CRIME AND SECURITY

Benjamin Goold and Lucia Zedner

Crime and Security

Edited by

Benjamin Goold and Lucia Zedner

Somerville College, University of Oxford, UK and Corpus Christi College, University of Oxford, UK

ASHGATE

Acknowledgements

Preface to the Second Series

The first series of the International Library of Criminology, Criminal Justice and Penology has established itself as a major research resource by bringing together the most significant journal essays in contemporary criminology, criminal justice and penology. The series made available to researchers, teachers and students an extensive range of essays which are indispensable for obtaining an overview of the latest theories and findings in this fast changing subject. Indeed the rapid growth of interesting scholarly work in the field has created a demand for a second series which like the first consists of volumes dealing with criminological schools and theories as well as with approaches to particular areas of crime, criminal justice and penology. Each volume is edited by a recognised authority who has selected twenty or so of the best journal articles in the field of their special competence and provided an informative introduction giving a summary of the field and the relevance of the articles chosen. The original pagination is retained for ease of reference.

The difficulties of keeping on top of the steadily growing literature in criminology are complicated by the many disciplines from which its theories and findings are drawn (sociology, law, sociology of law, psychology, psychiatry, philosophy and economics are the most obvious). The development of new specialisms with their own journals (policing, victimology, mediation) as well as the debates between rival schools of thought (feminist criminology, left realism, critical criminology, abolitionism etc.) make necessary overviews that offer syntheses of the state of the art.

GERALD MARS
Visiting Professor, Brunel University, Middlesex, UK

DAVID NELKEN
Distinguished Professor of Sociology, University of Macerata, Italy;
Distinguished Research Professor of Law, University of Cardiff, Wales;
Honourary Visiting Professor of Law, LSE, London, UK

Introduction

Security has become a major issue in contemporary crime control. Over the past decade, growing interest in risk assessment, prudential strategies, crime prevention, community safety and private security has helped to put security firmly on the criminological agenda (Hope and Sparks, 2000; Stenson and Sullivan, 2001). Major changes in the governance of crime have shifted the orientation of crime control away from traditional, reactive strategies towards more prospective and preventive measures designed to maximize security (Shearing and Stenning, 1983; Feeley and Simon, 1994). In many jurisdictions, private security personnel now outnumber those employed in public policing, such that the presumption of safety as a public good is gradually being replaced by the notion of security as a private commodity (Loader and Walker, 2001). A central plank of public policy and a major focus of private enterprise, the pursuit of security is now an endeavour in its own right, intimately linked with the fear of crime and possessed of a dynamic and momentum distinct from fluctuating crime rates and longer term trends in criminal behaviour (Jones and Newburn, 1998; Johnston, 1999; Wakefield, 2003).

As a result of these developments, security is now a key focus of criminological attention. Fuelled by the need to respond to the growing importance of the private security industry, as well as by burgeoning public- and private-sector interest in notions of risk, a new criminological literature of security has emerged (Ericson and Haggerty, 1997; O'Malley, 1998). Concerns with community safety, and safety in general, have given way to a fascination with the promise of security and the causes of insecurity (Crawford, 1998). Furthermore, in the wake of the attacks on New York and Washington, DC in September 2001, criminologists have become increasingly concerned with the relationship between anti-terrorist measures and crime prevention, and the extent to which the pursuit of security has displaced other priorities within the criminal justice system (Lyon, 2003; Walker, 2004; Deflem, 2004). Given this range of influences, inquiries into the concept of security not only needs to be set in the wider context of debates about policing, surveillance, and the prevention of terrorism, but also must consider the development of criminal justice policy and the changing contours of the social and political landscape (Valverde, 2001).

The pursuit of security also raises larger questions of governance, not least regarding the ways in which states govern and how changes in state governance allow a larger role for private players who are increasingly permitted, even invited, to assume previously core state responsibilities for social control and social order (Ericson and Stehr, 2000; Ocqueteau, 1993). Governing security in a mixed market of public and private provision is a challenge addressed increasingly by academic commentators (Johnston and Shearing, 2003; Hudson, 2003, Loader and Walker, 2004). In contrast to the shift from 'rowing to steering' in other spheres of government (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992), which indicates a retreat or 'hollowing out' of the state, the growth of private venture in the field of security has not diminished state involvement but rather fostered its expansion. A pressing question, therefore, is whether changes in security provision signal a larger social transformation (Bayley and Shearing,

1996) or whether they are better understood as part of a more gradual, less dramatic trajectory of change (Jones and Newburn, 1998).

