

Bringing the police back in  
Notes on the lost & found character of the police in police  
studies

### **Wat doet de SMVP?**

Een goed functionerende veiligheidszorg is van groot belang voor iedereen. Ontwikkelingen in de samenleving vereisen een voortdurende bezinning door alle betrokken partijen. Nieuwe ideeën op dit gebied verdienen steun en stimulans. Om tot optimale communicatie te komen tussen allen die het aangaat is een aanjager nodig.

De Stichting Maatschappij, Veiligheid en Politie (SMVP) wil die rol op zich nemen. De missie van de stichting is bij te dragen aan de maatschappelijke discussie over de verbetering van de veiligheid(szorg) in de breedste zin. Zij doet dit onder meer door meningen te formuleren over belangrijke thema's, door partijen bijeen te brengen, door vernieuwing te stimuleren, door conferenties, symposia en uitwisselingsprogramma's te organiseren en door achtergrondinformatie te verstrekken.

ISBN nummer: **978-90-72652-44-7**

# Bringing the police back in

Notes on the lost & found character of the police in police studies

Rede

uitgesproken bij de aanvaarding van het ambt van  
hoogleraar Politiestudies en Veiligheidsvraagstukken  
vanwege de Stichting Maatschappij, Veiligheid en Politie (SMVP)  
aan de Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam op  
donderdag 3 december 2009

door

prof. dr. A.B. Hoogenboom

‘I’m not afraid of a strong police, I’m afraid of a weak  
democracy’

Paul Ponsaers, Ghent University

## Introduction

Mijnheer de Rector Magnificus,

Ladies and gentlemen,

Narratives - or storytelling - are essential elements of our history and culture. In his *Origins of Stories*, Boyd (2009) argues that narratives are a specifically human adaptation. They offer tangible advantages for human survival, and are derived from playing, itself an adaption widespread among intelligent animals. More particularly, our fondness for storytelling has sharpened social cognition, encouraged cooperation, and fostered creativity. The need to hold an audience's attention, Boyd underscores, is the fundamental problem facing all storytellers. Today, I will do just that in trying to hold your attention.

This lecture is about politics, policing and the police, and it brings back in the political context of policing - and also how this relates to the craft of policing. I define the craft of policing in terms of the core tasks of the police: maintaining public order, enforcing the law, offering services to the public and securing the underlying quality of (criminal) intelligence - and finally executing these tasks in a timely and professional way. And by 'professional' I mean 'within the boundaries of the law', and thus proportionate. Still, the term 'professional' here is also about setting one's own moral standards and about being self-critical when it comes to assessing one's performance.

In the first part of my lecture I will define the political context of policing from which the core tasks of the police are derived. Next, I will give an overview of what these core tasks are.

In the second part of my lecture I shall argue how in the last 35 years both the political context and the craft of policing have gradually disappeared in police research. Layers and layers of academic knowledge

bringing in theories, concepts, definitions and ideas from different social sciences have been put on top of the craft of policing. Most of the research concerned here deals with organizational and managerial issues, or with descriptions of police processes. As a result, the political and theoretical context of policing, receiving less and less attention in research, is increasingly often ignored. I put forward six interrelated factors to explain why and how this happened.

In the third part of my lecture I will bring the police back into police research by arguing that the political context is changing. I will do this on two levels. On the first level I shall argue that order keeping and law enforcement, and the quality of intelligence needed to execute these tasks, is becoming more prominent in actual policing. The Dutch police system is slowly evolving from a service and consent model of policing towards a system in which order keeping, law enforcement and intelligence is being brought in. Yet, much of the police research still clings to the theories, models, concepts and ideologies of a police system oriented towards service to the public. This means other research questions have to be formulated. Which is what I will do.

On the second level, the strategically relevant question, both for the political system and the police, asks what - if at all - the function is of the police in today's network society in which a multitude of agencies and private actors are currently supplying safety and security. I will bring in recent research to fuel this discussion.

Finally, I shall thank some of the people who have been an inspiration for me, and thank others who have made it possible for me to lecture, to write, and to tell stories - and who have enabled me throughout my career to satisfy my curiosity and my interest in policing.

## 1. Politics, policing, police and the craft of policing

My story begins in 1982 when I took a political science course at the Erasmus University in Rotterdam. I was studying history at the time. The course focus was on nation and state building in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries. And, on a theoretical level, how power in society is exercised, challenged and preserved. Moreover, the course dealt with ways in which power can and must be held accountable in a democracy organized on the basis of the rule of law.

Nation building involves many things: the monopolization of physical violence in society; law making; the creation of a standing army for external security; a fiscal organization to finance the state, and finally the creation of the police for public order keeping, law enforcement and service to the public.

The course literature included two - now almost forgotten, and hardly ever quoted - PhD theses written by two Dutch police officers: Fijnaut (1979) en Van Reenen (1979). The first book was entitled *Opdat de Macht een Toevlucht zij. De Geschiedenis van de Politie als een Politieke Institutie (So that Power be the Last Resort. The History of the Police as a Political Institution)*. *Overheidsgeweld (Violence by the State)* was the title of Van Reenen's study. Both policemen/academics analyzed the dynamics between the political systems and policing in Western Europe (Fijnaut) and the Netherlands (Fijnaut en Van Reenen). Both stress the function of policing in terms of threats to national security, public order incidents and in general law and order incidents ranging from anarchist violent acts and labour strikes to the political emancipation of the labour movement. The nexus between politics and police is evident. It was during this course, reading these two eminent works, that my interest in policing was aroused, something which eventually brought me here today to tell you this story.

In *The Politics of the Police*, Reiner (2002) starts with a quotation from Max Weber:

*'He who lets himself in for politics, that is, for power and force as means, contracts with diabolical powers and for his action it is not true that good can follow only from good and evil only from evil, but that often the opposite is true. Anyone who fails to see this is, indeed, a political infant'.<sup>1</sup>*

The very group of words comprising **police**, **policy**, **politics**, **politic**, **political**, **politician** forms an indication of the delicate distinctions between politics and the police.<sup>2</sup> Reiner (2002, 2007) argues that the police are inherently and inescapably political. According to Skolnick (1967) 'the civil police is a social organization created and sustained by political processes to enforce dominant conceptions of public order'. For the Netherlands, Rosenthal (1999) analyzes the relationships between state and police.

The connection between politics and police is prominent in the history of the Dutch police system, as Fijnaut (2008) and many others have chronicled. The 'politie quastie' (police question) is a historical reality in the history of Dutch policing. There is - and always has been - a political struggle between local, regional and national levels of government, between the mayor and the public prosecutor, and between the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of the Interior. Throughout history, ever since the early 19<sup>th</sup> century up until this very day, the police system has been the result of political compromises between different political interests. Local government, the Mayor and the Ministry of the Interior favour a service-and-consent model of policing. The Public Prosecutor's Office and the Ministry of Justice favour a crime-fighting model. Both the police system itself and the priorities in policing are the result of political struggle between the different actors involved.

Every single policy issue today is political - from the strength of inter-regional investigative teams to their priorities, from the decision to use an observation and/or arrest team in some part of the Netherlands to the ongoing discussion on the possibilities to create one single information system for the country as a whole, just to name but a few examples. The 'Iron Police System', so aptly defined by Van Reenen (1987), is the outcome of constant political processes by which I mean the outcome of negotiations between the authorities involved. The police system and the primary police processes can be characterized as 'a negotiated order' (Hoogenboom, to be published in 2010).

<sup>1</sup> Max Weber, 'Politics as a Vocation', in: H. Gerth and C.W. Mills (eds), from Max Weber, London, Routledge, 1948, p. 123.

<sup>2</sup> Reiner, R., The Politics of the Police. London, Harvester Wheatsheaf, 2002.

## Politics and the police: the craft of policing

### *Public order*

Society has a fundamental and legitimate need for a '**recognizable, trustworthy and predictable social order**' (Tops, 2009). The specific role of the police is the enforcement of the law and maintenance of order because the police are '**specialists in coercion**'. The much quoted definition of the State by Max Weber emphasizes the monopoly of legitimate violence as its core characteristic. Policing is about the intractably nasty and messy business of order keeping, law enforcement and service to the public. The police are therefore an inevitable fact of modern life (Reiner, 2002). On the macro-level, order keeping is related to the political order and existing power relations as analyzed by Fijnaut (1979), Van Reenen (1979) and Reiner (2002).

In Western societies, order keeping on the micro-level also involves a large array of activities, varying from dealing with football hooliganism to clearing the highway and directing traffic after automobile accidents; from interventions in domestic incidents to 'clearing' a street or a square because of public aggression displayed during the weekend nightlife in major cities. In addition, the police are present at events involving large numbers of people, varying from sports events to cultural festivities, from Sail to Harbour days, and from Queen's Day festivities to the Antillian carnival celebrations.

The police are a mechanism for the distribution of **non-negotiable coercive force** (Bittner (1994/2003). This entails a constant 'difficult moral problem', because we live in a civilized society and condemn violence. Yet, even within civilized society, the existential function of the police is 'to make available a group of persons with a virtually unrestricted right to use violence and, when necessary, lethal means to bring certain types of situations under control' (Klockars, 1988). Also, the police can deprive people of their freedom and lives.

The '**irreconcilably offensive**' (Klockars, 1988) nature of policing refers to the monopoly of force that the police represents and at times exercises. The core capacity to use force, according to Reiner, underlies not only the diversity of problems in policing but also the means of policing. 'This does not mean that the police typically (or even often) use coercion or force to accomplish the resolution of the troubles they deal with. The craft of effective policing is to use the background possibility of legitimate coercion so skilfully that it never needs to be fore-grounded' (Reiner, 2002). Bayley (1994) calls this 'authoritative intervention'. It is not the actual use of violence but more over the ever present possibility to

do so. The police are about coercive power, but also about symbolic power (Loader, 1999).

The definition of policing, 'to make available a group of persons with a virtually unrestricted right to use violence and, when necessary, lethal means to bring certain types of situations under control', resonates with a wealth of theoretical and empirical research into the concept.

According to Ericson, real police work is not crime-related in the sense in which policing is represented and perceived in the media and the popular culture. This popular view 'has remarkable currency, given that the public police actually spend a tiny fraction of their time dealing with crime or something that could potentially be made into a crime' (Ericson, 1982).

The essence of public policing is '**reproducing order**', according to Ericson. Policing involves a wide range of non-repressive strategies dealing with a variety of behaviour. Certain types of situations must be brought under control: making the road safe for traffic after a car crash involving 14 automobiles, the security of Schiphol Airport or Heathrow Airport after a terrorist threat, or separating husband and wife after a call of domestic violence, to name but a few widely divergent examples.

Day-to-day policing is not about crime or services rendered to the public but far more about reproducing order in social interactions. Reproducing order in many instances is done by means of the threat of violence and/or the use of violence, with examples varying from attempts to end a pub brawl, arrests made by specialized SWAT teams or the use of military style order maintenance units during large-scale public events. Other illustrations include the 1984 Miners' Strike in the UK and, more recently, the large-scale deployment of riot police to police Seattle, Geneva, Genoa and Gothenburg during G7 summits.

Public policing on a local level essentially means a 24/7 task dealing with 'the asshole - creep, bigmouth, bastard, animal, mope, rough, jerk-off, clown, scumbag, wise guy, phoney, idiot, shithead, bum, fool or any of a number of anatomical, oral or incestuous terms - part of every policeman's world' (Van Maanen, 1978). The 'asshole' is policed by the threat of violence or removed (with legitimate violence or otherwise) from the location. Reproducing order has very little to do with the rhetoric of building community relations or crime fighting. Policing in this respect is not about talking with 'the public' but about interventions to restore order. The Dutch police warn the public in potentially riotous circumstances: 'Disperse yourselves, or violence will be used'.

