
Chapter III: Developmental perspective — introduction

Monica den Boer

Departing from a considerable body of research, this volume seeks to bring in new perspectives on strategies and perspectives for European police cooperation. Hence, this chapter addresses one of the key questions in the world of safety and security, namely what does the future hold and how will the agenda change in the next decades?

In order to read the future, it is instructive to take a profound look into the rear mirror. **Cyrille Fijnaut** — who has published extensively on the history of policing and organised crime — opens this chapter with a review of police history, police reform and police education. One of his major findings is that police reform is often prompted by a regime change, and far less frequently by large-scale public disorders or critical issues in criminal investigation. Historically, in most European countries this amounted to processes of centralisation, specialisation and militarisation. Historical analyses of police reforms help us to understand the contemporary processes of police reform. In his contribution, Fijnaut opens up new research avenues by pointing out that there are still gaps in our historical understanding of how police systems in Europe have been influenced by the North American model and how Europe — along the lines of former empirical tentacles — has influenced numerous police systems around the globe. Furthermore, Fijnaut advocates a firm position of historical studies on policing within police educational curricula, supported by solid historical research.

This brings us to the conceptual godfather of several academic concepts on policing: **Jean-Paul Brodeur**. His inspiration, wisdom and expertise is sorely missed by the international community of police scholars. We are very proud to be able to publish his contribution ‘Trust and Expertise in Policing’ posthumously. In his contribution, Brodeur analyses the paradoxical relationship between trust, community and expert knowledge in community policing. One of the greatest paradoxes he tackles is that in countries which started community policing, there seems to be a wide discrepancy between the intentions of community policing (‘softening the coercive edges of policing’) and the actual practice of crime-sentencing and high incarceration levels. Also, engaging the community is much more complex than traditionally believed. The traditional culture of police, Brodeur argues, is to be suspicious of citizens. Hence, to build a mutual trust relationship is enormously difficult, if not impossible. This is a very apt observation in times when one of the greatest challenges for police is to guarantee legitimacy. Formal legitimacy is only part of the story, the rest has to be done by winning credits through constant responsiveness and prioritisation of safety issues across the board.

In his contribution ‘Future of Policing: Policing the Future?’, **Didier Bigo** is characteristically critical of EU endeavours in the field of internal security cooperation. At the same time, he shares his surprise (and even admiration) for the fact that in this sovereignty field of cooperation, Member States of the European Union have been prepared to let go of some areas of

influence in order to enhance standardisation. Bigo presents us with a historical reconstruction of the strings that currently constitute EU police cooperation. Traditionally, European police cooperation has been grounded in informal intergovernmental networks with strong ties to the intelligence world and with a strong focus on European terrorism. More recently, the impact of technology has been very influential on the shaping of new police cooperation arrangements, particularly in the area of ICT - networks - such as the Schengen Information System. Another development has been the 'external' side of EU-policing in the form of civil police missions, often with an emphasis on restoring peace and stability in post-conflict regions, the reform of police and judicial institutions, as well as the training of local police officers. With the Stockholm Programme, Bigo welcomes the recent but late introduction of checks and balances in the fields of justice and security, as well as the emphasis on social and professional legitimacy. A key concern for Bigo is however whether there are any boundaries to law enforcement cooperation, especially with regard to data exchange with third countries.

In her contribution, **Sirpa Virta** looks at what the future holds for preventive policing. She approaches this issue in a multi-dimensional way by looking both at how 'preventive policing' has undergone a metamorphosis on the one hand, and how preventive policing is changing the essence of police performance on the other hand. Preventive policing has a strong historical rooting, particularly in the Anglo-Saxon context, and has gradually spread to other parts of Europe. In fact, preventive policing is not to be defined as a separate strand, but as an element of widely accepted models of policing, including community policing and proximity policing. The anxiety about terrorism and radicalisation, combined with the connection between global and local security, has given leeway to the so-called precautionary principle. This principle places the presumption of innocence under pressure. But it also facilitates secret surveillance and the pathologising of groups in society, which fundamentally alters the traditional model of community policing.

The final contribution in this section is from **Michiel Holtackers**, who provides us with an account about the EU Stockholm Programme, which dates from 2009 and which is to be succeeded by a new multi-annual

programme for the development of the EU Area on Freedom, Security and Justice. This overall strategy was launched in the course of 2010 in order to place new pointers on the horizon in the development of the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice in the European Union. Since the entry into force of the Maastricht Treaty in the early nineties, police cooperation across national frontiers has been a crucial and fast-growing domain of action. Several legal instruments have been adopted to join efforts against a range of transnational security deficits, including those of radicalisation, terrorism, organised crime and trafficking in human beings. Still, the scope of regulatory activity is being expanded to issues concerning public order control and crisis management. Also, instruments such as the European Union Arrest Warrant have been in use for some years now. These types of instruments seek to encourage direct cooperation between police and judicial authorities, and new ones are on their way, such as the European Evidence Warrant. A precondition for making these instruments work is trust as well as reciprocity. These criteria can only be cultivated through mutual awareness and knowledge of national police organisations and criminal justice systems. A working knowledge of languages is deemed important for direct cross-border cooperation as well. The Stockholm Programme aims at making the various instruments more manageable for field officers, and seeks to support this ambition by emphasising interoperability between systems and the launch of an EU-wide exchange scheme for police officers. CEPOL certainly carries an important task in encouraging this process, not in the least by fusing innovative insights into policing with law enforcement curricula.

What is it we learn from this chapter? First, that the knowledge of history is pivotal to our understanding of current and future transformations in policing. This knowledge should be engrained into all levels of police education and should be based on historical research. Second, we have learnt that models of policing should never be taken for granted. Rather than taking them at face value it is instructive to probe beyond levels of rhetoric and symbolism, and to undertake empirical research on the translation and implementation of these models in the real world. Third, the development of international policing is firmly embedded in a wider discourse on security, which is deeply affected by changes in governance and technology. Fourth, and

in connection with the emphasis on the emergence of proactive policing, we learn from this chapter that policing is not only a chameleon, but also borderless. Fifth, as policing is one of the fields of cooperation in the EU Area of Freedom, Security and Justice, police forces and police education institutions benefit from the new dynamic that pervades the European Union,

which is an emerging security actor. Hence, policing is not only paradoxical (according to Brodeur), but also in perpetual motion (according to Fijnaut, Bigo, Virta and Holtackers). International and comparative police research continues to be a much-needed reservoir for providing evidence-based arguments in the pursuit of professional excellence.