The essays in this volume reflect the range and variety of debates surrounding the issue of security. They address the very concept of security and explore its origins in the literature of criminology. They examine the relationship between the provision of security as a fundamental justification of state power and the ways in which diversification of security provision is changing the very meaning of the state. They ask whether security is inalienably a public good or whether it can safely be commodified and sold. Moreover, these essays consider the possible costs – both to the community and the individual – incurred by placing security above other goods. What ethical and political issues arise when security is pursued by public officials and by agents outside the criminal justice system? What are the implications of changes in the institutions, technologies and goals of policing, and what costs do they entail? What changes in governance and in the form and nature of state power result from the rise of the public and private security industries? Are risk and uncertainty necessarily things to be avoided and minimized, or is there a role for insecurity in modern life? Finally, the essays consider what is meant by security in different jurisdictions and legal cultures, how this differs comparatively, and with what ramifications.

The essays presented in this volume are organized into six Parts, each of which is discussed below.

Theorizing Security

The concept of security has a long history in the field of international relations. Lawrence Freedman's essay, which opens the volume, explores the genealogy of security from an underdeveloped, imprecise and essentially contested concept to a subject of so much academic and political attention that it is now, if anything, overdeveloped. Security conveys many meanings (physical and mental, objective and subjective, end goal and pursuit) (Zedner, 2003) and has many referents (from the individual to the state to the biosphere). Equally, its negative analogue – insecurity – has come to refer to everything from anxieties about crime, unemployment, financial uncertainty and personal health, to concerns at the international level about the dangers of climate change, population growth and terrorism. Recognizing these multiple sources of insecurity erodes traditional – and often unhelpful – distinctions between military and socioeconomic security, between external and internal security, and between national and supranational policies. Yet Freedman shares the disquiet expressed by 'critical security' scholars about the ethical and analytical implications of viewing diverse social, economic and political problems solely through the lens of security (Waever, 1995; Buzan *et al.*, 1998, Krause and Williams, 1997; Wyn-Jones, 1999). Although 'securitization' has the effect of mobilizing political and other resources, according to Freedman it also tends to sacrifice competing interests and values to the more pressing claims of security. At the same time, it stretches the concept of security so far as to risk rendering the concept meaningless (Freedman, this volume).

A similarly disquieting expansion in the security agenda can be found in the growing use of the concept of 'human security' (UN Commission on Human Security, 2003). Although proponents of human security claim that expanding the notion of armed territorial security to incorporate 'the security of people in their homes, jobs and communities' represents a

welcome conceptual breakthrough (UN Secretary-General, Boutros Boutros-Ghali in 1995, quoted in Neocleous, this volume, p. 15), as Mark Neocleous's essay (Chapter 2) makes clear, the progressive securitization of socioeconomic problems has the effect of depoliticizing what are fundamentally political issues. Tracing the origins of security in eighteenth-century liberal thought, Neocleous suggests that its roots lie in the twinned strands of the liberal state and the protection of individual property within bourgeois society. For liberalism, security came to refer to the liberty of secure possessions, whilst government existed principally for the protection of property. Accordingly, the development of the police can be read as a means of securing the interests of the propertied against those without, and thus of fabricating and maintaining a particular form of social order (Neocleous, 2000). In this regard, security is as much about the active process of securing as it is an objective condition or end goal. Yet the effect of applying the label 'security' is to foreclose debate, to legitimize emergency powers and thus to depoliticize questions of social and political power. It is for all these reasons that Neocleous is 'against security'.

