

# The Global Making of Policing

This edited volume analyses the global making of security institutions and practices in our postcolonial world. The volume offers readers the opportunity to gain a deeper understanding of the global making of how security is thought of and practised, from US urban policing, and diaspora politics to policing encounters in Afghanistan, Palestine, Colombia or Haiti.

It critically examines and decentres conventional perspectives on security governance and policing. In doing so, the book offers a fresh analytical approach, moving beyond dominant, one-sided perspectives on the transnational character of security governance, which suggest a diffusion of models and practices from a 'Western' centre to the rest of the globe. Such perspectives omit much of the experimenting and learning going on in the (post)colony as well as the active agency and participation of seemingly subaltern actors in producing and co-constituting what is conventionally thought of as 'Western' policing practice, knowledge and institutions.

This is the first book that studies the truly global making of security institutions and practices from a postcolonial perspective, by bringing together highly innovative, in-depth empirical case studies from across the globe. It will be of particular interest to students and scholars interested in International Relations and Global Studies, (Critical) Security Studies, Criminology and Postcolonial Studies.

**Jana Hönke** is a Visiting Professor at the Conflict Research Centre, Universität Marburg, Germany, and, subsequently, Assistant Professor and Rosalind-Franklin Fellow at the University of Groningen, the Netherlands.

**Markus-Michael Müller** is an Assistant Professor at the ZI Lateinamerika-Institut, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany.

First published 2016  
by Routledge  
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN  
and by Routledge  
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

© 2016 selection and editorial material, Jana Hönke and Markus-Michael Müller; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Jana Hönke and Markus-Michael Müller to be identified as author of the editorial material, and of the individual authors as authors of their contributions, has been asserted by them in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

*Trademark notice:* Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

*British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data*

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

*Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data*

Names: Hönke, Jana, editor. | Müller, Markus M., editor.

Title: The global making of policing : postcolonial perspectives / edited by Jana Hönke and Markus-Michael Müller.

Description: Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY : Routledge, 2016. | Series: Interventions | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2016002109 | ISBN 9781138910201 (hardback) | ISBN 9781315680040 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Police. | Internal security. | Security, International. | Postcolonialism.

Classification: LCC HV7921 .G584 2016 | DDC 363.2/3–dc23

LC record available at <http://lccn.loc.gov/2016002109>

ISBN: 978-1-138-91020-1 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-31739-600-0 (ebk)

Typeset in Times New Roman  
by Taylor & Francis Books

# Contents

<i>List of figures</i>	xiii
<i>List of contributors</i>	xiv
<i>Acknowledgement</i>	xvii
1 The global making of policing	1
JANA HÖNKE AND MARKUS-MICHAEL MÜLLER	
2 Capillaries of empire: Colonial pacification and the origins of US global surveillance	20
ALFRED MCCOY	
3 Laboratories of pacification and permanent war: Israeli–US collaboration in the global making of policing	40
STEPHEN GRAHAM AND ALEXANDER BAKER	
4 Beyond the laboratory thesis: Gaza as transmission belt for war and security technology	59
LEILA STOCKMARR	
5 Entangled pacifications: Peacekeeping, counterinsurgency and policing in Port-au-Prince and Rio de Janeiro	77
MARKUS-MICHAEL MÜLLER	
6 Associated dependent security cooperation: Colombia and the United States	96
ARLENE B. TICKNER	
7 Securing the diaspora: Policing global order	114
MARK LAFFEY AND SUTHAHARAN NADARAJAH	
8 ‘British cop or international cop?’ Global makings of international policing assistance, 2000–2014	132
GEORGINA SINCLAIR	

xii	<i>Contents</i>	
9	A translational perspective on police-building in Afghanistan: The enactment of ‘progress’ in the implementation gap LARS OSTERMEIER	149
10	Unpacking ‘the global’ PINAR BILGIN	167
	<i>Index</i>	178

# 1 The global making of policing

*Jana Hönke and Markus-Michael Müller*

In October 2011, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) launched the Airport Communication Programme (AIRCOP). Although funded by the European Commission and the Canadian government, and working in close cooperation with Interpol and the World Customs Organization, this project aims at strengthening cooperation and intelligence-sharing within the realm of airport security and policing between Brazil and the West African states of Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Nigeria and others. The stated objective is to confront what UNODC refers to as the 'Brazil–Africa Narco Nexus' (Brune, 2011). As such, the programme illustrates the global reach-out of contemporary policing.