Conventional wisdom equates police work with crime work: a myth perpetually reinforced by the police themselves, by moral entrepreneurs, politicians and some academics, and of course by the media and popular

culture images in movies, television series and novels (Reiner, 2002). A sound - comparative and cross-cultural - empirical basis exists for the primary non-crime related character of everyday policing.

Moreover, what is initially reported by the public as crime often turns out to be no criminal matter at all. In addition, most of the genuine crime the police are called upon to handle is minor. And crimes that the general public tend to associate policing with, such as homicide, aggravated assault, robbery and forcible rape, in fact form a mere fraction of policing reality. In 1990, violent crimes accounted for approximately 1 per cent of all reported crime in Australia; 9 per cent in Canada; 5 per cent in England and Wales, and 1 per cent in Japan. Policing is not about crime control but about restoring order and providing general assistance: **'the function of the police is to stop something that ought not to be happening and about which someone had better do something now'** (Bittner, 1970).

### **Dutch research**

Naeyé (2009), during his research into violence by and against the police for *Niet zonder slag of stoot* (*Not without a Fight*, Naeyé, 2005 pp. 492), became impressed by the large number of incidents police officers face when dealing with aggressive, deranged, disturbed, violent, suicidal, drunk, dangerous, spitting and HIV-infected people (with the combination of HIV infection and spitting at a cop now being treated as a serious assault charge in the USA). Furthermore, (massive) fights, domestic violence, disturbances and violence by football hooligans as well as the involvement of so-called 'innocent' bystanders showed Naeyé what actual policing is all about - not to mention today's excessive nightlife violence or criminals resisting arrest when caught in the act. The research material available, according to Naeyé, makes it clear just 'how difficult, bizarre and dangerous policing is, and also how unpredictable and varied' (Naeyé, 2005 pp. 492).

Earlier, Van Maanen described the craft of policing in a quote from a police officer: 'I guess what our job boils down to is not letting the assholes take over the city. Now I'm not talking about your regular crooks (...) they're bound to wind up in the joint anyway. What I'm talking about are those shitheads out to prove they can push everybody around. Those are the assholes we gotta deal with and take care of on patrol (...). You take the majority of what we do and it's nothing more than asshole control'. Punch (2009) wrote down a quote from a police official in Amsterdam's Warmoesstraat 'I'm only the zookeeper'.

Actual policing also figures in a number of recent research findings. Books and reports such as *Conflict op straat: strijden of mijden. Marokkaanse en Antilliaanse jongeren in interactie met de politie* (Kop en Euwema, 2007), *Kracht van meer dan geringe betekenis* (Drenth, Naeyé en Bleijendaal, 2008) and *Agressie en geweld tegen politiemensen. Beledigen, bedreigen, tegenwerken en vechten* (Naeyé en Bleijendaal, 2008) all show that policing is about public order keeping.

The findings by Naeyé and Van Maanen are in line with what we know through more than forty years of (inter)national police research in Western countries. What the police does 'is not about the delivery of an uncontentious service like any other (...) but is the inevitably messy and intractable one of regulating conflict (...). The police are thus inherently a 'dirty work' occupation' (Reiner, 2002).

The police are no social welfare organization. What the police does on a 24/7 basis - but especially when crisis structures are activated - 'is neither social service nor law enforcement, but order maintenance - the settlement of conflicts by means other than formal law enforcement' (Reiner, 2002). Or in Bittner's definition: 'a solution to an unknown problem arrived at by unknown means' (Bittner, 2005). The craft of policing is 'to transform troublesome, fragile situations into a 'normal' state whereby a form of order in society is preserved (Bayley, 1994; Waddington, 1999).

Conversations with civilians held by officers on the beat in a community policing context are an essential part of the craft of policing, but these conversations are just one of the activities that the police engage in. Conversations with civilians are only one facet of the kaleidoscopic reality of policing. Community meetings and the type of civilians who otherwise engage in conversations with the police are not the average civilians that Naeyé and Van Maanen write about and who make up the majority of police work.

The police differs from other public agencies, and for that matter from all the agencies and private organizations that are presently engaged in safety and security networks through '**the capacity for decisive action**' (Bittner, 1974). It is the police - and the police alone - who are trained, equipped, mandated and obliged by law 'to deal with every exigency in which force may have to be used' (Bittner, 1974).

#### *Law enforcement*

Law enforcement is the next biggest job in policing (Bayley, 1994). This function of the police concerns administrative control, traffic control and criminal investigations (Boek, 1999; Van de Bunt/Van Gemert, 1999). The criminal investigation process ranges from criminal complaints by

the public, the gathering of criminal intelligence, observation and identification of perpetrators, interrogations and for instance the use of forensic techniques for additional evidence.

Contrary to popular belief and all the media attention given to law enforcement (and criminal investigation), much crime is not actually solved through investigations, but by information given by the public. Also, the effect of criminal investigations on (organized) crime is rather diffusing and debated (Fijnaut et al., 1985). ‘Criminal investigation has been subject of enduring interest to the general public, and a considerable mythology has grown around it (Maguire, 2003).

#### *Service to the public*

As discussed earlier, much policing takes place on public demand, and in many cases the emergency calls are not crime related but made up of a broad pallet of (domestic) disturbances, incidents and accidents. Throughout the history of modern policing, service to the public has always been a part of policing strategies and actions. Next to responding to emergency calls, part of police strategies have always centered on availability and visibility in the local communities - from local stations to foot patrols and from giving lectures in schools to bike patrols. The community policing movement - which I will discuss later in greater detail - is deeply rooted in the service to the public function, as are more recent strategies such as reassurance and restorative policing (Van Calster and Gunther Moor, 2007). Part of the function here lies of course in the availability which enables the police to quickly respond to calls from the public, but also through close contact with the public knowledge of local communities.

According to Loader (1997) and Dupont (2006), the ‘symbolic capital’ function in all this is neglected. They argue it is not merely the capacity for decisive action, the criminal investigation nor the immediate reaction on calls from the public but the ‘continued cultural significance’ in which the real contribution to society lies. Next to the coercive power, the symbolic power of the police is important. As Loader states: ‘popular attachment to policing is principally *affective* in character, something which people evince a deep emotional commitment to and which is closely integrated with their sense of self. Policing, it seems, can provide an interpretative lens through which people make sense of, and give order to, their world: the sources of a set of plausible stories about the world which help people sustain ‘ontological security (Giddens, 1991)’. If this is valid, perhaps the strategy by the New York police to direct as many patrol cars as possible to the scene of an accident or a crime to ‘paint the

scene blue' has more effect on the public - and breeds more affect - than the combined reorganizations, introduction of new strategies and education of police officers combined.

### *Intelligence*

'The most important aspect of police work is in fact 'information work' (Nogala, 1995). Police are 'knowledge workers' (Ericson and Haggerty, 1997; Sheptycki, 1998) and information is the 'central input and basis for action in policing (Manning, 1992).

Order keeping, law enforcement and service to the public require solid, trustworthy - and above all timely - intelligence to execute these core tasks. For instance, contrary to myths of policing created and sustained by popular culture, crimes are only fractionally solved by good old-fashioned detective work in less than the 50 minutes that the TV show lasts. Most cases are solved on the basis of information given by the public. Intelligence has always been part of policing, coming from informants in political factions and criminal networks to informants in groups of football hooligans. Next to consulting informants, the police conducts observational operations, places wiretaps on telephone and internet communications, takes fingerprints and photographs of people who are arrested, and all of this finds its way into files, computers and data systems. This was the case in the days of the Napoleonic minister of police, Joseph Fouché ('Sire, if right now on the streets of Paris three people are talking, probably one of them is an informant working for me, and you'll have my report first thing tomorrow'). And it was also the case in the 48-year period in which J. Edgar Hoover headed the FBI; during 'The Troubles' in Northern Ireland, and in every single case in the history of policing - right until today, when the police depends on intelligence to decide whether or not to mobilize riot squads for a football game or some other large-scale event. Intelligence (or espionage) is regarded as the second-oldest profession in the world (following prostitution), and was back in the old days defined as follows: 'so what enables a good and wise military leader to overcome others? This is foreknowledge (...) which must be obtained from people who know the condition of the enemy' (Sun Tzu, 2003).

## 2. How the craft of policing got lost

Here, I shall discuss 6 interrelated factors to explain how the craft of policing got lost.

### **(1) From policing to involving society**

In 1984/1985, Pandora's box was opened by the Dutch State after the publication of two influential criminal policy reports: one by the *Roethof Commission* and a report entitled *Society and Crime* (Samenleven en Criminaliteit).

For the first time in more than 180 years, the State declares that crime prevention, surveillance and security is no longer a prerequisite of the State alone. Next to the criminal justice system, individual responsibilities of civilians, institutions, public agencies and the private sector are stressed and stimulated by policy programmes. Criminology would later use the concept of 'responsibilization' to analyze the increasing involvement of all sectors of civil society in crime prevention.

As a result, police research became 'diluted' with research into prevention programmes. Not the police became the object of study, but rather the other partners involved. Not order keeping and law enforcement are now the focus of research, but 'security'. The very notion of law enforcement begins to lose ground to prevention, cooperation and the more general term 'security'. Next to the 'old' generation of police researchers (Punch, Fijnaut, Van Reenen, Reiner, Bittner, Skolnick, Van Maanen, Banton and Manning and many others), a new generation of scholars has entered the field. They come from different backgrounds and introduce notions and concepts from public administration as well as new organizational perspectives.

The research interest into the craft of policing becomes part of a much broader interest in safety and security, and in the possibilities of aligning different partners. As a result, classic elements of the police function, namely order keeping, law enforcement, service to the public and the underlying quality of intelligence to execute these functions, become mixed with all sorts of vague 'security rhetorics'. Each new actor

in the security arena brings with them a new - and often ill defined - interpretation of security: physical security, social security, safety, human security, national security, transport security etc. Much is currently being done in the name of security, but what does it all mean? Do we have any sort of notion of what 'security' entails? No, we don't, but at the same time we fail to acknowledge this. We don't accept the fact that 'security' is vague, and in fact a 'wicked issue' (Rittel and Webber, 1973; Rhodes, 1998). The real problems for 'security' and/or a solution are hard to define, yet have an imminent appeal to us all.

The political context, and for that matter the rule of law, becomes vague if mentioned at all. Security becomes a catch-all concept that is attractive and persuasive for every speaker and every audience. Security has different meanings for different actors in different contexts. Boutellier writes about security as a 'semantic dragnet' (Boutellier, 2004). The very concept of security has become so broad, diffuse and applicable everywhere that it has completely lost its meaning (Boutellier, 2004). Moreover, this is the first step in many to come, taking us further from order keeping, law enforcement and intelligence.

## **(2) The POS-generation comes to power**

In the second half of the nineteen-seventies, a small number of young, ambitious and innovative police officers (especially the trio Wiarda, Nordholt and Straver), inspired by Anderson, were involved in writing a report on the strength of the Dutch police. The report 'Project Group Organizational Structures' (POS) is only partly about the strength of the police but constitutes in fact a new - and in many ways innovative - vision on policing. The authors draw a blueprint for policing very much in line with community policing concepts developed in the United States.

The POS-report stresses a decentralized, de-specialized, preventive police model organized in the local community and exhibiting strong ties with civilians in neighbourhoods. One of the POS slogans is *Kennen en gekend worden* ('Knowing by being known'). Here it is one element of the craft of policing: service to the public becomes the dominant police ideology.

In 1993, a new Police Act came into effect. In one of the largest reorganizations in Dutch public administration, 148 municipal police forces were integrated with 17 state police forces into 25 regional forces and 1 national police force. The POS authors rose to power in the new regional police structure. They became chiefs of police and used their new positions to implement many POS-ideas.