If the theoretical literature on security reveals its inherent complexity, its expansive potential and its dangers, it also reveals security to be an inherently normative concept. In its various guises, security constantly reappears as a good that must be defended. The role of the state in its defence is one of the central justifications for modern state power. Accordingly, the expanding non-state provision of security by private corporations, communities and private citizens poses a significant challenge to the notion of security as an exclusively public good. Ian Loader, in his essay (Chapter 3) and in subsequent writings (Loader, 2000; Loader and Walker, 2001; Loader and Walker, 2004), articulates a robust conception of security as an inalienable public good and mounts a spirited defence of the state as its rightful guarantor. If, as Loader contends, security constitutes an integral part of the rights and goods enjoyed in common that help generate individuals' sense of identity, then the social meaning of security is such as to require democratic governance of its distribution. Loader therefore insists that security ought not to be thought of as a tradeable commodity subject to free exchange within the market. Rather, considerations of democratic accountability and justice require that security be provided within a framework of democratic deliberation and decision-making.

The complexity of the concept of security requires that care be taken to establish which of its multiple meanings is in play in any given context. Imprecision creates expansive readings of security, which in turn license extraordinary measures. As the three essays in Part I demonstrate, precise usage is not only analytically important, but also has political implications for the claims that can be made in its name.

Security and Governance

Part II examines the relationship between security and governance, focusing in particular on changes in the distribution and provision of security and their implications for its orientation and meaning. The opening essay by Clifford Shearing (Chapter 4) distances the governance of security from policing in order to distinguish the forward-looking rationale for security from the retrospective orientation of punishment. According to the logic of security, ideas of risk, actuarial calculation, loss adjustment and insurance displace policing and punishment as the central practices of governance (O'Malley, 1992; Feeley and Simon, 1994; Simon, 1997). Likewise, the centrality of the state is replaced by the marketplace, which, through

the commodification of security, creates 'bubbles of governance' and private 'contractual communities' such as gated residential areas, shopping malls and the virtual communities of credit and insurance. Together, this expanding archipelago of private security provision creates what Shearing terms 'an emerging "neo-feudalism"' (p. 53) in which palpable tensions arise between the justice orientation of the state police and the risk orientation of local, private security.

The following essays by Adam Crawford and Stuart Lister (Chapter 5) and by Benoît Dupont both address the impact of changes in the distribution of security provision, not least the diversification of policing across state and non-state actors. The twin policies of 'responsibilization' (or the shifting of responsibility) (Garland, 2001) and 'marketization' of security have resulted in the scattering of security provision across multiple public, voluntary and private providers. The resultant patterns have variously been captured by the conceptual metaphors of 'patchworks', 'security quilts', 'frayed, fragmented and fragile tangled webs' and the mapping out of 'security networks'. It is a matter of continuing debate whether the resultant relationships between security providers can reasonably be described as cohesive networks, as Dupont suggests, or whether, as Crawford and Lister contend, this is an overly organized image of what are altogether more fragmented and disconnected arrangements. Whether these scattered security providers are arrayed in a 'horizontal "market model"' (Dupont, p. 82) or in a 'state-centred "vertical model"' (Crawford and Lister p. 76) is also a matter of both analytical dispute and normative debate as to how security provision ought to be regulated. If, as Crawford and Lister argue, the state is more than merely one node among many, its role remains pivotal both in respect of its symbolic power and its regulatory capacity. If, on the other hand, the state is merely one 'node' in an increasingly diverse security network, then the issue is less who governs security than who has the power to purchase it (see Shearing and Wood, Chapter 7 in this volume). Dupont contends that no single player 'no matter how large and resourceful' can shoulder the costs of security alone (p. 83). If responsibility for providing security is scattered it follows that the networks themselves become the primary means of governance, employing coordination and horizontal layers of accountability rather than hierarchical rule.