Yet contemporary policing not only has a global *reach*. It is also globally *made*. In 2013, for instance, Mike Katone, a police officer in Springfield, Massachusetts, designed and implemented a plan for the local police department to confront street gangs. Interestingly, he modelled his plan after the counterinsurgency police practices he had encountered during his time serving in the military in Afghanistan and Iraq. In an interview he explained the following: "Insurgents and gang members both want to operate in a failed area – a failed community or a failed state [...]. They know they can live off the passive support of the community, where the local community is not going to call or engage the local police" (Washington Times, 2013). The policing of Springfield was hence made in Afghanistan just as much as it was in the US. It is the analysis of this truly *global* making of policing that has not yet received adequate attention in research or literature. It therefore stands at the center of this book.

What we mean by the 'global making of policing' is the circulation of both policing techniques and practices, which together lend to the global (re)making of policing within the international realm. These processes of global making are much more complex than usually depicted. Policing models and practices are not simply globalized, as is often assumed, through diffusion from a supposed (liberal) centre to seemingly marginal spaces, in which they get translated at best. Instead, core global and domestic police institutions and practices are co-constituted by various actors and experiences from across the globe. Seemingly marginal places in our postcolonial world have played a

## 2 *Jana Hönke and Markus-Michael Müller*

crucial role in these processes and it is the goal of this book to make visible the often hidden presence of the margins – as an idea, encounter and agent – in making policing a global reality.

More specifically, two arguments are presented. First, we argue that the liberal, ‘diffusionist’ narrative of the making of global policing silences the ‘illiberal’, violent side of liberal ordering. Violence has always been part and parcel of liberalism: by way of constructing certain ‘others’ in such a way that policing them ‘otherwise’ appeared necessary. Illiberal practices are not the result of a deformation of liberal governance by an ‘illiberal local’. Nor do they necessarily indicate the emergence of a ‘post-liberal’ era. Instead, there is a violent side to liberal global governance itself and hybrid practices emerge from the very idea that ex-centric sites and populations need to be policed *otherwise* (Brogden and Ellison, 2012; Kienscherf forthcoming; Laffey and Sutharan, this volume). ‘Homeland policing’, in turn, has been actively shaped by such violent experiments and innovations that travel back from the ‘laboratories’ to the ‘metropole’.

But liberal global policing is not all-powerful, as some of the global governance and governmentality literatures suggest; a perspective that would reproduce the idea that agency is exclusively located in the ‘West’. On the contrary, the second argument we put forward is that practices of global policing are dynamically coproduced; they are an outcome of entangled histories. While these entanglements remain hierarchically structured, agents in the “postcolony” (Mbembe, 2002) have shaped these processes.

In uncovering these processes that give reality to what we call the *global making of policing*, we do not aim at presenting a new, all-encompassing theory. Rather, we consider the idea of the global making of policing to be what Collier and Ong have termed a “loose-knit conceptual orientation” (Collier and Ong, 2006: 5–6). The latter, instead of offering an overarching theoretical framework, provides a coherent heuristic lens that ties the empirically rich case studies in the chapters that follow together by offering an analytical orientation capable of uncovering, rendering legible and understanding the complex realities and practices that underpin the global making of policing in our postcolonial world.

Based on in-depth empirical research in ‘most of the world’ (Chatterjee, 2004) – that is, the postcolonial world outside but also within the ‘modern West’ – this book assembles a collection of essays that coherently engage with this truly global making of contemporary policing. The scope of the case studies ranges from the making of US policing in the Philippines and the Gaza Strip, to the translation of knowledge produced in police missions from Afghanistan to Germany, to emerging hybrid security assemblages around Tamil diaspora communities and the travelling of urban pacification projects between Brazil and Haiti. Together, the chapters offer innovative theoretical and empirical insights into the entangled character and co-constituted nature of the apparatuses, practices and forms of knowledge of contemporary policing.

The remainder of the introduction proceeds as follows. We start with a discussion of existing research on global policing and the origins of core policing institutions and practices and draw out its limitations. After a critique of dominant, diffusionist conceptions of global policing, we introduce alternative understandings of this process based on an engagement with postcolonial studies, historiographies of (post)colonial policing and critical criminology, various area studies' research on policing, and other bodies of literature. This is followed by methodological reflections and the introduction of three analytical perspectives through which this book seeks to improve our understanding of the global making of policing. The first is an investigation into the postcolony as a laboratory. The second features the multiplication of metropolises and related 'South–South' policing encounters. The third revolves around the postcolonial nature of transnational security fields and assemblages. The final section introduces the individual chapters of the book organized along these three perspectives.