Police research again underwent certain changes in terms of direction, priorities and intellectual backgrounds from which researchers were selected. Next to public administration research, the focus was now also directed towards the difficult and challenging task of re-designing a new police system on the regional level. The craft of policing (order keeping, law enforcement and the underlying quality of intelligence to execute these tasks) became part of a broader spectrum of problems and issues.

However, one of the core tasks of policing, namely service to the public, neatly fits into the POS-ideology. Gradually, community policing as a concept has become a dominant police philosophy. Order keeping, law enforcement and intelligence as subjects of interest to police leaders as well as police research are not high on the policy or research agenda.

Almost all the new chiefs of police - and certainly the POS-generation - rise through the ranks along 'blue' police functions: operational experiences in uniformed tasks, functions and projects. They typically do not have much experience in criminal investigation and the underlying criminal intelligence functions.

### **(3) Private security: new kids on the block**

In the period 1985-2000, the landscape of policing changed substantially as a result of the growth of private security. In 1979, some 9,000 uniformed personnel were registered in the branch. Today, the private security industry employs 33,000 people, a process which is certainly not limited to the Netherlands. Around the world, growth figures, turnovers, concentration tendencies and ever increasing product diversity are impressive.

Privatization of security slowly enters the political, policy and police research agenda. From the early nineteen-nineties onwards, the political agenda has every now and then addressed the legal framework of the security market, which dates back to the early 30's. In 2002, a new legal framework came into effect.

The policy agenda - resulting in a number of research projects financed by the government - are in line with the spirit of Roethof (1984) and *Samenleving en Criminaliteit* (1985). The principal research questions revolve around issues of public-private partnerships, mainly in and around industrial areas, shopping malls and football stadiums, for instance. The focus is again on the possibilities and difficulties of cooperation. The research on privatization does not encompass theoretical frameworks as developed by Shearing, Stenning, Marx, South and Hoogenboom, analyzing commercial objectives as opposed to law

enforcement objectives. Nor does private justice, private investigations or private intelligence figure in research designs or empirical research.

In the mid-nineties, the Dutch Police Foundation SMVP started research projects on public-private partnerships touching on sensitive issues such as information exchanges between the police and insurers, money laundering and the respective responsibilities of the state and the private sector and private investigations. Still, this was hardly followed up by the academic community. Until today, private security in all its facets has remained under-researched. It is horizontal ideologies that surface most of the time: we shall and must cooperate! Together we are strong, and the one-liner of all one-liners is '1 plus 1 = 3'. No other questions are asked. No other analytical frameworks are used.

#### **(4) Police leadership transforms itself into new public management managers**

In 1994 and 1995, a completely different but again time and energy absorbing process came to dominate the police agenda: principles of new public management were introduced on an unprecedented scale. Policing was to follow developments in public administration in general: new jargon was brought in. Police leaders (now talking in terms of 'management') were preoccupied with processes, and the content of policing became somewhat secondary. People were increasingly absorbed by issues other than those related to the craft of policing.

The introduction of the INK-model, designed to measure and improve the quality of internal processes, started a process of organizational redesign. This meant that a business-oriented model with an emphasis on detailed descriptions of different primary police processes entered police research. Energy, focus and accountability of police 'management' centered on structures, models and formal descriptions of the craft of policing.

The content of actual policing has become of secondary interest to the police leadership as well as the research community. Budgets for research, advice, training and evaluation have during the past few years gone to processes rather than to actual policing. This means that almost every single aspect of policing has been scrutinized by consultants to describe its primary processes in detail.

As a result, police researchers have gradually lost their 'grip' on police research. Next to traditional police researchers, new academic disciplines have entered the arena - or have taken up even stronger positions in areas where their presence had already been established, such as public administration and business studies. Also, a parallel world of

consultancy firms has come to play an increasing - and in some ways dominating - role in police research. By definition, police research is becoming more policy-oriented, incident-driven and instrumental. The political, bureaucratic and policy needs of tomorrow are to be addressed by practical, down-to-earth research describing 'best practices' for the day after tomorrow. Here, too, the need for theory, fundamental research, mid-term and long-term projects are not that imminent.

Detailed descriptions of the tiniest parts of policing are the inevitable result, and protocols and definitions - not to mention decision-making rules and regulations - are injected into policing. What we are witnessing here is the beginning of the bureaucratization of the craft of policing.

### **(5) Police solidarity turns sour: the IRT-affair**

In 1994/1995, what is generally known as the IRT-affair pre-occupied the police leadership in many ways. At the time, a number of criminal investigations into organized crime were only barely under the control of the police leadership or the authorities (mayors and public prosecutors). Within the criminal justice system as a whole, small groups of criminal intelligence officers, criminal investigators and some eager public prosecutors created their own 'underworld' in pursuing criminals with the help of methods that bordered on legality (and at times crossed them). The IRT-affair affected the political system and operational realities in fundamental ways. A Parliamentary Enquiry was held, chaired by Maarten van Traa, which exposed the true nature of certain criminal investigations into organized crime.

Old loyalties, friendships, camaraderies and professional relationships between chiefs of police, the police and the Public Prosecutor's Office and other principals involved in the 'police question' (politie quastie) were strained - and in some small, lingering ways remain so today. According to the Parliamentary Enquiry Commission on Investigative Methods, the criminal justice system was in a state of crisis.

The good thing to come out of IRT-affair is the detailed description and analyses of two elements of the craft of policing: the criminal investigation process and the quality of underlying criminal intelligence processes (informants, infiltration, analyses, electronic surveillance). The reports published by Van Traa's Parliamentary Enquiry Commission are truly unique documents in the history of Dutch policing.

Still, one question remains. Did the Van Traa reports lead to a renaissance of police research into the criminal investigation process or the criminal intelligence process? The answer is no, not really. A follow-up study was held by Fijnaut, Van de Bunt and Nelen (1996), and some

years later *Rechercheprotret* (Muller et al., 2004) was published. Klerks (2000) writes about criminal investigations of organized crime groups, but there is no comprehensive research programme on the investigative process or intelligence in the nineteen-nineties.

A number of studies by Crombag, Wagenaar and Van Koppen (1992; 1996) raise serious doubts on the quality of the investigative process, but also about the functioning of the judicial system. In their *Dubieuze Zaken (Dubious Cases)*, a number of miscarriages of justice are dealt with in detail. However, their work has not really led to a follow-up in police research. Law enforcement, and especially the criminal investigation and criminal intelligence processes, do not really figure prominently in police research.

## **(6) Further net widening: plural policing**

The *Society and Crime (Samenleving en Criminaliteit)* philosophy of the mid-eighties remained prominent throughout the nineties - and still is prominent today. Numerous police programmes and governance models for security have been initiated and are currently being developed. We find numerous concepts to improve cooperation within the criminal justice system. The different agencies are defined in terms of chains ('ketensamenwerking'), and all the parts of the individual chains have to structure their case load in such a way that the next link is optimally equipped to take over. New public management models are introduced to optimize administrative procedures.

Public-private cooperation has become a central feature of criminal policies, from cooperation between public agencies and private security companies in industrial areas to shopping malls, football stadiums and crowd control during pop concerts and other festivities involving large crowds, for instance.

Networking, integral security and programmatic approaches towards security are variations of the quest - started in 1985 - to involve ever more civilians, (semi) public organizations and the private sector. Responsibilities for security in general and the prevention of crime are extended. And following this, we find a powerful drive towards multi-agency cooperation.

All agencies involved have to intensify their horizontal mutual cooperation: information is to be exchanged and the classical vertical approach towards security is redefined in terms of integral and programmatic approaches in which the Three Musketeers oath 'one for all, and all for one' plays a highly prominent role. Research projects are much in line with this mood of the times.

## Intermission: police research lost in the flood

*'Hey man, did you see that, those poor cats are sure messed up. I wonder what they were getting into, or were they just lost in the flood'*  
-Bruce Springsteen, *Lost in the Flood* (1983)

It can be argued that the craft of policing got lost in the flood in three ways. First, policing became almost synonymous with 'community policing', both in policy programmes and in police research. Of course this is a caricature, and yes, some research was still being done - also into the craft of policing (COT, 1988, 1992, 1995; Crombag et al., 1992, and others, see next section), but for the last 30 to 40 years (inter)national police research has been dominated by the 'community policing' movement. In the nineteen-sixties, pioneering research on community policing in the United States influenced young police officers and the first generation of police researchers in the ensuing seventies and eighties.

The 'community policing' movement runs through the POS-reports on all levels. Young police researchers like Kees van der Vijver and Wim Broer launched POS-like projects in the eighties. From the nineteen-nineties until today, researchers like Bas van Stokkom (2008), Jan Terpstra (2008), Lodewijk Gunther Moor (2009), Paul Ponsaers (2005; 2008), Marleen Easton (2008) and Hans Bouteiller (2002; 2007) have been using the community policing model implicitly or explicitly. Horizontal relationships between the police and the citizens - which lie at the very heart of the community policing model - are predominant. In a sense, the craft of policing - at least in much of the available police research - is focused on the third element of the craft of policing: serving the public and community-defined interests.

The first two elements of the craft of policing, order keeping and law enforcement, basically concerned with the exercise of legitimate power vis-à-vis citizens, are not that popular in police research. Explanations can obviously be found in the factors dealt with above and in the relatively stable political and societal context - from the mid-eighties until the turn of the century. The community policing movement thrives on academics born and raised in the sixties and seventies and academically moulded in the eighties. Consequently, ideologies from the periods described find their ways into conceptual frameworks stressing burgher participation and harmonic cooperation with all sorts of new agencies.

With regard to order keeping, Klockars offers another explanation. Deep down, order keeping - and in the end the use of violence - offends core values cherished in Western societies. Yet, at the same time, this

situation is unavoidable and unchangeable. Even democracies need to resort to violence in moments of order breaking. This necessary paradox needs some degree of comforting and wrapping-up in narratives, called 'circumlocutions' by Bittner (2003) and taken a step further by Klockars (1988).

The argument here is that society must come to terms with the existence of an institution, the police, whose means at times are irreconcilably offensive to democratic values. Therefore society must cloak that institution with signs, symbols and images that effectively conceal, mystify and legitimate actions (Klockars, 1988). The police are an institution that is constantly being 'wrapped up' in this way (Bittner, 1970; Klockars, 1988). Klockars explains community policing especially in terms of 'wrapping up'.

Whether or not the Bittner/Klockars argument is valid, the fact remains that the craft of policing (order keeping, law enforcement and intelligence processes involved) has become under-researched. Somewhere along the line, we have lost sight of the kaleidoscopic nature of the police function, the police organization and the craft of policing resulting from the political function.

Organizations whose tasks directly relate to the political and legal functions of policing - like the Military Police (Royal Marechaussee), the Intelligence and Security Agencies (AIVD/MIVD), the Forensic Laboratory (NFI) or the Rijksrecherche - do not figure in police research. The argument also holds for the agency responsible for the personal security of the Royal Family and other persons (DKDB), the National Detective Agency (NR) or the different agencies involved in international police cooperation (IPOL, Europol, Interpol). The police does not equal the regional police force or, within the regional police force, the 'blue', most visible tasks. The police function in our society is carried out by a wide variety of agencies, organizations and functionaries.

As a result, the craft of policing as demonstrated by these agencies got lost in the flood: examples include border controls, criminal investigations, protecting the lives of prominent members of society, the many thousands of controls in traffic, in transport security, in bars and restaurants, and the role played by the police in licensing. Also, the talking to informants, the wire tapping, the setting up of front stores, the bugging, the infiltration, the fines being given, the arrests, the interrogations, the observational and arrest teams, the specialized intervention teams to bring in fire power, and the criminal investigations into organized crime, political corruption and white collar crime got lost in the flood.

Instead, a somewhat ideological and to some extent ‘romantic’ image of community policing came to dominate. The ‘capacity for decisive action’ became redefined along horizontal lines promoting relationships between the police and the burgher. The intelligence processes underlying these relationships - and other police tasks - do not figure prominently in police research. Routinely, the police write down reports, log into computers and store information, intercept telephone conversations, talk to informants in the criminal milieu, make criminal analyses and inform mayors on public order events.