For Clifford Shearing and Jennifer Wood (Chapter 7), the increasingly spatial aspect of security creates different geographical domains with differing genres of security provision. In public spaces security can still be acclaimed as a public good, whereas in privately owned space protection is limited to those have rights of access. A complicating factor is that in many localized spaces (both public and private) security might best be thought of as a 'club good' to which only privileged members have access and from which others are excluded (von Hirsch and Shearing, 2000; Hope, 2000). The proliferation of localized security provision thus creates 'zones of governance', 'communal governments' or 'community nodes' (Shearing and Wood, p. 99) which provide spaces for the development and use of 'common goods' which stand somewhere on the continuum between public and private interests. An emblematic example is the residential gated community whose members buy rights of access to communal services such as maintenance and security enjoyed in common, but from which outsiders are excluded (Blakely and Snyder, 1997). For Shearing and Wood, while the emergence of these communal nodes or new 'denizens' can lead to the creation of unwelcome 'governance deficits', they can produce new and potentially beneficial forms of communal self-rule through the enhancement of 'local capacity governance'. The authors optimistically contend that, adequately resourced,

local community governance can deepen democratic control over the provision of security in ways that are consistent with the provision of security as a public good.

The Burdens of Security

An altogether less optimistic perspective on security is offered by the essays in Part III, which, in quite different ways, examine the problems, costs and burdens associated with the pursuit of security by both the public and private sectors. The first two essays by Ian Loader (Chapter 8) and Tim Newburn (Chapter 9) focus on the 'commodification' of security and its reduction to a saleable product traded in the marketplace. The commodification of security has variously been attributed to the rise of mass private property (see Shearing and Stenning, Chapter 12 in this volume), the fiscal crisis of the state (Spitzer and Scull, Chapter 13 in this volume) and the demand created by general, growing feelings of insecurity in society. (Bauman, 1998). In contrast to these writers, Loader concentrates instead on the way in which a consumer culture treats security as an object to be supplied and consumed like any other. The problem for Loader – and the burgeoning security industry – is that security consumption has 'a powerful in-built capacity to disenchant' (p. 129), as security products inevitably signal the risks they pretend to repel and amplify disappointment when they fail to protect. Furthermore, to the extent that consumers of private security effectively 'exit' from participation in public security provision, this withdrawal marginalizes and depoliticizes public policing and security.

In similar vein, Tim Newburn (Chapter 9) traces the main trajectories of change in the provision of security, focusing in particular on the re-emergence of private policing, the commodification of public policing, the emergence of new security technologies, such as CCTV, and the resultant 'pluralization' of security provision. Newburn identifies rising crime levels, economic restructuring, fiscal restraint, changes in formal and informal patterns of social control, as well as the rise of mass private property and consumerism, as motors of security provision. Although his contribution is as much about the sources of change, he also lays stress upon its consequent dangers. If Newburn is right, then problems of governance – particularly resulting from the pluralization of policing – as well as inequalities in the provision of protection leading to 'security differentials' (p. 156) and increases in fear and insecurity are all likely costs of the growing obsession with security.

In contrast to the other essays in Part III, in 'Security and Liberty' (Chapter 10) Jeremy Waldron explores another of the potential burdens of security, namely the threat to civil liberties posed by the war against terror. The continuing risk and repeated realization of further catastrophic terrorist attacks in the wake of 9/11 has generated an impassioned debate about the appropriate balance between security and liberty. Provocatively, Waldron takes issue with the very idea of balance. First, he is adamant that the protection of fundamental liberties ought to exclude the consequentialist claims of security. Second, he argues that the purported balance between liberty and security is in reality a 'proposal to trade off the liberties of a few against the security of the majority' (p.164). Third, he points out that powers awarded to the state to combat terrorism may in turn diminish individual liberties against the state. Finally, Waldron insists that we be more explicit about the difficulties associated with accurately assessing the seriousness of the threats faced. In combination, these philosophical and practical concerns provide a powerful check upon too ready accession to demands for greater state power in the name of security.

In the final essay in this section, Lucia Zedner (Chapter 11) delineates several paradoxes inherent in the pursuit of security, paradoxes that call into question its claim to be an unqualified good. These include the fact security embraces the pursuit of risk reduction but presumes the persistence of crime; that the expansion of the security industry has enlarged rather than diminished the penal state; that security promises reassurance but increases anxiety; that it is posited as a universal good but is based on social exclusion; that it promises freedom but erodes civil liberties; and that that, although held up as a public good, it corrodes trusts and other attributes of the good society. Taken together, these paradoxes require that security not go unchallenged. Instead, Zedner argues that security should be justified by reference to clearly enunciated principles, and that the means of its pursuit must be consistent with its supposed ends.