### **Rethinking global policing through postcolonial perspectives**

Taking on the empirical and analytical challenge to uncover the complex processes that make policing a global reality, the insights of the postcolonial literature act as our starting point. Inspired by postcolonial ideas, we suggest a fresh analytical approach to seemingly old questions; an approach that enables us to go beyond dominant, one-sided perspectives on transnational security governance that propose a diffusion of models and practices from a 'Western' centre to other parts of the globe. Such perspectives omit much of the experimenting and learning going on in the (post)colony that constitute policing practices from Springfield to Kandahar and inform the most innovative – peaceful as much as violent – aspects of global policing. The book demonstrates this relationship by highlighting the multi-directional travelling of practices across the globe as well as the active agency and participation of seemingly 'marginal' actors in producing and co-constituting what is conventionally thought of as 'Western' policing practice, knowledge and institutions.

The Western-centrism that informs much of contemporary International Relations scholarship on international security and global policing is deeply related to a "foundationalist decontextualization" (Steinmetz, 1999: 20). In this section, we elaborate on how and why an analytical lens characterized by postcoloniality helps us to leave behind such Western-centrism: through a re-contextualization that makes visible the seemingly hidden presence of the 'margins' in contemporary forms of global policing. Following the call of Gurminder Bhambra (2010) and others to recognize connected histories and international interconnectedness, such empirical work allows to question dominant narratives as well as to reconstruct conceptual categories (see also Vasilaki, 2013).

The issue of postcolonialism has received growing attention throughout the social sciences (for overviews, see Ashcroft *et al.*, 2007; Loomba, 2005;

#### 4 *Jana Hönke and Markus-Michael Müller*

Young, 2003). Key to postcolonial thinking is a critical “engagement with the role of power in the formation of identity and subjectivity and the relationship between knowledge and political practices” (Abrahamsen, 2003: 197), with particular focus on the dichotomizing division of the world into the ‘West’ and the ‘Rest’ (Hall, 1992). The division is based on the assumption of an endogenous development of the ‘West’. On this basis, “the social norms, structures, and values characterizing the so-called Western societies [are taken] as a universal parameter for defining what modern societies are and the processes of their emergence as the path to be followed by other, modernizing countries” (Boatcă *et al.*, 2010: 1).

In critically highlighting the underlying power/knowledge relations of such a dichotomizing world view, postcolonial theories imply “an epistemological concern, namely to question the universality of the categories of modern social scientific thought, and of the disciplines into which it is divided; it is an epistemological challenge to, and critique of, existing disciplines, including IR” (Seth, 2013b: 2). This epistemological challenge and critique has received growing attention from within IR (Seth, 2013a; *Millennium*, 2011; Chowdry and Nair, 2002; Slater, 2004; Ling, 2002; Paolini *et al.*, 1999), contributing to an awareness that the unquestioned Western-centrism that informed the discipline since its beginnings produced an overly Eurocentric conception of world politics (Hobson, 2012). As Hobson has shown in detail, from its origins in the late eighteenth century, international theory has been informed by a Western-centric reasoning that combined a form of scientific racism with a Eurocentric institutionalism. This combination led IR theory “to parochially celebrate and defend or promote the West as the proactive subject of, and as the highest or ideal normative referent in, world politics” (Hobson, 2012: 1).

Far from being a thing of the past, this problematic perspective still looms large in contemporary IR debates. Therefore, it is hardly surprising that the analytical and epistemological problems stemming from Western-centric reasoning in IR have also become a concern for scholars within the subfield of security studies. While growing, much more awareness is required of the fact that long-cherished concepts, methods and theories were nearly exclusively developed based on specific and Eurocentric narratives of ‘the West’. Equally important, they are based on experience in (Western) Europe or North America, which cannot always be adequately applied to the analysis of security governance elsewhere. As Buzan and Hansen have argued in this respect, international security studies are “by birth an Anglo–American discipline which has been based on a Western conception of the state. This conception has arguably limited empirical and political relevance for major parts of the non-Western world, where the drawing of colonial boundaries irrespective of local communities and allegiances has produced a radically different set of political, economic and cultural structures” (Buzan and Hansen, 2009: 19).