But police research does in fact much reflect these aspects of actual policing. Police research touches upon fragments of the police function, fragments of primary processes, fragments of theoretical knowledge. Policing has become de-politicised, and policing has become ‘reduced’ to community policing (‘basis politiezorg’, ‘buurtregisseurs’, ‘wijkzorg’, et cetera). In the last few years, the community policing movement has reinvented itself along new concepts such as reassurance policing and more recently restorative policing. The dominant perspective is ‘horizontal’: the burgher as a partner.

The second way in which the craft of policing got lost in the flood is illustrated by policy programmes, safety rhetorics and security narratives stressing the ‘responsibilization’ of civilians, schools, public administration agencies, public transportation and the private sector. The dominant perspective is ‘horizontal’: we are all partners, and partners must cooperate. The vague concept of ‘security’ and ‘multi-agency’ approaches to achieve ‘security’ has not only infiltrated our language, our research programmes and our designs, but also our theoretical lenses to view empirical realities.

Thirdly, the craft of policing got lost in the flood of studies on organizational issues, administrative processes and efficiency questions. Police research has become ‘overwhelmed’ by scholars from public administration, business schools and large numbers of consultants who look into bureaucratic processes and implementation strategies yet again for another ‘necessary’ reorganization. Their horizons are limited to ‘pressing’ needs of today, or at best the day after. Grounded, thorough and sound (theoretical) knowledge on policing does not figure prominently.

### **Inadequate, superficial and one-sided**

At the dawn of the 21st century, three criminologists, Van de Bunt, Bruinsma and Haen-Marshall (2001), analyzed the knowledge infrastructure of crime and crime control in Dutch society. With the term

'knowledge infrastructure' they refer to the way in which universities and other research institutes organize their academic and applied research on crime and crime control.

Their findings are disturbing, to say the least. Much of modern research is policy and/or incident-driven, and theoretical frameworks are lacking. They conclude that:

- the knowledge infrastructure is policy and incident-driven, and that there is a lack of mid-term and long-term fundamental research;
- limited resources are available at universities, and that therefore investments in the knowledge infrastructure are unstable;
- the infrastructure is fragmented and that too little accumulation of knowledge takes place;
- academic silos do not communicate, and that
- there is a lack of international orientation on the part of researchers working in the field of crime and crime control.

The Dutch programme Police and Science, funded by the Ministry of Internal Affairs, has financed police research since 1999. In 2006, in a session with researchers, the Programme Director analyzed the research proposals the programme had received each year and concluded that:

- many of them lacked a sound theoretical framework, and that
- much of the proposals were policy driven and descriptive by nature.

So, the problem we are facing today is two-folded. Firstly, research into policing (and crime) has the above-mentioned characteristics and therefore does not suffice to adequately deal with themes related to policing. Secondly, many layers of other types of knowledge have been stacked on top of this frail 'knowledge structure' lacking fundamental academic theories, concepts and forgotten empirical material. Research 'scratches' on the surface.

### 3. Bringing the police back in

I shall now bring the police back in again by first arguing that the political context is changing. Crime, crime control and security issues are increasingly politicized. Because of this, the craft of policing is becoming more important. Order keeping becomes more prominent; criminal investigations become more prominent; intelligence as a prerequisite of both becomes more prominent; national security interests become more prominent, and as a result the cooperation between the intelligence community and the police has been intensified.

All this has led to changes in the police system, to new organizations, to a more dedicated focus on operational processes, to the introduction of new strategies, tactics and operational concepts, and to new forms of cooperation between the police and relevant other agencies. Overwhelmingly, these shifts in policing are not the subject of police research. Therefore, I intend to bring the police back in - and put it on the research agenda of the near future.

#### **(1) Politics, policy and policing: crime and security higher on the political agenda**

Around the turn of the century, the political climate gradually started to change. Also, in the new context, order keeping, law enforcement, service to the public and the underlying quality of intelligence to execute these tasks received greater attention. Reducing crime and the fear of crime has become increasingly central to national and local policies.

I shall now briefly discuss political sentiments, public order incidents, the effects of 9/11 and a series of political murders in the Netherlands, some critical incidents and certain miscarriages of justice.

##### *Political sentiments*

In his *Culture of Control*, Garland (2001) analyzes changes in the political context of crime and crime control. He mentions:

- a decline of the rehabilitative ideal;
- the re-emergence of punitive sanctions and expressive justice;
- changes in the emotional tone of crime policy, and
- increasing politicization and a new populism.

Politicians consider law enforcement to be a permanent ‘danger zone’. Critical incidents in the criminal justice domain form a constant worry, from cold cases to criminal cases thrown out of court, and from crime statistics to prisoners on leave who do not return. The effects on popular sentiments and thereby the voting behaviour of burghers are immediate and strong. Crime, insecurity and policing have become a political reality influencing politicians and bureaucrats alike. Not crime in itself, but rather the effects of acting on crime are important in this political reality. A highly charged political discourse now surrounds all crime control issues. Punch (2008) describes this in his work entitled *Zero Tolerance Policing*.

The Dutch Interior Minister Guusje ter Horst, responsible for policing in the Netherlands has stated that: ‘This time and age asks for another role: the police are not a welfare organization, but the police are responsible for order keeping and criminal investigations. I understand this needs change and adaptation for many police officers who have not been working along these lines’.<sup>3</sup> The clear message here is that policing must change.

#### *Public order incidents*

In 1999, citizens from Spangen, a neighbourhood in Rotterdam experiencing a culmination of social and crime problems as a result of unemployment, youth gangs, drug problems and violence, took their protest into the street. This was one of the first signals indicating that people living in bad parts of the big cities not only have security problems but also that they doubt the capacities of local government and the police to actually intervene.

Throughout the following years, order incidents took place in Den Bosch, Utrecht and recently in Hoek van Holland. Emergency calls to the police from the public seem to involve more (threats of) violence, and the public debate is currently centering on violence against the police, the fire department, bus drivers and against ambulance personnel. In addition, policing in multi-ethnic neighbourhoods is challenged from time to time by groups of young Moroccans or people from other ethnic backgrounds.

<sup>3</sup> Baal, A. van, & P. Tops, ‘Politieacademie en politiegezag’ in: *Tijdschrift voor de Politie*, vol. 71, nr. 8, 2009.

Cities like Amsterdam and Gouda illustrate this phenomenon. It can therefore be concluded that the community policing ideology, although necessary and functional as always, has clearly reached its limits in confrontations like those mentioned above.

### *9/11: The Day That Changed Everything?*

In a fascinating number of studies edited by Matthew J. Morgan, the British publisher Palgrave MacMillan examines the impact of 9/11 on:

- politics and war;
- psychology and education;
- business and economics: the business of terror;
- the media, arts and entertainment;
- the new legal landscape, and
- religion and philosophy.

From 2001 onwards, the political climate and the general mood in the Netherlands have changed. The terrorist attacks in the US, and later in other parts of the world, have exerted their influence on the Netherlands as well.

### *Political murders*

The brutal murders of politician Pim Fortuyn and artist Theo van Gogh affected the country's already developing mood swing even further.

### *Critical incidents: narratives of neglect*

The 'Schiedammer Park Murder', in conjunction with a number of other miscarriages of justice, has put the criminal investigation process in the spotlight.<sup>4</sup> The relative neglect of criminal investigations in the eighties and nineties have clearly come to the fore in critical incidents, exemplified by the lack of securing a crime scene, the inadequacy of forensic investigations, certain weaknesses in the interrogation process itself and the lack of quality concerning formal statements written down by investigators.

It has become hard to explain to the political elite and to society at large why mistakes or sloppiness lead to criminal cases being thrown out of court. Examples here include the famous Dutch Hells Angels case, which had to be dropped because evidence rules had been broken, certain cold cases that were reopened, indicating that failures had been made in

<sup>4</sup> In this case after years it was found an innocent man had been convicted. The case reflects 'flaws' in the professional capacities of the criminal justice system.

the past, or cases in which prisoners on leave failed to return to prison. It is the legitimacy of the criminal justice system and the government in general that are at stake here.

Generally speaking, the investigative skills needed include:

- administrative compliance;
- a sound and thorough chronology of cases;
- an open mind and an awareness of cognitive biases;
- disclosure of relevant information whenever legally possible;
- critical incident management;
- evidential, investigative opportunity reviews and challenge groups;
- bringing in independent advice;
- sound interrogation techniques and psychologies.

Still, in some cases the craft of the criminal investigative process is found wanting. Authors like Fijnaut (2009), Van de Bunt/Van Gemert (1999) and Nelen (1998) lament the relative neglect of research into vital aspects of the criminal investigation process. A decade earlier, Crombag, Wagenaar and Van Koppen (1992) had shown parts of the investigation to be inadequate.

It can be concluded that we lack research into actual policing and the use of extensive investigative techniques - from stop and search procedures to arrests, and from house searches to interrogations.

#### *The state moves in*

Around the turn of the century, national government introduced an obligatory system related to policy making for the Dutch regional forces. This control and police cycle, in Dutch 'Beheers- en Beleidscyclus', was yet another element in the politics of the 'Iron Police System' (Van Reenen, 1987) gradually shifting the balance of power. In 2002/2003, the government introduced contracts with regional forces stipulating specific criminal output per period.

Both initiatives illustrate the changing political context and, as a result, a renewal of the political power struggle not only between the national, regional and local levels of government but also between two police models: the 'service and consent model' and the 'crime-fight model'. It must be borne in mind here that the shifting balances of power had already led to a new national police organization to investigate organized crime: the National Detective Agency (Nationale Recherche).

The national and international terrorist events, the political murders and the critical incidents fuelled the political discussions even more, and in 2005 a highly critical report on the effectiveness of the regional police

system (Leemhuis-Stout, 2005) led to a new Police Act (2007) proposal to Parliament for the creation of a national police force.

In this changing political context, the craft of policing is gradually becoming more important, and because I concluded earlier that many layers of academic knowledge have been stacked on top of the craft itself, I shall conduct some archaeological digging and bring the police back into the research spotlights.

## **(2) Bringing the craft of policing back in**

### *Public order*

Society has a fundamental and legitimate need for a ‘recognizable, trustworthy and predictable social order’ (Tops, 2009), and the specific role of the police is the enforcement of the law and the maintenance of order because the police are ‘specialists in coercion’.

This element of the craft of policing is slowly being brought in again. And ‘slowly’ is the word to use here, because there is indeed a fundamental truth in Klockars’ argument stating that deep down, violence and the threat of violence offend our democratic values. However, the ideology of community policing, notwithstanding the fact that it is a vital part of the craft of policing, does not suffice in some of the raw realities of urban conflicts witnessed at the beginning of the 21st century.

In 2005, I interviewed Peter Gieling, a district chief of police in one of Utrecht’s more difficult districts: Kanaleneiland (Hoogenboom, 2006). He talked about the lack of confidence he saw in members of the force when he took over command. Public order in this multi-ethnic neighbourhood involved many of the incidents described above by Naeyé and Van Maanen. His argument was yes, we must foster community relations, and yes we have to develop horizontal relationships with shopkeepers, schools, welfare agencies and youth groups and individuals, **but** there are limits. Naeyé-like encounters also require proportionate interventions to keep order and/or to make arrests.

With his background in arrest teams, Gieling organized training sessions for his district covering the special technique of ‘making arrests in a group situation’ (aanhoudingen in groepsverband). This was done not to stimulate greater repression, as this could only put more pressure on the fragile situation, but instead to offer his police officers greater confidence in dealing with potentially violent situations.

