moments. Foremost of these began in 1938, when the Nazis invaded Austria and the agency fell under Hitler’s control. Its HQ was moved to Wannsee, a suburb of Berlin, where it shared a villa with the Gestapo. Various high-ranking SS officers led the

organization, including Reinhard Heydrich, one of the most ruthless men of the Third Reich and an architect of the Final Solution. After the War, the agency was renamed Interpol – the International Criminal Police Organization – and moved to a suburb of Paris. But the Nazi association continued to cast a long shadow. In 1963, Jean Napote, who had collaborated with France’s Vichy government, was elected Secretary General; in 1968, Paul Dickopf, who had served under Heydrich as an SS officer during the war, was elected President. These controversial appointments did little to quell concerns that Interpol was not tracking down Nazi war criminals. When Raymond Kendall, a bluff Englishman from Scotland Yard, took over in 1985, he tried to compensate; one of the first things he did was to issue a wanted notice for Josef Mengele, the notorious Auschwitz doctor nicknamed “the angel of death”. But he was too late. Mengele had drowned in a Brazilian swimming pool six years earlier (Crank and Rehm 1994).

Noble, who was born in New Jersey in 1956 and brought up a strict Catholic, is something of a legend in the secretive annals of Interpol’s history. A lawyer by training, he was first awarded the top job in 2000, becoming Interpol’s first non-European and non-Caucasian Secretary General (his mother was German, and his father African-American; they met in Germany, where his father was serving after the War). Noble has been elected for three consecutive five-year terms. Often, he has courted controversy; after the terror attacks at the Westgate Mall in Kenya, for instance, he suggested that gun laws could be relaxed, as “an armed citizenry [might be] more necessary now than it was in the past with an evolving threat of terrorism”. Yet under his leadership, Interpol has gone from a creaking, outmoded outfit to an ultra-efficient law enforcement agency.

When he first took up the post, Interpol had long been dominated by the French. And it was ailing. In 1999, Noble told the LA Times that Interpol was functioning on a nine-to-five, five-days-a-week basis, meaning that if a request for an international arrest alert came in on a Friday, it would not be looked at until the following week. For a global law enforcement agency, this was almost comical. It may have sufficed for the French civil service on which Interpol was modeled, Noble conceded, but “more intensity is required now”. The Secretary General was also

keen to upgrade the agency's appalling equipment. "At Interpol headquarters," he said, "if we don't fund it to the point that every Interpol employee has a laptop or a computer terminal and is trained and equipped to use it, then we've got to say we can't accept that." When Noble took over, wanted notices were being assessed and translated by hand, before being sent by airmail (Crank and Rehm 1994).

Noble's reforms were scheduled to be introduced on 17 September 2001. Then, came 9/11. And they were rolled out immediately. "In a way, we've been helped by one of the most tragic events imaginable," he reflects. Fast-forward 15 years and the difference is obvious. One of the agency's principal functions is to issue "red notices", or wanted notices, against fugitives around the world. At the touch of a button, these are sent to 190 police forces in all corners of the earth, which are instantly placed on the alert for the wanted person (Only a handful of countries, such as Samoa, Palau, the Federated States of Micronesia and North Korea are not members of Interpol).

Currently, Interpol is putting the finishing touches to the Global Complex for Innovation, a state-of-the-art new facility in Singapore that has opened its doors last year. This will enhance the organization's presence in Asia, and put it one step ahead in the fight against technological crime. But it is a new Secretary General who is the custodian of this new era. Whether the new boss will take a less hardline view than his predecessor on the collateral damage of the red notice system is impossible to predict. Either way, Ronald Noble has handed on an organization that is immeasurably more effective than the one he inherited. And despite the controversy, the world is a safer place for it (Crank, 1994).

General Assembly

INTERPOL's supreme governing body, the General Assembly is composed of delegates appointed by each member country. It meets annually to take all important decisions related to policy, resources, working methods, finances, activities and programmes.

Executive Committee

Elected by the General Assembly, the Executive Committee is headed by the President of the Organization. It provides guidance and direction to the Organization and oversees the implementation of decisions made at the annual General Assembly.

Implementation

Day-to-day implementation of the Organization's strategic decisions is carried out by the General Secretariat and National Central Bureaus.

General Secretariat

Located in Lyon, France, the General Secretariat operates 24 hours a day, 365 days a year and is run by the Secretary General. The Secretariat has seven regional offices across the world along with Special Representatives at the United Nations in New York and at the European Union in Brussels.

National Central Bureaus (NCBs)

Each INTERPOL member country maintains a National Central Bureau linking national police with our global network. Staffed by highly trained national law enforcement officers, NCBs are the lifeblood of INTERPOL, contributing to our criminal databases and cooperating together on cross-border investigations, operations and arrests.