There have been a number of attempts to analyse the governance of (in)security, policing and war through a postcolonial lens (see, for example, Muppidi, 1999; Krishna, 1999; Agathangelou and Ling, 2004; Barkawi and Laffey,



2006; Porter, 2009; Hönke and Müller, 2012; Barkawi and Stanski 2013). While this literature is growing, the call for a “postcolonial moment in security studies” (Barkawi and Laffey, 2006) has still not received the attention it should. Where it has, in addition, contributions tend to remain somewhat theoretical or concerned with the deconstruction of dominant knowledge. While this is absolutely crucial, this book seeks to move beyond that by offering empirical research strategies and case studies that uncover, and help to reconstruct, the global making of policing. By so doing we hope to provide empirically grounded, conceptually and methodologically innovative contributions for a truly global research agenda on policing and security.

To this end, and in order to overcome parochial forms of knowledge production, pushing research towards “non-Eurocentric security studies” (Barkawi and Laffey, 2006: 330), we argue, requires a further decentring of research on (in)security governance and policing. In so doing, a deeper engagement with postcoloniality is critical and essential. The *postcolonial condition*, or *postcoloniality*, refers to global interactions based on unequal power relations (see Hönke and Müller, 2012: 387). While colonies have nearly disappeared, ‘coloniality’ and the underlying geopolitics of knowledge can still be observed today (Mignolo, 2005; Hall, 1996; Gupta, 1998). As we have argued elsewhere, postcoloniality therefore designates global power relations that are based on binary ‘us versus the inferior other’ constructions. Their underlying recourse to civilization and modernization discourses legitimizes Western interventions that express “the privilege of possessing dominant categories of thought from which and where the rest of the world can be described, understood, and ‘improved’” (Mignolo, 2005: 36). In other words, the Western will to improve is based on a particular polarized and hierarchical form of representation and knowledge production that Coronil (1996: 57), following Said (1978), has called ‘Occidentalism’. He defines this as:

the ensemble of representational practices that participate in the production of conceptions of the world which (1) separate the world’s components into bounded units; (2) disaggregate their relational histories; (3) turn difference into hierarchy; (4) naturalize these representations; and thus (5) intervene, however unwittingly, in the production of existing asymmetrical power relations.

‘Improving’ the world, from colonial and imperial civilizing missions to more contemporary forms of Western interventionist dealing with the postcolonial afterlife of Kipling’s ‘white men’s burden’, has placed the police forces – as well as accompanying practices and knowledge production from strategy to criminology – at the forefront of (post)colonial projects of order-making. As a result, policing remains imbued with Orientalism; deeply inscribed in self-imaginings, institutional memories, and practices. In analogy to what Porter (2009) has termed ‘military Orientalism’, Western police forces institutionalized knowledge, ideas and practices that are based on categorizations of an

## 6 *Jana Hönke and Markus-Michael Müller*

‘us’ vs. an inferior ‘other’ under the guise of a ‘police Orientalism’ (Müller and Ostermeier, 2014). In similar ways as its military counterpart, police Orientalism deeply influences how policing practitioners (and scholars) “formulate what it means to be Western and non-Western” – “from morale to morality, tactics to strategy, casualty tolerance to authority” (Porter, 2009: 2) – and, of course, in terms of the ‘targets’ of policing in and through such transnational encounters that constitute global policing.

Thinking about the postcolonial condition thus implies rejecting the static analytics of bounded units from which security institutions and practices originate and then diffuse (Coronil, 1996; see also Mignolo, 2005). On the contrary, policing is an essentially transnational and transcultural process (Hall, 1996: 247). This process involves shaping and reorganizing entangled ‘local’ and ‘global’ power relations in formerly colonizing or colonized societies as well as in cases that do not have histories of direct colonization. A postcolonial perspective therefore introduces a different reading of capitalist modernity in that it emphasizes the centrality of entangled power/knowledge/practice fields through which unequal power relations emerge and are transformed and challenged.

Therefore, in terms of geographic location, what Bhabha calls “ex-centric” sites (Bhabha, 1994: 6, 262) need to be put on equal analytical footing with supposedly more central ones. These serve as analytical vantage points from which to trace the global making of policing in new ways. As Jean and John Comaroff have argued, “[t]o the degree that the making of modernity has been a world-historical process, it can as well be narrated from its undersides as it can from its self-proclaimed centers” (Comaroff and Comaroff, 2012: 6–7).