One of the ‘old warriors’ in police research, Piet van Reenen (SMVP, forthcoming, 2009/2010), writes a chapter entitled ‘The teeth of the police’, in which he rethinks the order keeping function of the police. The

focus is almost never on violence or the threat of violence, according to Van Reenen. He discusses the police in terms of a 'threat system'. Like Reiner (2002), quoted above, Van Reenen is not in favour of greater repression or the use of greater force per se, but he points out the fact that the police is functional in society also because of the threat of violence. This symbolic function is deeply rooted in our culture (Dupont, 2006).

The above notion is very much in line with Loader's (1997) work on the symbolic and cultural significance of the police. Policing has effects through public order keeping interventions, through law enforcement and through service to the public. But beyond these coercive powers, Loader (1997), Dupont (2006), and Wood (2006) point to the symbolic power that policing also represents. However, 'it would seem that the Dutch threat system has been weak, and still is' (Van Reenen, 2009/2010). Consequently, Van Reenen argues, this symbolic function of the police, 'the threat system', must be strengthened.

During the last few months, public order keeping has received much attention. In the aftermath of a public order incident in Hoek van Holland, in which the police shot at riotous youth attending a beach festival and in which one youngster was killed, many questions were raised in various commentaries with regard to the 'teeth' of the police. Law professor Ybo Buruma, a well-known and highly respected scholar, used the word 'cowardice', and police unions reported that insufficient firearms training, physical training and specific techniques involving crowd management is being offered. Earlier, one of the finest Dutch empirical police researchers Van der Torre (2007) in his *Lokale politiechefs* (*Local chiefs of police*) described the constant and often immediate confrontations between police officers and the public. The police are constantly torn between different needs and expectations and have to make instant decisions on the spot. These face-to-face contacts put pressure on police officers. On a number of occasions, according to Van der Torre, officers do not seek confrontations and opt for the easy way out.

It is not the first time that Van der Torre goes right to the heart of order keeping. In *Blaauw Relaas* (*Blue Stories*) he analyzes the problematic nature of order keeping in a number of Dutch cities. One of them is Arnhem and its city centre De Korenmarkt. He starts his chapter on De Korenmarkt with two quotes from police officers: in the seventies, De Korenmarkt was known as 'the bullet market'. It was a special area with criminality in the streets and the bars. It necessitated a special approach and this special approach we put in'. And how about this one: people involved in nightlife activities have to take the police seriously. What you need, then, are sound qualities, also physical qualities, to make your point. One doesn't learn these at the police academy or during

regular police work because here an anti-violence mentality generally prevails, whereas violence is the heart of what policing is all about'. Can we detect 'fear' in some parts of policing? Is there too much paperwork, too much accountability in terms of statements that have to be made for incidents (drawing a gun, resisting arrests, violence by and against police officers or the use of dogs in the public domain)? Are today's New Public Management principles a hindrance to the craft of policing? And, can these checks and balances be adjusted, or would this create even more unwanted situations? What does the Minister of the Interior exactly mean when she says that 'this requires change and adaptation for many police officers who have not been working along these lines'? In sensitive and highly charged political discussions 'feelings seem to be facts'.

As was stated earlier, public order keeping is under-researched, although Naeyé, Timmer and others have been doing excellent work throughout the years, work which must now be taken a few steps further. To this end, new research questions have to be formulated to give input to the ongoing debate on the quality of order keeping. This part of the craft of policing must be brought in again. **The Classics** in policing - Bittner (1967, 1970 and 1974); Skolnick (1969, 1972, 1986 and 1988); Manning (1977, 1979); Punch (1979 and 1985); Reiner (1978, 1991, 2002 and 2007); Fijnaut (1979); Van Reenen (1979), and Van der Torre (1999, 2007) - all offer a sound and thorough intellectual basis for this.

#### *Law enforcement*

In 2002, the police processed 214,018 suspects to the Public Prosecutors Office. In 2005, this number rose to 250,130. The 'horizontal' ideologies from the report *Samenleving en Criminaliteit (Society and Crime)* date back to the mid-eighties, and the community policing objectives introduced throughout Dutch policing law enforcement have never left the stage. Things change and also stay the same.

On a routine basis, policing involves all sorts of control activities, from traffic controls (concerning speed, alcohol and driver's licenses, for instance) to border and immigration controls by the Military Police (KMar). Because of what are known as the 'prestatiecontracten' or targets between the national government and regional police forces, we now have a nation-wide overview of different law enforcement activities.

In 2003, the policing technique involving so-called 'preventive stops and searches' was introduced in Amsterdam, Rotterdam and later also other cities. In addition, CCTV cameras were placed in various different public areas. During the last few years, ANPR-actions have been introduced and are currently becoming part of the routine of regional

forces in Rotterdam, Amsterdam and Zwolle, for instance. The national police force KLPD is cooperating with 27 countries within the European Union to coordinate control activities concerning waterways, the rail system and road transport. International police organizations such as Aquapol, Railpol en Tispol have been set up to coordinate traffic controls throughout the European Union.

Law enforcement also involves criminal investigations and, routinely, the police is involved in investigations varying from traditional forms of crime and organized crime to white collar crime. In many cases, this process involves cooperation with the Fiscal, Agricultural or Social Security agencies from the Ministries of Finance, Agriculture and Social Security. Public policing has become part of new and often 'hybrid' structures and processes. Nevertheless, many of these operational realities are not researched at all. It has become clear that this part of the craft of policing must be brought in again.

Dutch policing has introduced law enforcement projects around the new themes of 'cybercrime' and financial-economic investigations (finec): two highly promising innovations in policing in a society that is transforming into an information society and which sees financial-economic problems spilling over as a result of the current financial crises. But how are these programmes structured? What strategies and tactics have been formulated, how are the programmes managed, how receptive are the regional forces, and how do strategic partners - the Public Prosecutor's Office, the business community and other investigation agencies such as the FIOD-ECD or SIOD - rate these transformations? Is enough being done?

At the same time, the Police Academy has launched an ambitious innovation project with a Master's Programme in Criminal Intelligence and the recruitment of scholars from a wide variety of academic backgrounds. Some years ago, the Academy announced that the institute must upgrade itself to a higher educational and academic level. In the future, 20% of all police officers must have a higher education background. Together with transformations already at work, this is a major reorganization touching upon traditional managing problems, but in the case of the police also upon cultural themes. And as we know from many of the foundations of police research, cultural resilience can be very strong. The first indications of this can already be seen. Again, the transformation of law enforcement taking place today presents a fascinating subject for new police research.

### *Intelligence*

‘The most important aspect of police work is in fact ‘information work’ (Nogala, 1995). Police are ‘knowledge workers’ (Ericson and Haggerty, 1997; Sheptycki, 1998) and data and information are the ‘central input and basis for action in policing (Manning, 1992).

Order keeping, law enforcement and service to the public depend on the quality of underlying intelligence processes. Still, it is only from the late nineteen-nineties onwards that more attention has gradually been given to intelligence, both on a policy and an operational level. In the late nineties, the police ‘re-discovered’ intelligence when dozens of police officials travelled back and forth between Kent, where ‘intelligence-led policing’ was making waves, and the Netherlands. It led to different intelligence programmes within the police, but police research has not yet followed suit. We still lack a body of (theoretical and empirical) knowledge on what is taking place, how projects are implemented, how the changes affect policing and how the rule of law functions in this domain.

For the last decade, much effort - in a painstakingly gruesome ‘political’ way - has been put into improving and modernizing IT-structures in the police system. For over two decades, the Dutch General Accounting Office (Algemene Rekenkamer) has criticized the quality of police information systems and the inability to share information, not only among and between police forces but also between the regional and the national levels.

After 9/11, and especially after the political killings in the Netherlands, much effort has been put into organizing information channels from districts and regional forces to the national level when it comes to security and terrorism incidents. There are ‘national information nodes’ and ‘regional information nodes’, and the system is linked to ‘information nodes’ within districts. In addition, an elaborate system has been operative for some years now for the pre-analyses and analyses of criminal intelligence by special units for case screening purposes. This system operates as a filter and has the power to choose whether or not a case is processed to the criminal investigation divisions. On the national level, a National Intelligence Model has been conceptualized and must be operational in 2012.

Intelligence is influenced by scientific breakthroughs in many ways, from IT to DNA and from Automatic Number Plate Recognition systems to CCTV in the public domain. Increasingly, we find shifts from human intelligence (humint) to technical, electronic, signal and open source intelligence. The old adage from the POS era *Knowing to be known* (*Kennen om gekend te zijn*) is being redefined in the transformation from

the physical world to the digital world. *Technopoly* (Postman, 1993; Hoogenboom, due in 2010) is the concept used to describe the impact of technology on social life - of which policing forms a vital part.

Technology has always shaped policing - in visible as well as invisible ways (Nogala, 1995; *Spelverdeler in de opsporing*, 2005; Marx; 2002; Chan, 2003). The social organization and intelligence process of the police is influenced by automobiles, telephones, fax, computers and breakthroughs in the natural sciences, for instance in the field of finger printing, biometrics and DNA. In the history of policing, technologies have proven to be 'force multipliers', meaning that technology can improve a police organization's efficiency and capability without employing extra staff (Nunn and Quinet, 2002). Still, anticipation on the part of police research in this domain is sketchy, anecdotic and lacks theoretical frameworks and future scans as well as curiosity.

In the summer of 2007, I attended an anti-terrorism conference in London and witnessed the changing landscape of police and security research. Two thirds of the audience worked in various universities of science and technology and in the private sector, especially in computer science. Their research programmes were about artificial intelligence, data mining, neural networks, cctv and the integration of different sensors (from detection of nuclear material to explosives) as well as on the interception of text messages, signal intelligence and picking out (mobile) telephone calls from of the air. Although Wesley Skogan's *Police and the Community in Chicago*, 2006) is elementary for a sound understanding of police realities, other realities increasingly often enter the scene. This is exactly the point made by the conference chairman - former BBC journalist Ross - who during the day ridiculed 'old school' scientists and mostly referred to criminologists, who he said have nothing of any importance to bring into the current debate anymore.

In sum, the reorientation towards intelligence and the incorporation of technological innovations in the broadest sense possible have not yet become part of the academic research agenda. This part of the craft of policing must be brought in again.

The Dutch police have developed the *National Intelligence Model* (NIM) and are step by step implementing new approaches, methods and structures for variations of intelligence-led policing. In 2012, the NIM must be fully operational. A fascinating number of research question lie waiting to be answered.

Part of the ongoing influence of technology on intelligence is the blurring of boundaries between physical and virtual worlds. Today, social network analyses can be conducted with the use of Hyves, Twitter,

Google searches and a large number of other social networks. Criminal intelligence used to be all about human intelligence (humint) and increasingly about technical intelligence (techint) but currently even more, open-source intelligence (oscint) is introduced. Again, a relevant and highly promising research subject.

Here also, research must re-introduce some of **The Classics** on intelligence and policing. There is a vast and solid body of work offering sound theoretical foundations that definitely need to be rediscovered. Ericson and Haggerty (1997); Sheptycki (1998); Manning (1992); Nogala (1995); Marx (1987, 2002, 2005); Ratcliff (2002), and especially Chan (2001) on the cultural dimensions of the police are all essential to understand 'intelligence hoarding', 'information silos', the impact of technologies on policing, and more in general the central - but also highly contested - nature of intelligence in policing, especially related to information sharing.

#### *Connecting high and low policing*

The political function of policing in terms of national security, primarily performed by the intelligence and security agencies (AIVD and MIVD), is called 'high policing' as opposed to 'low policing', which covers most of policing in Western society - from community policing, responding to emergency calls and order keeping to law enforcement and service to the public (Brodeur, 1988).

Policing has been influenced by 9/11 and the political murders mentioned earlier. The size of the AIVD has tripled from over 500 officials at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century to over 1500 in 2009. The size of Regional Intelligence Bureaus (RID) has been doubled and their cooperation with the AIVD intensified (Hoogenboom, 2009).