In short, the essays in Part III raise a number of concerns about the sources, features and costs of security – concerns that should lead us to question security's central place in public policy and to consider seriously how best to regulate its private provision.

The Private Security Industry

The growth of the private security industry is inseparable from the larger criminological interest in security per se. The first essay in Part IV by Clifford Shearing and Philip Stenning (Chapter 12) is a classic contribution, originally published in 1981, to our understanding of the private security industry, and it remains a focal point of reference for private security scholars today. In it, Shearing and Stenning first traced the re-emergence or 'rebirth' of private security as a phenomenon with profound implications for the public police and wider conceptions of justice. Of particular significance is the fact that, in contrast to public policing, private security is distinguished 'by its emphasis on a preventative approach to the protection of assets and the maximization of profits' (p. 230). Thus, despite superficial similarities in terms of role and practice, private security entertains a significantly different approach to that conventionally deployed by the police. Another significant identifying feature of the growth of private security is, they claim, its correlation with the expansion of 'mass private property' whose owners have a vested interest in buying private security services (pp. 248–49). Given the palpable limits to formal, direct regulation of private security, Shearing and Stenning conclude by calling for a fundamental reappraisal of property relations and, in particular, the expansion of mass private property.

From the same era, the essay by Steven Spitzer and Andrew Scull (Chapter 13) also remains very influential. In it the authors explore the relationship between private security and capitalist economic development. The crux of their argument is that the modern re-emergence of private security parallels the rise of policing for profit in the eighteenth century (see also Zedner, 2006). However, whereas private security enterprises were originally characterized by 'piece-work' in which thief-takers were paid according to their results (with the consequence that the unscrupulous had an incentive to procure thefts in order to claim the rewards of recovery), the modern security industry is instead deeply reliant on corporate capitalism. In this regard, private security is now primarily a service industry for the commercial sector, trading in specialized services aimed at preventing and reducing the security problems associated with mass industrial production and international financial capital.

In Chapter 14 Les Johnston updates this story by identifying numerous other factors that have since played a part in the expansion of the private security industry. Recognizing 'factorial explanations' (p. 284) as largely descriptive, however, Johnson goes on to explore various sociological explanations of the transition from modern to 'late' or 'postmodern' society – not least the rise of managerialism in public service, the spread of market-based forms of service delivery, the rhetorical appeal to community and the impact of globalization – and their relevance to the growth of private security. In particular, Johnson argues that genealogical accounts of changing governmental mentalities, not least 'post-Keynesianism', 'advanced liberalism' and 'actuarial justice', all help to shed light on the rise of private security, its scope, and its diversity. For Johnson, especially striking is the global nature of the security industry and its varying penetration of different jurisdictions, with Russia and South Africa heading the list of those countries with the highest private–public police ratios in the world. Moreover, the growing involvement of private security firms in both civil and military security raises the spectre of a new 'military-industrial complex', especially given that the role played by private military firms in many developing countries has now been considerably augmented by the opportunities created by the war on terror and the conflict in Iraq. Knowing how to tackle the potential injustices that arise as a result of these developments is, for Johnson, made all the more problematic by his apparent lack of faith in the power of the state to assert control over, or to regulate, the private security industry.

The final essay in Part IV by Trevor Jones and Tim Newburn (Chapter 15) revisits the 'mass private property' thesis advanced earlier by Shearing and Stenning, and questions its explanatory force by cautioning that mere historical coincidence between changing property relations and the rise of private security should not be confused with causation. They also observe a tendency to exaggerate the extent and impact of mass private property both across America and, more particularly, in Britain and Europe where the phenomenon is much less well developed. The substantial expansion in private security thus requires other explanations which may relate, in part, to the changing nature of urban space, to the declining number of informal guardians and caretakers, and to broader structural changes which have made possible the market for security. They rightly condemn the advancement of untested hypotheses about the rise of private security, its scope and role, and insist on the need for empirical verification of these claims.