Oversight

Advisers – these are experts in a purely advisory capacity, who may be appointed by the Executive Committee and confirmed by the General Assembly. Commission for the Control of INTERPOL's Files (CCF) – The CCF ensures that the processing

INTERPOL's Core Functions

In order to carry out its mandate, INTERPOL provides its member countries and designated partner organizations four core functions or services (Crank, and Langworthy, 1992):

1. Secure global police communications services INTERPOL recently designed and implemented a state-of-the-art global communications system for the law enforcement community which is called "I-24/7". This new communication tool – to which all member countries are already connected – allows for the transmission of information about suspected individuals and crimes to INTERPOL's member countries requiring assistance with ongoing international investigations in a secure manner within real time.
2. Global databases and data services once police have the capability to communicate internationally, they need access to information which can assist investigations or help prevent crime. INTERPOL has therefore

developed and maintains a range of global databases and data services, covering key information such as names, fingerprints, photographs, DNA profiles of individuals under investigation or wanted for arrest as well as data concerning Stolen and Lost Identification and Travel Documents (SLTD), stolen vehicles, stolen works of art and illicit weapons related to criminal cases.

3. **Operational police support services** INTERPOL provides specific crime – related support through its third core function, the provision of operational police support services. INTERPOL has six priority crime areas: drugs and organized crime, financial and high-tech crime, fugitives, public safety and terrorism, trafficking in human beings (including crimes against children), and corruption. Other crime areas of concern include, inter alia, environmental and intellectual property crime. INTERPOL convenes theme-oriented specialized working groups which bring together experts from around the world to share expertise and develop and promote best practice in investigation techniques. INTERPOL also conducts thematic criminal analysis in order to, inter alia, detect new crime trends, trace criminal networks, determine modus operandi, and identify perpetrators. In addition to specific crime area support, INTERPOL operates a Command and Coordination Centre (“CCC”) 24 hours a day/7 days a week, linking the General Secretariat, regional offices and all NCBs for urgent police-related matter or emergency. The CCC co-ordinates the exchange of information between member countries requesting assistance with international investigations. The CCC also assumes a crisis-management role during serious incidents and serves as the first point of contact for any member country which might require assistance with a crisis situation. In addition, upon request of a member country, INTERPOL can deploy Incidence Response Team (IRT) which has the capacity to provide a range of investigative and analytical support to the local law enforcement authorities at the scene of the incident.
4. **Training and Development** INTERPOL enhances the capacity of member countries to

effectively combat serious transnational crime and terrorism, through the provision of (a) focused police training initiatives and of (b) on-demand advice, guidance and support in building dedicated crime-fighting components with national police forces. The latter includes the sharing of knowledge, skills and best practices in policing through INTERPOL channels and the establishment of global standards on how to combat specific forms of crimes.

The Five Most Interesting, Famous and Violent Cases the Agency has dealt with in Recent Times.

1. Charles Sobhraj

During the 1970s Charles Sobhraj - known as 'The Serpent' - stalked and killed at least 12 westerners in Southeast Asia. He stole the identities of his victims and used these to elude law enforcement agencies. Interpol finally put a stop to his killing in 1976.

2. Albert Walker

Canadian fraudster Albert Walker stole millions from his clients and colleagues during the 1980s then fled to the UK with his daughter Sheena who assumed the role of his wife. Wanted by Canadian authorities he became number two on Interpol's most wanted list, and when he murdered a business associate on a fishing trip in 1996 after assuming his identity, he was finally apprehended.

3. Craig Pritchert and Nova Guthrie

A modern-day Bonnie and Clyde, Pritchert and Guthrie robbed a number of banks across western America during the 1990s. In total they stole more than £312,000 and lived it up on the proceeds, enjoying holidays in Colorado and Belize. They were apprehended in Cape Town in 2003 after a member of the public recognized them from an episode of America's Most Wanted.

4. Ira Einhorn

After brutally murdering his girlfriend in Philadelphia in 1978, Einhorn is charged by the police but skips bail and flees the country for Europe. 20 years later in 1997 Interpol finally track him down in the

small French village of Champagne-Mouton where he is arrested by French police.

5. Jonathan Tokeley-Parry

British smuggler Jonathan Tokeley-Parry is responsible for illegally moving more than 3,000 pieces of Egyptian antiquities out of Egypt by disguising them as reproductions. Together with Scotland Yard and the Egyptian Antiquities Police, Interpol tracked down Tokeley-Parry and brought him to justice. He was sentenced in 1997 to six years imprisonment.