Executive police officials are trained to spot potential signs of radicalization and have become more involved in anti-terrorism policies. The KMar (an organization with 2,200 officials in 1993 and now employing 6,800 people) patrols Schiphol Airport and other vital objects. The KMar also performs so-called mobile border patrols on a daily basis.

The National Detective Agency (NR), part of the KLPD, is involved in criminal investigations into terrorist networks, and in 2005 the Office of the National Coordinator for Counterterrorism was created, an agency employing some 100 officials. It coordinates not only security measurements by the public and private sectors but also activities on the part of the police and in-house security departments of multinational companies. The agency also conducts analyses of intelligence agencies. And in these areas, too, many of the operational realities are not

researched at all. So, as was stated earlier, this part of the craft of policing must be brought in again.

And here again, **The Classics** can be useful. Brodeur (1988, 2003) is necessary for a conceptual understanding of political intelligence, the intelligence community and the relationship with policing. Brodeur finds himself in good company with scholars like Matassa and Newburn (2003) and Van Hulst, the former head of the AIVD, who delivered the Willem van Oranje Lecture in 2005. Their work is of key importance to understand current transformations in intelligence.

### **(3) Policing the network society: what is the place of the police?**

The network society is all around us (Goldsmith and Eggers, 2006; Castells, 1995). It is rising and shaping the public sector in new ways; also in the way security is organized. There is much to do about 'plural policing' (Crawford, 2005; Loader, 2005; Walker, 2003; Dupont, 2004, 2006), 'fragmentation of policing' (PIO, 2005), 'the mixed economy of visible patrols' (Crawford, 2003), nodal governance of security (Wood and Shearing, 2005) and 'nodal order' (Boutellier, 2007).

We live - we are told - in a horizontal or network society where many agencies in the field of safety and security cooperate, or at least *should* cooperate. This is fully in line with the ideologies of integral security and multi-agency approaches that started in the mid-eighties. The 'horizontal ideology' is strong, pervasive and all around. 'Much is being done 'in the name of security, and often what is being done is based on the assumption that we all agree on what 'security' actually is (Valverde and Wood, 2001). The appeal of governance networks, however, is widely accepted, and for many inevitable.

Academics following the 'plural policing' line of reasoning basically write about the increasing (semi)public and private agencies and organizations which are performing police-like tasks and functions. There are even authors who predict **the end of policing** as we now know it: 'Future generations will look back on our era as a time when one system of policing ended and another took its place' (Bayley and Shearing, 1996). McLaughlin and Murji (1995) predict 'the end of public policing'. Bayley and Shearing (1996) tell us we are witnessing 'the breaking up of the state's monopoly on policing'. According to these prominent police researchers 'police are no longer the primary crime-deterrent presence in society' and 'we are witnessing a fracturing of trust in our system of public policing'. Public policing - we are told - is being restructured, and the public police as we know it may even become a relic of the past. Bauman and Tester (2001) point to the 'growing impotence of the state

(...) and the falling apart of totalities capable of securing the autonomy of human society' (Loader, 2005).

There is 'state scepticism in policing and security studies' (Loader, 2005). If we look below the surface of many texts published in policing and security studies, Loader argues, 'one tends to find fully felt scepticism towards the state'. Johnson and Shearing (2003) and Shearing and Wood (2003) argue that the state and the police no longer have any privileges in plural security networks. Loader (2005) develops a number of perspectives on the role of the state, and the views expressed by the above-mentioned authors fit his 'state as an idiot' perspective. I will discuss the police in the network society from two perspective. Firstly, I want to break away from the 'horizontal ideologies' stressing cooperation. Secondly, I want to re-evaluate the role of the police (and criminal justice system) by bringing in law enforcement again in the network society. Some of the networks and partners involved have dark side too.

### **I disagree**

My first point concerns the complexity reduction taking place. 'Beware of the undertows in policing and security' (Hoogenboom, due in 2010). Feelings are not facts, and looking underneath the surface of the 'horizontal ideology' dominant since 1985 is illuminating in many ways. Nevertheless, it is hardly ever done. Matters are more complex than they at first appear (Loader, 2005). The bureau-political context is completely ignored. The mundane realities of public administration can also be analyzed in terms of power and conflicts (Rosenthal et al., 1996). There is a 'struggle for policies' and a struggle in general. Ignoring this resonates with the 'political infancy' remark by Max Weber mentioned at the beginning of this lecture.

The police and the criminal justice system, regulatory agencies, inspectorates, local public administration agencies, welfare agencies, social security agencies, the intelligence community and the private security companies are all involved in safety and security, but all from different angles. There are differences in legal functions. There are differences in tasks, in supervision strategies, tactics and operations. And last but not least, there are differences in culture.

Again, in the words of Boutellier, 'a semantic dragnet called security' more or less binds partners. Nobody in their right mind is against 'security', but 'security' means different things for different people in different contexts.

De-politization, taking out power relations in the equation of partner + partner + partner = security, of the integral security concept blinds us to

the fact that all agencies and ‘partners’ involved have different objectives and different interests. In networks, friends and foes align, cooperate and struggle over power to formulate policies, share information or cooperate in individual cases.

Hardly any theoretical frameworks have found their way into police research to analyze these complexities. The security of Schiphol Airport is a jigsaw puzzle of (semi)public and private agencies, as are the Veiligheidshuizen and the Financial Expertise Centrum (FEC), in which financial regulators, customs, the AIVD and the police are more or less cooperating, or the different multi-agency activities of the police and the Fiscal Intelligence and Investigation Agency, for instance. Practitioners involved in these complex realities all understand and cope with the difficulties involved. Hybridism is the catch phrase for some of these complexities.

Underneath the calm seas of cooperation, undertows of competition, strategic evasion and straightforward conflicts are a structural part of policy and operational practices. As an early researcher of private security, I find the superficial ways in which police research deals with this phenomenon - ignoring criminological research of the eighties - fascinating. Private security in those days was analyzed in terms of loss prevention, a completely different objective than that of the criminal justice system, and in terms of private justice. The latter refers to the non-filing of criminal complaints by the business community. Depending on the crime concerned, between 60 to 90 percent of crime is not reported to the police or the Public Prosecutor, but is instead dealt with internally (through dismissals, demotions, repayment arrangements or negotiations over insurance claims).

The Social sciences offer a wide variety of theoretical models to describe, analyze - and in some ways also to provide - practical ideas for these complex realities. But, again, ideology prevails. As of 1985, we have *wanted* to believe in horizontal cooperation with civilians in community policing gospels, and in cooperation with partners in multi-agency projects. ‘Security’ has become not only a catch-all phrase for all sorts of societal problems, but also some sort of mantra, or even ‘religion’ in this day and age.

Gradually, research has incorporated more of the contradictions in the network euphoria. Rhodes (2006) introduces ‘the sour laws of network governance’. On the surface, networks are about trust, reciprocity and cooperation. Underneath the surface, however, ‘the holy grail of co-ordination’ is questioned. One of the ‘sour laws’ is about the limits of coordination. Another one is the ‘dispute about ownerships’ and concerns the abilities and inabilities of leadership to actually share

responsibilities, accept other authorities, to delegate and to let go of certain activities. There are intrinsic limits to security networks. For instance, there is the trust factor: 'you can't shake hands with a clenched fist, and trust between agencies is in short supply' (Fleming, 2006). Also, there are 'core contradictions' in networks (Fleming, 2006). Fleming favours 'aggressive' infighting of the police in the different networks. Hoogenboom (2010) uses the concept of 'police assertiveness': the police is not always a 'natural partner' of some of the horizontal partners because of the differences in objectives discussed above. But are these authors on the right track?

### **Speak softly, and carry a big stick**

But all this is not the only point I want to make today. My second point concerns the legitimate role that the police play in law enforcement, also in the context of law and rule breaking by partners in security networks. Not only do we see political struggle in networks of security, but also some of the 'horizontal partners' have dark sides themselves.

I want to bring the police and law enforcement back in the network society by stressing the fact that 'partners' are also prone to criminal acts. I want to introduce the law enforcement perspective, one of the primary functions of the police, into the 'horizontal euphoria'. The state and the police represent necessary virtues in a democracy organized by the rule of law and the principles of the *Trias Politica*. Together with Loader (2005) and Crawford (2009), I argue that it would be foolish to 'throw out the state' (Rose, 1999). In spite of scientific 'rumbles in the academic jungle', the state has its own historical dynamics, no matter what we as 'intellectuals' may come up with.

In the words of Loader and Walker (2006), the state and the police represent:

- symbolic power and cultural authority;
- legitimacy claims and public perceptions of its legitimacy;
- distinctive (tactical) resource and a source of information through which interests are pursued, and
- a residual position as a back-up of last resort with regard to other forms of control ('anchored pluralism')

In governing security, the state 'is a kind of *éminence grise*, a shadow lurking off-stage', as Hawkins described the role of the law in the regulation of water purity (1984). It is precisely the role of the law and

law enforcement that form the argument I want to use in bringing the police back into the network society of multi-level, multi-actor networks of public and private security providers. These two networks are both conceptualized in terms of brightness - but networks also have dark capacities. I will use the latter to argue the legitimate role of the police and the criminal justice system in the network society.

### **Bright networks and dark networks**

‘In the governance of security, the state, together with its coercive power, remains central’ (Ayling, Grabosky and Shearing, 2006). But precisely in what way? And, for what reason?

Ayling, Grabosky and Shearing (2006) put forward the argument of ‘key values of democratic policing (which) may be threatened’ in the ongoing fragmentation of policing and security. Nevertheless, I feel that this ‘key value argument’ is still somewhat abstract. This lecture is about the political context of policing and the core tasks of policing that are derived from this political function: order keeping, law enforcement and service to the public.

I will ‘unpack’ law enforcement here, and I will bring this into the discussion of the role and function of the police in the network society. My argumentation rests on the concept of ‘dark networks’ and empirical research into law breaking by legitimate network partners.

The ‘dark networks’ and ‘the place of the police’ come from the work of Wood (2006). In her work **‘Dark networks, bright networks and the place of the police’**, she asks the principal question ‘If the police, as a social institution, are uniquely knowledgeable and skilled and remain a symbol of law and order (Loader, 1997), what is their place in policing and security networks? If there is something ‘core’ about who and what the police are and what they do, how to retain this uniqueness in the face of an increasingly ubiquitous set of providers boasting a growing set of security enhancing skills, capacities and resources?’

Wood’s use of ‘dark networks’ is inspired by the 9/11 Commission Report (2004). ‘Dark networks’ are terrorist networks or the blurring of boundaries between the political system, bureaucracies, law enforcement, the private sector and organized crime (Ruggiero, 2003). Ruggiero suggests that such crime may ‘mingle with entrepreneurial and, at times, governmental deviance’. But why use this perspective only for analyses of terrorist networks or criminal networks consisting of politicians, regulators, public administration and the private sector in Third World countries? Why not also bring in the ‘dark network’ perspective in bright security networks in the Netherlands and in other countries, today?

Law enforcement is also relevant in the context of structural ‘deviancy’ or, more directly, in the context of law breaking potential of the public sector itself. Huberts et al. (2005) in *Rule Breaking Government Agencies (Overtredende Overheden)* conclude that:

- government agencies violate laws on a regular basis, not only administrative laws but also criminal laws;
- no distinction can be made between government agencies on the national, provincial or local level and that rule breaking occurs on all levels of government;
- environmental violations are classic examples, but that rule breaking takes place in every police domain;
- administrative laws are enforced by dozens of inspectorates, regulators and agencies with controlling and regulatory powers, but also that enforcement is not strongly developed - especially in the case of enforcing laws involving the behaviour of agencies themselves;
- government agencies do not distinguish themselves from private companies and that both violate the law systematically and structurally.