Risk, Insecurity and Uncertainty

The essays in Part V each consider, in very different ways, how the pursuit of security reproduces insecurity and entertain the intriguing possibility that risk, insecurity and uncertainty may have positive qualities that are generally overshadowed by the larger claims of security and certainty.

In the first of these essays, Richard Ericson, Dean Barry and Aaron Doyle (Chapter 16) analyse the attributes of neo-liberalism in the specific context of the private insurance industry. Neo-liberalism both emphasizes the role of individual self-reliance and the responsibility for protecting one's interests and, at the same time, promotes risk-taking as a necessary feature of the free market. The simultaneous need to manage risk but also to permit risk-taking is a central tension rarely addressed in the larger literature on security. In their analysis of the workings of the private insurance industry, Ericson *et al.* show that whilst insurers fear that

the fact of being insured reduces incentives to avoid risk or take preventive security measures, the very working of the insurance industry offers incentives to other parties to engage in risky behaviour (p. 328). In order to regulate the consequent moral hazards, the insurance industry has generated substantial surveillance and security technologies that it turns into market commodities. Deprived of the safety net of welfarism, the individual under neo-liberalism must buy security products and be responsible for their own welfare in order to mitigate the risks that inevitably accompany life in the market.

In the remaining two essays, Willem de Lint and Sirpa Virta and Pat O'Malley engage with the positive qualities of uncertainty and risk respectively. De Lint and Virta (Chapter 17) argue that criminology has failed to question the assumption that security is an unqualified good whose pursuit trumps all other goods. Privileging security, they suggest, undermines the value of the uncertainty and ambiguity that lie at the heart of political debate and a healthy democracy. Instead, uncertainty is cast alongside insecurity as a problem to be 'fixed' by national security policies that champion necessity, exceptionalism and emergency powers (p. 358). In place of the authoritarian tendencies of security, they propose a 'radical security politics' that 'is both a rejection of authoritarianism and an embracing of ambiguity' (p. 359). Rejecting the conventional association of security with certainty, they find 'security in ambiguity', arguing that ambiguity and uncertainty provide the wellspring of politics and the spur to political engagement that is a necessary bulwark to 'the *terror* of the *un*ambiguous order' (p. 366, emphasis in original).

In similar vein, O'Malley (Chapter 18) explores the positive possibilities – or what he terms 'the uncertain promise' – of risk. His essay provides an important counter to the belief that the popular demand for security promotes awareness of risk, generating a vicious circle in which greater risk awareness causes greater insecurity and hence the demand for yet more security (p. 379). Instead, he shares Bernstein's view that risk is good news: 'we are not prisoners of an inevitable future. Uncertainty makes us free' (p. 378, citing Bernstein, 1998, p. 229). Although O'Malley accepts that risk is inherently dangerous, he contends that criminology has concentrated too much on its negative side. In this essay he explores the many and various uses to which risk can be put and, in so doing, reveals risk to be a political construct with positive, as well as negative, possibilities. Developing an 'ethics of risk' (p. 388) requires recognition of the varieties of risk in play and, therefore, the different ways in which risk may be deployed as a resource in the pursuit of 'a democratised, agonic politics of security' (p. 372).

Comparative and International Issues

While all of the essays contained in this volume present arguments that have implications for a broad range of countries and political contexts, those in Part VI explicitly address the comparative and international aspects of security. The first by Lucia Zedner (Chapter 19) proposes an agenda for the comparative analysis of security, a concept which, she argues, first needs to be subjected to close semantic analysis and careful deconstruction to reveal the multiple meanings in play when it is invoked. Viewed comparatively, superficial similarities in terminology should not blind us to widely varying usages in different jurisdictions and divergent connotations arising in local legal cultures. Universalizing claims about the convergence of crime control practices under conditions of late modernity (Garland, 2001)

can be subject to the test of comparative analysis into the varieties of local organization and distribution of security, particularly as it is manifested between public and private sectors, that may reveal an altogether more complex and differentiated picture of security provision.

