

# The Shifting Boundaries of Policing: Globalisation and its possibilities

Professor Philip Stenning

School of Criminology and Criminal Justice  
Griffith University



# HISTORY OF POLICING A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

		<u>AUSPICES</u> (who determines order?)	
		<u>Private</u>	<u>Public</u>
<u>IMPLEMENTATION</u> (who maintains/ enforces order?)	<u>Private</u>	1	2
	<u>Public</u>	3	4

# PLURAL POLICING PROVISION A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

		<u>AUSPICES</u> (who determines order?)	
		<u>Non-state</u>	<u>State</u>
<u>IMPLEMENTATION</u> (who maintains/ enforces order?)	<u>Non-state</u>	1	2
	<u>State</u>	3	4

# So what is 'policing'?

“For our purposes ‘policing’ is defined as intentional action involving the conscious exercise of power or authority (by an individual or organisation) that is directed towards rule enforcement, the promotion of order or assurances of safety.”

Crawford *et al.*, 2005: 4

# Advantages of Crawford *et al.* definition

- Neither the state nor the public police are specifically mentioned in it
- None of the words 'crime', 'law' or 'criminal justice' appear in it
- The definition doesn't suggest that policing is necessarily something that is only undertaken within a specified geographical territory
- It refers to 'power' as well as 'authority' as a basis for policing
- It notes that policing does not necessarily have to be done by an 'individual'
- Despite these previous 5 features, the definition easily covers what the public police do.

# Alternative (plural) policing provision

- Within/by the state
- “Above” the state (transnational & international policing)
- “Below” the state (citizen and “community” policing)
- Outside or beyond the state (“private policing”)

# Pluralisation of policing within and by the state

## - Australian examples

Australian Customs and Border Protection Service

Queensland Crime and Misconduct Commission

Victoria's Independent Broad-Based Anti-Corruption Commission

Australian Crime Commission

NSW's Independent Commission Against Corruption

WA's Corruption and Crime Commission

Contracting out public policing services (e.g. detention centres run by private security firms)

etc. etc.

# Dual G4S and Lincolnshire Police logos on uniforms

BBC News online, 20 April 2012. Last updated at 13:17

A uniform combining the name of a police force with a private company logo is being worn for what is thought to be the first time



# Pluralisation “above” the state

(international & transnational policing examples)

- Interpol
- Europol
- FINTRAC
- UNPOL (formerly CIVPOL)
- Multi-national peace-keeping forces
- International Criminal Court investigators
- etc. etc.

- see e.g. Bowling, B & J. Sheptycki *Global Policing* (2012)

# Pluralisation “below” the state (citizen & “community” policing examples)

- Special Constabulary
- Stadswachten (Netherlands)
- Neighbourhood Watch
- Citizen Patrols
- Taxis on Patrol
- “Ambassador” programmes
- Etc., etc.

# Pluralisation outside (or beyond) the state (“private policing”)

- The contract security industry
- The in-house security sector

# Some private security and policing services

- Static & mobile guard & patrol
- Investigation services
- Access control
- Security consulting
- Crowd control
- Secure cash-carrying
- Personal protection
- Alarm systems and response
- Other security hardware and equipment
- Etc., etc.

# Some key features of private policing

- “Order” is often privately defined
- Not necessarily focused on crime and law enforcement
- More hardware/technology-intensive and less labour-intensive
- Policing is often “embedded”



# Spitting is unacceptable.

Bus Operators are now equipped with DNA Kits to assist with the apprehension of offenders.

# Three explanations for modern growth of private policing

- Filled gaps in public provision
- Growth of “mass private property” and other kinds of “communal property”
- Neo-liberal governance, New Public Management and contracting out

# Some potential benefits of pluralisation of policing

- Increased cost-effectiveness & efficiency
- Wider participation in policing policy etc. determination
- Policing priorities & approaches more easily tailored to local and special needs
- Increased opportunities for experimentation
- Financial costs more likely to be borne by beneficiaries

# Some potential problems arising from pluralisation of policing

- Inequitable access to effective policing
- Public interest may be subordinated to private interests
- Difficult to effectively regulate
- Risk of exploitation
- Challenge to sovereignty, national (domestic) values etc.

# Some new horizons and challenges

- Cyberspace
- Climate change
- New conceptions of ‘human security’
- Human migration

# Some further reading

Bayley, D. & C. Shearing (1996) “The Future of Policing” *Law and Society Review* 30(3): 585-606.

Bowling, B & J. Sheptycki (2012) *Global Policing* (Los Angeles/London: Sage Publications)

Brodeur, J-P (2010) *The Policing Web* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Canada, Law Commission (2006) *In Search of Security: The Future of Policing in Canada* (Report to Parliament) - especially Chapters 1-3, 6 & 7 - accessible at <http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Collection/JL2-26-2006E.pdf>

Crawford, A., S. Lister, S. Blackburn & J. Burnett (2005) *Plural Policing: The mixed economy of visible patrols in England and Wales* (Bristol: Policy Press)

Hoogenboom, R. (1991) “Grey policing: a theoretical framework” *Policing and Society* 2(1): 17-30.

# Further reading - 2

Johnston, L. (1992) *The Rebirth of Private Policing* (London/New York: Routledge)

Johnston, L. & C. Shearing (2003) *Governing Security: Explorations in Policing and Justice* (London/New York: Routledge)

Johnston, L. & P. Stenning (2010) “Challenges of governance and accountability for transnational private policing” - in Lemieux, F. (ed.) *International Police Co-operation: Emerging issues, theory and practice* (Collumpton, U.K.: Willan Publishing), Ch. 15 (pp. 281-297).

Jones, T. & T. Newburn (eds.) (2006) *Plural Policing: A Comparative Perspective* (London/New York: Routledge)

Kempa, M., P. Stenning & J. Wood (2004) “Policing communal spaces: a reconfiguration of the Mass Private Property hypothesis” *British Journal of Criminology* 44(4): 562-581.

Maitland, F. (1885) *Justice and Police* (London: MacMillan)

Millie, M & V. Herrington (2006) “Applying Reassurance Policing: Is it “Business as Usual”?” *Policing & Society* 16(2): 146-163 - accessible at:  
[http://pdfserve.informaworld.com/428468\\_731193511\\_745996066.pdf](http://pdfserve.informaworld.com/428468_731193511_745996066.pdf)

# Further reading - 3

Rigakos, G. (2002) *The New Parapolice: Risk Markets and Commodified Social Control* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press)

Shearing, C. & P. Stenning (1983) "Private Security: Implications for Social Control" *Social Problems* 30(5): 493-506 .

Stenning, P. (2009) "Governance and Accountability in a Plural Policing Environment - The Story So Far" - *Policing - A Journal of Policy and Practice* 3(1): 22-33.

Stenning, P. & C. Shearing (2012) "The Shifting Boundaries of Policing: Globalisation and its possibilities" - in Newburn T. & J. Peay (eds.) *Policing: Politics, Culture and Control* (Oxford: Hart Publishing), pp. 265-284

Zedner, L. (2007) "Pre-crime and post-criminology?" *Theoretical Criminology* 11(2): 261-281 .

## Some questions for discussion

1. What strategies and policies should the public police adopt to maximise the benefits of collaboration in a pluralised policing environment?
2. What risks might be involved for public police in collaborating with non-state policing providers? How might the public police best manage these risks?

## Questions for discussion (cont'd)

3. What challenges does the pluralisation of policing pose for effective and acceptable governance of, and public accountability for, policing? How might these challenges best be met?
4. How can we best ensure equitable access to safety and security in a plural policing environment?