Importantly, such ex-centric sites are not just to be found in geographically faraway places. Rather, these margins and the postcolonial power/knowledge relations that produce them as marginalized spaces also characterize the relationship between indigenous people and the majority of the society in settler colonies, such as the US, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. In the latter cases, colonial settler societies that gained political independence continue to marginalize and discriminate against indigenous populations, inscribing postcolonial relations into liberal democratic states that are marked by ongoing struggles over rights and recognition of indigenous groups (Crosby and Monaghan, 2012; Grossman and Sparks, 2005; Johnson, 2011; Valverde, 2012). Similarly, governing migrant and/or diaspora populations and communities inside liberal states fits the picture (Fassin, 2013: 53). Focusing on these phenomena, the book argues, “enables recovery of the entangled global histories and geographies through which security and insecurity are produced” (Laffey and Nadarajah, 2012: 405; see also Hönke, 2013).

### **Global Policing**

Policing is a core aspect of world politics. Broadly conceived, policing encompasses a set of institutions, practices, technologies and forms of knowledge

that aim at establishing a “regulatory power to take coercive measures to ensure the safety and welfare of the ‘community’” (Dubber and Valverde, 2006: 4). Today, this community often remains elusive and is simultaneously constructed as being both ‘local’ and ‘global’. It is crafted in and through policing practices, knowledge and institutions that integrate local and global forces into transnational fields. Such integration processes are directly embedded in power structures related to “the capacity of the police to maintain and reproduce order” (Hardt and Negri, 2001: 17; see also Hills, 2009).

The actors and institutions operating in the transnational fields that populate the uneven topography of global policing are far from homogenous. Nor are the resulting interactions and outcomes the result of a harmonious collaboration. Conflict, competition and resistance are crucial aspects that shape global policing, as well as practices of appropriation, grafting and subversion. Portraying global policing as an activity of a “global police force” (Hardt and Negri, 2001: 17) hence misses the conflicting plurality of the involved actors. Nevertheless, while the “idea of a global police force is a chimera, [...] global policing is a reality” (Bowling and Sheptycki, 2012: 3; see also Bachmann *et al.*, 2015).

Contrary to Bowling and Sheptycki, we argue that the global in global policing should not be reduced to “the capacity to use coercion and surveillant powers around the globe in ways that pass right through national boundaries” (Bowling and Sheptycki, 2012: 7). Nor is it in the seemingly ungoverned “pockets of the global south” where the “flows” of global policing stop (Bowling and Sheptycki, 2012: 126). Such perspectives, while being sensitive towards the global dimension of policing, still reproduce what we criticized above. For one, they reflect the Western-centrism that still dominates much of mainstream international security and policing research. They also underestimate the role played by these ‘pockets of the global south’ in the making of global policing and the “entangled transnational histories of postcolonial (in)security governance” (Hönke and Müller, 2012: 387).

In fact, most standard accounts of the emergence of the modern police assume an endogenous pattern of institution-building, causally related to decisively national variables, such as, for instance, bureaucratic centralization processes, political participation and mobilization, the existence of standing armies, and socioeconomic changes in Western Europe (see Reiner, 2010; Innes, 2003; Neocleous, 2000; Knöbl, 1998; Bayley, 1975). Such interpretations, therefore, reproduce what Hobson has called the “Eurocentric big-bang theory of world politics” according to which the “West is understood to have endogenously self-generated through the Eurocentric logic of immanence” (Hobson, 2012: 139).

This logic of Western immanence is at odds with empirical findings of the rich historical research on the impact of imperial and colonial policing on metropolitan developments, from the “age of empire” (Hobsbawm, 1987) to our “colonial present” (Gregory, 2004). Ranging from the composition of metropolitan policing and contemporary counterterrorism by British colonial

## 8 *Jana Hönke and Markus-Michael Müller*

policing in Northern Ireland (Williams, 2004; Ellison and O'Reilly, 2008) to the making of American policing in the Philippines (McCoy, 2009b, this volume) and Latin America (Müller, 2015; Rosenau, 2014), these studies have demonstrated that colonial territories and imperial encounters were veritable “laboratories of modernity” (Stoler and Cooper, 1997: 5). As in other fields of modern governmental practices, imperial and colonizing powers experimented with policing, social control, and surveillance-related practices, knowledge, and technologies. In the guise of what Hanna Arendt (see also Foucault, 2003: 103; Graham and Baker, this volume) describes as “the boomerang effect of imperialism on the homeland” (Arendt, 1973: 155), these experiments travelled back home, thereby producing a cross-fertilization (Sinclair, this volume; Sinclair and Williams, 2007) between colonial and metropolitan policing practices and knowledge. These processes and their effects characterize global security institutions and practices long after formal colonialism and the age of empires came to an end (see also Brogden, 1987; Brogden and Ellison, 2012: Chap. 1; McCoy, this volume, 2009a; Müller, 2015; Sinclair, 2006; Thomas, 2011; Williams, 2004).