The next two essays by Ian Loader and Michael Levi and David Wall focus on security developments within Europe and, in quite different ways, reveal how security contributes to the construction of European identity. In Chapter 20 Loader poses the question explicitly: 'Is Europe today being governed through security and, if so, with what effects?' (p. 425) His answer is that new arrangements for intergovernmental cooperation and the emergence of supranational security institutions – together with the resultant professional practices and cultures, governmental institutions and discourses, and lay mentalities – create a European identity that is constructed negatively 'in defensive opposition to an apprehended array of "existential threats" to "Europe" and its security' (p. 445). Opening up space for immanent critique and an alternative conception of a civic European identity is, for Loader, essential to the task of avoiding the costs of 'securitization' and ensuring the democratic governance of policing and security in Europe.

For Levi and Wall (Chapter 21), the impact of 9/11 has been to set in motion the conspicuous 're-securitization' of a number of European countries, many of which – unlike the United States – have had a long history of dealing with terrorist attacks. Importantly, they distinguish between the established 'hard security' of border controls and the newly emerging 'soft security' of information communication technologies – technologies that now form the backbone of 'the European Information Society' (pp. 459–60). According to Levi and Wall, the new security technologies or 'mass surveillance assemblage' (p. 466) have profound implications, not least in terms of the potential threat to individual privacy, the questionable accuracy of surveillance systems and the tensions between public and private interests that result from data merging (p. 469). Moreover, not only do new surveillance technologies reveal more crime, they can also lead to unexpected and unwarranted intrusions into our everyday lives, as well as new forms of criminal activity. In sum, the new European information society has profound implications for the meaning of identity, and poses even greater challenges for its protection.

In the final essay Benoît Dupont, Peter Grabosky and Clifford Shearing (Chapter 22) confront problems of quite a different order in their discussion of security 'in weak and failing states'. The authors explore the possibility of transferring mechanisms for the co-production of security from stronger states to those where conventional security mechanisms are either poor or non-existent. Theirs is an altogether more optimistic contribution than many in this volume, proposing new institutional arrangements which, they believe, have the capacity to arrest the decline of security in the least secure nations of the world. Recognizing that blanket policy transfer is unlikely to be successful, they advocate 'value pluralism' capable of adapting to the 'diverse contexts, cultures and knowledges found in weak and failing states' (p. 493). Taking the example of innovation in one South African township, they promote the 'Zwelethemba model' of peacemaking – peacebuilding, and partnerships to create sustainable, managed, and regulated 'Peace Committees' charged with local resolution of conflict and the building of local capacity for security (pp. 494–97). Whilst the cynic may well regard the relatively unproblematic manner in which they promote the Zwelethemba model as overoptimistic or even naïve, it is difficult not to be impressed by the courage, creativity and audacity with which they seek security for those most disadvantaged in the least secure of societies.