Five Most Interpol's Wanted Fugitives

Some of the world's most wanted fugitives are(Crank and Rehm 1994):

1. Rafael CARO-QUINTERO – Wanted Since 1985

Caro-Quintero, who has been wanted for, incredibly, almost thirty years, would now be 62-years-old. He is one of the founders of Mexico's formidable Guadalajara Cartel, responsible for the cultivation and distribution of more than 10,000 tonnes of marijuana, equivalent to 2,204,620,000 (or 2.2 billion) lbs. He has many aliases, including: "El Grenas," "El Charral," "El Jefe," "Rafa," "Rafaelillo," "Rafael," "Don Rafa," "Doctor," and "Licenciado Rios." In 1985 Caro-Quintero and others murdered two US citizens thought to be Drug Enforcement Agents, and later the same year kidnapped and murdered a known DEA agent and a pilot. Described as having pock-marked skin, Caro-Quintero is 6' tall with a medium build and brown eyes

2. Emil DAN SIRBU – Wanted Since 2006

Born on August 19th, 1967 in Timisoara, Romania, Emil Dan Sirbu was sentenced to 13 years in prison for belonging to a criminal organization which was involved in trafficking cocaine from South America to Romania. He has brown hair and brown eyes, and is thought to be in the Americas, like many of the criminals on this list. He's at large, and still hasn't served out his sentence.

3. Patrik SNAJDR – Wanted Since September 2007

This 5'7" Slovakian is 32-years-old and has brown eyes, and is wanted for charges of organized crime, extortion and gross coercion. It is believed that Snajdr was a member of the 'Strvtaci' criminal organization, which operated in the Bratislava and Trnava districts of Slovakia until September 2007. Snajdr is thought to have been a member of the group, which was involved in intimidation, extortion and fraud using coercion, between August 2005 and September 2007. He, too, is thought to be in the Americas, and likely armed and dangerous like his compatriots on this list

4. Clemente de Jesús CASTELLANOS RIVAS – Wanted Since 2009

34-year-old Salvadoran Clemente de JesúsCastellanos Rivas is slim with brown hair and dark brown eyes, and has a "MS 13" gang tattoo on his forehead. He is wanted for "injury causing death, homicide or murder" after firing several shots, on December 18th, 2009, at a vehicle in which police investigators were traveling. This occurred in San José del Pino, Santa Tecla, El Salvador. One investigator was killed. Castellanos Rivas also goes by the name El Trece Clemente, and may be armed and dangerous.

5 Miguel MATUS – Wanted Since 2010

This triple-murderer from the Dominican Republic was born on June 9th, 1977. In 2011 in the Santo Domingo Province of the Dominican Republic, DicientPolanco shot and killed three men and has been wanted ever since. He is considered violent and is likely armed and dangerous. His height is unknown, but he has a medium build, black hair, and eyes which are dark in color.

Conclusion

The research work attempts to give a bird eye view of the International Criminal police organization since inception in an historical context. The research examines the theoretical framework of the ICPO which is tied to that of intergovernmental theory. With a systematic analysis of a study conducted on the past, present and the future of the organization byJake Wallis Simons in 2013. The findings however, address

the organizational structure of INTERPOL, its mandate, core functions with some famous cases the organization has handled and the names of some most wanted on the INTERPOL list.

Interpol has an annual budget of around €78 million, most of which is provided through annual contributions by its membership of 190 countries (as of 2015). The organization's headquarters is in Lyon, France. It is the second largest political organization after the United Nations in terms of international representation. In 2013, the Interpol General Secretariat employed a staff of 756, representing 100 member countries. To keep Interpol as politically neutral as possible, its charter forbids it, at least in theory, from undertaking interventions or activities of a political, military, religious, or racial nature or involving itself in disputes over such matters. Its work focuses primarily on public safety and battling terrorism, crimes against humanity, environmental crime, genocide, war crimes, organized crime, piracy, illicit traffic in works of art, illicit drug production, drug trafficking, weapons smuggling, human trafficking, money laundering, child pornography, white-collar crime, computer crime, intellectual property crime and corruption.

Recommendations

1. The world as it is today, Member Countries, especially from third world nations should relinquish the opinion that Information Communication Technology (ICT) is meant for the privilege few and embrace the fact that ICT is a tool in the fight against all forms of crime.

2. For the work of INTERPOL to be effective and efficient member Countries should be willing to update the Interpol databases and at the same time be able to check against the Interpol criminal data bases regularly, this will enable them to be able to arrest dangerous criminals on the run.

3. Statutory contribution of Interpol members should be considered very important if the organization should live to the expectation of its Members, considering the fact that Interpol is a nonprofit making organization, it relies square on the annual statutory contribution from her members and donations from well-wishers.

References

1. Crank, J. (1994): "Watchman and community: myth and institutionalization in policing", *Law and Society Review*, Vol. 28, pp. 325-51.
2. Crank, J. (2003): *Understanding Police Culture*, 2nd ed., Anderson Publishing, Cincinnati, OH.
3. Crank, J. and Langworthy, R. (1992): "An institutional perspective of policing", *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, Vol. 83, pp. 338-63.
4. Crank, J. and Langworthy, R. (1996): "Fragmented centralization and the organization of the police", *Policing and Society*, Vol. 6, pp. 213-29.
5. Crank, J. and Rehm, L. (1994): "Reciprocity between organizations and institutional Encyclopedia, Environments: a study of Operation Valkyrie", *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol. 22 No. 5, pp. 393-406.