The Dutch Rijksrecherche daily investigates rule breaking by public officials and civil servants and yes, also by police officials and AIVD-employees. The AIVD has created the possibility to report unethical conduct by public officials and the telephone lines operated by Report Crime Anonymously (Meld Misdaad Anoniem) also receive calls from the public reporting ‘deviant’ behaviour by public officials.

The AIVD conducts thousands of background studies on civil servants (including police officers) as well as private officials who are to be employed in so-called vital positions. The rule of law (and law enforcement) entails a variety of preventive background checks and repressive measures through criminal investigations, involving the powers of the law to interrogate, to bug telephones and trace internet communications, just to name but a few examples, all of which are asymmetrical by nature. And by ‘asymmetrical’ I refer to the use of authority and corresponding powers by the state for national security reasons or law enforcement.

Crime in real life - as opposed to attention being given to most crime in (boring) criminology - is ‘democratized’: the Governor of Limburg recently addressed ethical dimensions of public administration in his province, and Guusje ter Horst, Minister of Internal Affairs, is concerned about ethics in government. As were many of her predecessors, I must add.

The police and the criminal justice system cooperate with 'horizontal' partners on all levels, and this multi-agency strategy is important. Still, law enforcement in a democracy structured by the rule of law is also about independence, autonomy and the legal obligation to enforce the law. The Trias Politica is our political heritage from the Enlightenment, the nation building process, to curb arbitrary powers of the Feudal system and in a later phase to organize democracies around the principle of the rule of law. It is this political context that I started with as a student when I first became interested in policing, and it is this political context I want to re-introduce here.

The law enforcement function of the police is deeply rooted in our political system in which law making, the executive and the judicial powers are divided to balance power. 'Horizontal networks' in this perspective could have negative effects on a society governed by the rule of law (Bogason and Musso, 2006). As Van Steden (2009) recently argued, using Loader's (2005; 2007) and Crawford's (2003; 2007) positions and insights, 'security' must be rooted in the governance structures of the democratic state. Societies - even the network society - are in the end still dependent on stability, order keeping and law enforcement by the police, the criminal justice system and the intelligence community.

Loader and Walker use the concept of 'anchored pluralism': the multiple actors in various kinds of overlapping networks at the end of the day must be 'anchored' in the rule of law and must be held accountable. The state, in casu the police and the criminal justice system are responsible for this by law.

Law enforcement does not equal 'horizontal' ideologies all the time, on all occasions and without reserve. Law enforcement objectives do not contain something like 'cooperation with partners in 'security''. Many times 'partners' are necessary, but from time to time they violate the law. Financial institutions cooperate to prevent money laundering but are also unwilling - or even willing - money launderers; fiscal advisors, notaries, private security companies and the business community in general violate the law every now and then.

Private security employees sometimes use excessive force or discriminate at the doors of discotheques; price fixing takes place on different markets; illegal environmental waste is shipped through Rotterdam by bona fide - and malafide - companies and dumped in the Third World; illegal arrangements have become structural in the construction industry; financial institutions (or individual functionaries) are instrumental in money laundering schemes and/or fraud schemes (Punch, 1997; 2002; 2009).

My ‘bringing-the-police-back-in’ argument here states that *by law* the police and the criminal justice system as a whole are independent agencies in the **wilderness of the mirror realities** seen in the network society, where almost everybody seems to be busy with safety and security.

I work with police chiefs responsible for criminal investigations, and they report that 6 out of 10 suspects in environmental crimes are local politicians and/or local public officials; in years gone by there were a number of criminal cases relating to misconduct and corruption by private investigators and business intelligence agencies selling confidential information.

The network society and all the horizontal policies and multi-agency initiatives are vital to crime prevention, crime control and in general to safeguarding society from insecurity, crime and terrorism, but cooperation is not the primary function of the police: it is law enforcement, next to order keeping and service to the public.

From this perspective, the role of the police in the network society is important and may well become much more important in due course. Only in times of political and societal upheaval do we learn from the history of the state (Fijnaut, 1979), so that structures and systems for national security, order keeping and law enforcement are restructured, strengthened and become more prominent - not to foster ‘horizontal’ cooperation in itself, but for national security reasons (*Raison d’Etat*) and to enforce the law, even when laws are broken by mayors, ceo’s of financial institutions, public officials, police officers, business managers or public prosecutors. This is and always has been the political (and legal) function of the police from the nation building processes of the 17<sup>th</sup> century until today, when a politician like Geert Wilders is protected by the police on a 24/7 basis. If he or other burghers protected by the DKDB, the special service for safety and protection of the Royal Family and other VIP’s, are in danger, members of the DKDB will not hesitate to kill the assailants if necessary.

This is what we call a society that operates under the rule of law and in the end harnesses the monopoly on violence. The enforcement of criminal law in a democracy is the responsibility of the police. The public mission of the police and the criminal justice system is what distinguishes the police from other providers of security (Wood, 2006). Ian Blair, Commissioner of the London Metropolitan Police, wants to reaffirm the link between policing and the public good. In forging this link, Wood (2006) argues, we can understand the police as ‘a highly skilled, professional and democratic organization’. The Australian Police Professional Standards Council (2006) desires to ‘re-image policing as an

exclusive domain of practice'. But, again we are only at the beginning of grounded research into the function of the police in the decades to come.

### **Finally**

What I have done here today is go back to the political context of policing, and within this context define the core tasks of policing: order keeping, law enforcement, service to the public and securing the quality of underlying intelligence to execute these tasks. I have called this the craft of policing.

This craft has become lost in police research due to a number of factors. Order keeping, law enforcement and intelligence have become lost in the flood of integral security, 'win-win situations', public-private cooperation ideologies and in general a 'security' ideology encompassing everything - and therefore nothing. The craft of policing has become lost in a dominant vision on policing stressing service to the public: community policing and more recently reassurance and restorative policing.

Because the political context is changing, the craft of policing is becoming increasingly important. However, police research in general still remains 'stuck' in 'old' frameworks and normal science routines in policing related to service to the public and network ideologies of cooperation and multi-agency policies.

I have argued that order keeping, law enforcement and intelligence must be brought in again. The realities of policing in terms of organizational structures and operational processes have increasingly come to differ from the research agenda dealing with police research.

I am convinced that in police research we must start asking different questions, questions that are related to the changing realities of policing: I have done this for the sake of order keeping, law enforcement and intelligence. Also, I have done this for the position of the public police in the network society. Especially this group is only now starting 'to crawl' out from underneath the layers of academic knowledge clouding the historical function of policing.

In many respects, I consider the articulation of these new questions and the opportunity of conducting research into some of these new and uncharted territories a true honour and a challenge. It is with gratitude and great professional eagerness that I accept my chair in Police Studies and Security Issues at VU University.

## I am grateful

I wish to thank a number of people who have made it possible for me to present this lecture today.

First of all, my sincere and heartfelt thanks goes out to my promotores, Joest 't Hart and Uri Rosenthal. Joest taught me the intellectual roots of the Rechtsstaat: instrumentality and the protection of civil rights, two core values underlying the exercise of power by the state. Uri gave me the intellectual freedom and unlimited time to satisfy my curiosity and to develop my interest in police research. Moreover, Uri and the COT (Crisis Research Team) form one of the exceptions in police research by having researched the craft of policing throughout the years.

I also thank Nyenrode Business University for making it possible to combine two chairs: one at Nyenrode and this one at VU University in Amsterdam. I must admit that I am a bit of a stranger to accountancy and controlling, and to a business university in general, but at Nyenrode I have been given the opportunity to teach white collar crime and financial integrity in a potential white collar crime culture. It is a sign of academic maturity to allow this.

I would also like to express my gratitude to Piet Tieleman and Bernard Welten, who picked up the phone somewhere in 2003, when my lecturing, story telling and writing were no longer important to me. They gave me classrooms to talk to, and pencils to start writing again. There's much truth in the old blues line 'nobody loves you when you're down and out', but in a way it's also a caricature of life - and in my case, then, an outright lie.

I also owe a big thank-you to Marcel Pheijffer, my friend and alter ego in science. Jokingly, we sometimes refer to all of our efforts in terms of Abbot and Costello, Laurel and Hardy and sometimes, with a streak of boldness, in terms of John and Paul. We're never sure who's who, but without your support, Marcel, I wouldn't have given this lecture today.

The Board of SMVP also deserves a special mention here. In a politicized reality of security, there is an evident need for independent opinion making, independent research and independent criticism. The

SMVP has always engaged in this, and has shown its ‘teeth’ on many occasions. Especially the long and tenacious struggle for an independent voice in safety and security delivered by the SMVP’s Chairman of the Board, Prof. mr. Pieter van Vollenhoven, has been an inspiration to me. One of the functions of academia is to ‘irritate’, to provide alternative views and to challenge common sense. I believe that academia is also about ‘making some noise’. Van Vollenhoven has done this, and the SMVP has done this for some 20 years. I am proud to be a part of this tradition.

I am also grateful to Hans Boutellier, Hans van den Heuvel and especially to Leo Huberts. I appreciate where you come from, what you have accomplished and where you want to go. I consider myself fortunate in working with you - and other SecurityLab members - in our never-ending search to understand policing. I disagree with some of the themes and concepts used by Hans and Ronald, but it is for disagreement that academics are academics.

I also want to thank Maurice Punch - one of the ‘old warriors’ in police research - with whom, over the years, I have shared many a discussion about policing (and with whom I have dined in many Pakistani restaurants in various cities). He introduced police research in the Netherlands in the early nineteen-seventies and still offers highly valuable contributions in talks, lectures and in writing.

Finally, I want to thank ‘my girls’: my wife Pien, our daughters Sophie (12) and Puck (11), and also our Grand Basset Griffon Vendéen, Crêpe Suzette, a.k.a. Suus (6). The only reason why I continue telling stories, lecturing and writing on policing and security is because at home I am unable to interrupt their story telling. At home, I tend to be quiet most of the time. I listen, I do the dishes, every now and then I work in the garden, and I take the dog on its daily walks. But I’m so proud of their story-telling talents and of everything they are, and of everything they will become. Thanks to their peace and quiet - and the absolute lack of pressure to hold this audience’s attention - I can go on forever, and will probably do so until the words in my stories become incoherent, sloppy and barely audible.

Mijnheer de Rector Magnificus,

Ladies and gentlemen,

Ik heb gezegd.

## References

Adang, O. (2005). *Met alle Geweld Leren*. Den Haag.

Adang, O. & E. van der Torre (red.) (2008). *Nederlands grootste evenement, een jaar na Hoezo rustig? Het verloop van de jaarwisseling 2007-2008*. Den Haag.

Ayling, J., P. Grabosky & C. Shearing (2006). 'Harnassing resources for networked policing', in: Fleming, J. & J. Wood. *Fighting Crime Together. The Challenge of policing and security networks*. Sydney: University of New South Wales.

Bakan, J. *The Corporation. Het pathologisch streven naar macht en winst*. Amsterdam: Business Contact. ([www.thecorporation.com](http://www.thecorporation.com))

Banton, M. (2005). 'The police as peace officers', in: T. Newburn, *Policing. Key Readings*. Cullompton: Willan.

Bayley, D.H. (1994). *Police for the Future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bayley, D.H. (2005). 'What do the police do?' in: T. Newburn, *Policing. Key Readings*. Cullompton: Willan.

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

Bittner, E. (1974/2003). 'Florence Nightingale in the pursuit of Willie Sutton: a theory of the police', in: T. Newburn, *Policing. Key Readings*. Cullompton: Willan.

Boek, J. (1999). 'De politiefunctie', in: C. Fijnaut, E. Muller & U. Rosenthal, *Politie. Studies over haar werking en organisatie*. Alphen aan den Rijn: Samsom.

Bogasso, P. & J.A. Masso (2006). 'The democratic prospects of network governance', in: *The American Review of Public Administration* 1(3), 18.