Acknowledgement

References

Bauman, Z. (1998), *Globalization: The Human Consequences*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
Bayley, D. and Shearing, C. (1996), 'The Future of Policing', *Law and Society Review*, **30**(3), pp. 585–
606.
Bernstein, P. (1998), *Against the Gods: The Remarkable Story of Risk*, New York: Wiley.
Blakely, E. and Snyder, M. (1997), *Fortress America: Gated Communities in the United States*,
Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
Braithwaite, J. (2000), 'The New Regulatory State and the Transformation of Criminology', in D.
Garland and R. Sparks (eds), *Criminology and Social Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Buzan, B., Waever, O. and de Wilde, J. (1998), *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, London:
Lynne Rienner.
Crawford, A. (1998), 'Community Safety and the Quest for Security: Holding Back the Dynamics of
Social Exclusion', *Policy Studies*, **19**(4), pp. 237–53.
Crawford, A. (2003), '"Contractual Governance" of Deviant Behaviour', *Journal of Law and Society*,
30(4), pp. 479–505.
Deflem, M. (ed.) (2004), *Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism: Criminological Perspectives*, Amsterdam:
Elsevier.
Ericson, R. and Haggerty, K. (1997), *Policing the Risk Society*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Ericson, R. and Stehr, N. (eds) (2000), *Governing Modern Societies*, Toronto: University of Toronto
Press.
Feeley, M. and Simon, J. (1994), 'Actuarial Justice: The Emerging New Criminal Law', in D. Nelken
(ed.), *The Futures of Criminology*, London: Sage, pp. 173–201.
Garland, D. (2001), *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*, Oxford:
Oxford University Press.
Hope, T. (2000), 'Inequality and the Clubbing of Private Security', in T. Hope and R. Sparks (eds),
Crime, Risk and Insecurity, London: Routledge, pp. 83–106.
Hope, T. and Sparks, R. (eds) (2000), *Crime, Risk and Insecurity: Law and Order in Everyday Life and
Political Discourse*, London: Routledge.
Hudson, B. (2003), *Justice in the Risk Society*, London: Sage.
Johnston, L. (1999), *Policing Britain: Risk, Security and Governance*, Harlow: Longman.
Johnston, L. and Shearing, C. (2003), *Governing Security: Explorations in Policing and Justice*, London:
Routledge.
Jones, T. and Newburn, T. (1998), *Private Security and Public Policing*, Oxford: Oxford University
Press.
Krause, K. and Williams, M.C. (eds) (1997), *Critical Security Studies: Cases and Concepts*, Minneapolis:
University of Minnesota Press.
Loader, I. (2000), 'Plural Policing and Democratic Governance', *Social and Legal Studies*, **9**(3), pp.
323–45.
Loader, I. and Walker, N. (2001), 'Policing as a Public Good: Reconstituting the Connections Between
Policing and the State', *Theoretical Criminology*, **5**(1), pp. 9–35.
Loader, I. and Walker, N. (2004), 'State of Denial? Rethinking the Governance of Security', *Punishment
and Society*, **6**(2), pp. 221–28.

Lyon, D. (2003), *Surveillance after September 11*, Oxford: Polity Press.

Neocleous, M. (2000), *The Fabrication of Social Order: A Critical Theory of Police Power*, London: Pluto Press.

Ocqueteau, F. (1993), 'Legitimation of the Private Security Sector in France', *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, **1**(4), pp. 108–22.

O'Malley, P. (1992), 'Risk, Power, and Crime Prevention', *Economy and Society*, **21**(3), pp. 252–75.

O'Malley, P. (ed.) (1998), *Crime and the Risk Society*, Aldershot: Dartmouth.

Osborne, D. and Gaebler, T. (1992), *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*, New York: Penguin.

Shearing, C. and Stenning, P. (1983), 'Private Security: Implications for Social Control', *Social Problems*, **30**(5), pp. 493–506.

Simon, J. (1997), 'Governing Through Crime', in L.M. Friedman and G. Fisher (eds), *The Crime Conundrum: Essays on Criminal Justice*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Stenson, K. and Sullivan, R.R. (eds) (2001), *Crime, Risk and Justice: The Politics of Crime Control in Liberal Democracies*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing.

UN Commission on Human Security (2003), *Human Security Now*, New York: United Nations.

Valverde, M. (2001), 'Governing Security, Governing Through Security', in R. Daniels, P. Macklem and K. Roach (eds), *The Security of Freedom: Essays on Canada's Anti-Terrorism Bill*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, pp. 83–92.

von Hirsch, A. and Shearing, C. (2000), 'Exclusion from Public Space', in A. von Hirsch, D. Garland and A. Wakefield (eds), *Ethical and Social Perspectives on Situational Crime Prevention*, Oxford: Hart Publishing, pp. 77–96.

Waever, O. (1995), 'Securitization and Desecuritization', in R.D. Lipschutz (ed.), *On Security*, New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 46–86.

Wakefield, A. (2003), *Selling Security: The Private Policing of Public Space*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing.

Walker, C. (2004), 'Terrorism and Criminal Justice: Past, Present and Future', *Criminal Law Review*, pp. 311–27.

Wyn-Jones, R. (1999), *Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory*, London: Lynne Rienner.

Zedner, L. (2003), 'The Concept of Security: An Agenda for Comparative Analysis', *Legal Studies*, **23**(1), pp. 153–76.

Zedner, L. (2006, 'Policing Before and After the Police: The Historical Antecedents of Contemporary Crime Control', *British Journal of Criminology*, **46**, pp. 78–96.