Bossche, S.N.J. van den & J.F. Ybema (2003). *Geweld tegen Politieambtenaren: opvang van slachtoffers en schade afhandeling in vier politiekorpsen*. TNO, Hoofddorp.

Boutellier, H. (2004). *De Veiligheidsutopie*. Den Haag: Boom Juridische uitgevers.

Boutellier, H., (2007). *Nodale orde: Veiligheid en burgerschap in een netwerksamenleving*. Amsterdam.

Brodeur, J.P. 'High and Low Policing: Remarks about the Policing of Political Activities', in: *Social Problems*. 30(5), 507-20.

Bruinsma, G.J.N., H. van de Bunt & I. Marshall (2001). *Met het oog op de toekomst. Verkenning naar kennisvragen over misdaad en misdaadbestrijding in 2010*. Den Haag: AWT.

Bunt, H. van de & W. van Gemert (1999). 'Opsporing', in: C. Fijnaut, E. Muller & U. Rosenthal *Politie. Studies over haar werking en organisatie*. Alphen aan den Rijn: Samsom.

Buruma, Y. (1993). *De strafrechtelijke handhaving van bestuurswetten*. Arnhem: Gouda Quint.

Calster, P. Van & L. Gunther Moor (2007). *Reassurance policing: een alliantie tussen burgers en politie?* Dordrecht: SMVP.

Chan, J. (2003). 'Changing police culture', in: T. Newburn (ed.), *Handbook of policing*. Cullompton: Willan.

Crawford, A. (2003). 'The Pattern of Policing in the UK: Policing beyond the Police', in: T. Newburn (ed.), *Handbook of policing*. Cullompton: Willan.

Crawford, A. et al. (2005). *Plural Policing. The Mixed Economy of Visible Patrols in England and Wales*. Bristol: Polity Press.

Crawford, A. (2006). 'Networked governance and the post-regulatory state? Steering, rowing and anchoring of policing and security', in: *Theoretical Criminology*, 10(94), 449-479.

Dupont, B. (2004). 'Security in an Age of Networks', in: *Policing and Society*, 14(1), 76-91.

Dupont, B. (2006). 'Mapping security networks: from metaphorical concept to empirical model', in: J. Fleming & J. Wood, *Fighting Crime Together. The Challenge of policing and security networks*. Sydney: University of New South Wales.

Ericson, R. & K. Haggerty (1997). *Policing the Risk Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ericson, R.V. (1982; 2003). 'The police as reproducers of order', in: T. Newburn, *Policing. Key Readings*. Cullompton: Willan.

Fijnaut, C. (1979). *Opdat de macht een toevlucht zij? Een historische studie van het politieapparaat als een politieke instelling*. Antwerpen.

Fijnaut, C. et al. (1985). *Politiële misdaadbestrijding*, Den Haag: WODC.

Fijnaut, C. (1985). 'De toekomst van de politie in Nederland', in: *Tijdschrift voor de Politie*, 11.

Fleming, J. & J. Wood (2006). *Fighting Crime Together. The Challenge of policing and security networks*. Sydney: University of New South Wales.

Fleming, J. (2006). 'Working through networks: The challenge of partnership policing', in: J. Fleming & J. Wood, *Fighting Crime Together. The Challenge of policing and security networks*. Sydney: University of New South Wales.

Garland, D. (2001). *The Culture of Control*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Goldsmith, S. & W.D. Eggers (2004). *Governing by Network. The New Shape of the Public Sector*. Washington: The Brookings Institution.

Hobbs, D. et al. *Bouncers, Violence and Governance in the Night-Time Economy*. Oxford: University Press.

Hoek, A.M van & P. Hulshof (2007). *Geweld tegen de politie in uitgaansgebieden*. Den Haag.

Hoogenboom, A.B.

- (1985). *Bijzondere opsporingsdiensten en politie: een exploratief onderzoek naar de handhaving van de bijzondere wetgeving in Nederland*. Den Haag.
- (1987). *Particuliere recherche. Een verkenning van enige ontwikkelingen*. Den Haag.
- (1988). 'Honderden Kleine Theaters van Bestrafting; de verspreiding van de politiefunctie', in: *Delikt en Delinkwent* 5, 429.
- (1991). 'The Mining Police: Dutch Private Security in a historical perspective', in: Ph. Robert & C. Emsley, *Geschichte und Soziologie des Verbrechens*. Pfaffenweiler, 85.
- (1994). *Het Politiecomplex. Over de samenwerking tussen politie, bijzondere opsporingsdiensten en particuliere recherche*. Arnhem.
- (2008). 'Fictional and Factual Policing: The Case of Reassurance Policing', in: Easton, M. et al., *Reflections on Reassurance Policing in the Low Countries*. Den Haag.
- (2006). *Operationele betrokkenheid*. Den Haag: Politie en wetenschap.
- (2009). *Spelers op zoek naar regels en scheidsrechters. Inwinning openbare orde informatie door de RID*. Den Haag.
- (2010). *The Governance of policing and security. Ironies, Myths and Paradoxes*. Palgrave McMillan.
- (2010). *Politie in de netwerksamenleving*. Dordrecht: SMVP.

Huberts, L. et al. (2005). *Overtredende overheden. Op zoek naar de omvang en oorzaken van regelovertrledingen door overheden*. Den Haag: Boom Juridische uitgevers.

Klerks, P. (2000). *Groot in de hasj*. Arnhem: Gouda Quint.

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

Jones, T. & T. Newborn (2002). 'The transformation of policing? Understanding Current Trends in Policing Systems', in: *British Journal of Criminology* 42, 129-146.

Jones, T. & T. Newborn (1998). *Private Security and Public Policing*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

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

Klockars, C.B. (1988). 'The rhetoric of community policing', in: T. Newburn, *Policing. Key Readings*. Cullompton: Willan.

Loader, I. (1997). 'Policing and the social: Questions of symbolic power', in: *British Journal of Sociology* 48(1), 1-18.

Loader, I. (2000). 'Plural Policing and Democratic Governance', in: *Social and Legal Studies* 9(3), 323-345.

Loader, I. & N. Walker (2001). Policing as a public good. Reconstructing the connections between policing and the state', in: *Theoretical Criminology*. 5(1), 9-35.

Loader, I. & N. Walker (2006). 'Necessary Virtues: The legitimate place of the state in the production of security', in: J. Wood & B. Dupont (eds.), *Democracy, Society and the Governance of Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Loader, I. & N. Walker (2007). *Civilizing security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maanen, J. van (2005). 'The asshole', in: T. Newburn, *Policing. Key Readings*. Cullompton: Willan.

Manning, P.K. (1977). *Police Work*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press

Manning, P.K. (2005). 'The police mandate, strategies, and appearances', in: T. Newburn, *Policing. Key Readings*. Cullompton: Willan.

Marx, G.T. (2005). 'The New Surveillance', in: T. Newburn, *Policing. Key Readings*. Cullompton: Willan.

McLaughlin, E. & K. Murji (1995). 'The End of Public Policing. Police Reform and the New Managerialism', in: Noaks, L. et al., *Contemporary Issues in Criminology*. Cardiff.

Ponsaers, P. & M. Easton (2008). 'Community (oriented) Policing Reassured: Significance within the Flemish Context', in: M. Easton et al., *Reflections on Reassurance Policing in the Low Countries*. Den Haag: Boom Juridische uitgevers.

Punch, M. (2009). 'Why corporations kill and get away with it: the failure of law to cope with crime of organizations', in: P.A. Nollkaemper & H. van der Wilt (eds.), *System Criminality in International Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Punch, M. (2009). *Police Corruption. Deviance, accountability and reform in policing*. Cullompton: Willan.

Reenen, P. van (1985). 'Liberal Policing in the Interventionist State', in: *Police Studies* 2.

Reenen, P. van (1987). 'Het ijzeren politiebestel', in: P. van Reenen, *Het Politiebestel*. Arnhem: Gouda Quint.

Reiner, R. (2007). 'Neophilia or Back to basics? Policing research and the Seductions of Crime Control', in: *Policing & Society* 17(1), 89-101.

Rittel, H.W. & M.M. Webber (1973). 'Dilemmas in a general theory of planning', in: *Policy Sciences*, 4, 155-69.

Rock, P. (2005). 'Chronocentrism and British criminology', in: *British Journal of Criminology*, 56(3), 473-491.

Rhodes, R.A.W. (2006). 'The sour laws of network governance', in: Fleming, J. & J. Wood. *Fighting Crime Together. The Challenge of policing and security networks*. Sydney: University of New South Wales.

Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of Freedom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosenthal, U. 'Politie en staat', in: C. Fijnaut, E. Muller & U. Rosenthal, *Politie. Studies over haar werking en organisatie*. Alphen aan den Rijn: Samsom.

Ruggiero, V. (2003). 'Global markets and crime', in: M.E. Beare (ed.), *Critical Reflections on Transnational Organized Crime, Money Laundering and Corruption*. Toronto: University Press.

Shearing, C.D. & P. Stenning (1983). 'Private Security: Implications for Social Control', in: *Social Problems*, 30, 493.

Shearing, C. & J. Wood (2003). 'Nodal Governance, Democracy, and the New 'Denizens'', in: *Journal of Law and Society*. 30(3), 400-19.

Shearing, C.D. (2005). 'Nodal Security', in: *Police Quarterly* 8(1). (<http://pox.sagepub.com>)

Skogan, W.G. (2006). *Police and Community in Chicago. A tale of Two Cities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Skolnick, J. (1966). *Justice without Trial*. New York: Wiley.

Steden, R. van (2009). 'Burgerparticipatie in lokale veiligheidsnetwerken; over 'nodale sturing' en 'verankerd pluralisme', in: *Justitiële Verkenningen 1*. Themanummer Nodal governance en veiligheidszorg.

Stokkom, B. van (2008). 'Disorder Policing and Community Needs. 'Revising' Broken Windows Theory', in: M. Easton et al., *Reflections on Reassurance Policing in the Low Countries*. Den Haag: Boom

Tops, P. et al. (2009). Evaluatie stadsmariniers (niet gepubliceerd).

Torre, E. van der (2007). *Lokale politiechefs*. Den Haag: Reed Business.

Torre, E. van der, *Blauw relaas. Verhalen over vakmanschap van politiebazen*. Apeldoorn: Politieacademie.

Traa, M. van, *Inzake opsporing: Enquêtecommissie opsporingsmethoden*. Den Haag: SDU.

Wood, J. (2006). 'Dark networks, bright networks and the place of the police', in: J. Fleming, & J. Wood, *Fighting Crime Together. The Challenge of policing and security networks*. Sydney: University of New South Wales.

Wood, J. & C. Shearing (2007). *Imagining Security*. Devon.



*Bestuur*

prof. mr. Pieter van Vollenhoven - *voorzitter*  
H. Wiegel - *vice-voorzitter*  
prof. dr. C.D. van der Vijver - *secretaris*  
drs. L.G.H. Gunther Moor - *projectsecretaris*  
ir. P.O. Vermeulen - *penningmeester*  
R.J.G. Bandell  
mr. H.J. Bolhaar  
mr. drs. L.C. Brinkman  
mevr. prof. mr. C.P.M. Cleiren  
prof. dr. J.H.J. van den Heuvel  
mr. E.M. d'Hondt  
prof. dr. J.A. van Manen  
prof. dr. W.J. de Ridder  
mevr. mr. E. Unger  
drs. B.J.A.M. Welten  
mr. J. Demmink - *adviserend lid*  
mevr. ing. R.M. van Erp-Bruinsma - *adviserend lid*

*Directie*

mr. P. Deelman

*Curatorium*

P.J. Aalbersberg  
prof. dr. J.H.J. van den Heuvel  
prof. dr. J. Naeyé  
prof. dr. P. van Reenen  
prof. dr. C.D. van der Vijver