This continuing legacy of such policing encounters has been demonstrated in a paradigmatic way in Alfred McCoy's (2009a; 2009b) detailed analysis of the entanglement of (post)colonial policing and state formation in the United States and the Philippines. His work showcases the crucial role of policing and surveillance technology within the mutually reinforcing patterns of (post) colonial state formation and the emergence of surveillance regimes, knowledge production, and security techniques and technologies in both countries. Freed from legal and constitutional constraints, McCoy demonstrates how the US colonial administration in the Philippines experimented with policing strategies and surveillance technologies that were later reimported back home, thereby “making the Philippines a social laboratory for the perfection of American state power” (McCoy 2009a: 106) – an ongoing process of security entanglements from the beginning of the twentieth century to the contemporary ‘War on Terror’ (see also McCoy, this volume).

Moreover, while, in light of these observations, global postcolonial policing entanglements could easily be read as reducing postcolonies to the status of laboratories for external actors to refine and modify policing practices, it is important to keep in mind the agency of seemingly marginalized actors in postcolonies. The latter actively contribute to circulating technologies and practices of policing, and also appropriate, (re)negotiate, and modify externally promoted and imposed policing models (Belcher, 2015; Hönke and Müller, 2012: 387–8; see also the discussions by Tickner and Bilgin in this volume).

These insights can be brought into a productive dialogue with postcolonial perspectives within security studies. In fact, it seems that while historical policing research provides ample illustrations of basic analytical claims made by postcolonial scholars, there has been strikingly little interest in engaging with postcolonial ideas and concepts. Therefore, we claim that the rich empirical findings from historians working on imperial and (post)colonial

policing, and the more abstract analytical and theoretical tools offered by postcolonial (security) studies, which all stress the co-constituted character of global policing, can be combined to ‘provincialise’ (Chakrabaty, 2000) contemporary knowledge of global policing. This is accomplished by rejecting its inherent Western-centrism and parochialism that perpetuates epistemological boundaries. The latter, as Boatcă *et al.* have argued in another context, “so far have prevented the emergence of a global sociology of colonial, neocolonial and postcolonial [policing] contexts” (Boatcă *et al.*, 2010: 14).

### **The global making of policing: Analytics for studying up, across and in-between**

From the above follows that alternative analytical perspectives are needed that better recognize the entangled character of (policing) histories. Accordingly, the contributions to this book all open up avenues for such research. Building on methodological reflections developed in more detail elsewhere (Hönke and Müller, 2012), all contributions move beyond dominant North–South perspectives on global policing. They all strive for a methodology that engages multiple ‘metropolises’ and (post)‘colonies’, treating them as part of one relational field. Far from simply reflecting a one-way North–South governance diffusion as suggested by Bowling and Sheptycki, the chapters reveal the much more complex and multidirectional processes at play in the global making of policing technologies and practices. They highlight the distributed agency in the making of policing but also the hierarchy and violence inherent in liberal global policing. As for the latter, it is, for instance, shown how some of the entanglements that underpin the export-import business of global policing work according to a veritable logic of laboratories: a number of sites in the postcolony indeed function as laboratories of postmodern security governance; as sites in which technologies of control are tried out that would not be at home, yet that then travel to Springfield and elsewhere shaping, e.g., domestic surveillance, urban policing or border controls in ‘the West’ (Coaffee and Wood, 2006; Müller, 2015; see Graham and Baker, McCoy, and Stockmarr in this volume). In order to do this, and without claiming to be the first nor alone “in refusing disciplinary boundaries and decrying some of their effects” (Jessop and Ngai-Ling, 2001: 89), the chapters offer distinctly transdisciplinary perspectives and integrate perspectives that are rarely brought into a productive dialogue with each other, namely Criminology, International Relations, Area Studies, History, and Science, Technology and Society Studies.

As argued throughout, where we ask questions *from* is crucial. It is also paramount to determine what method(ologie)s we adopt to find and pursue these questions. In this regard, our contribution ties in with recent efforts in IR to reflect and further explicate empirical strategies and method(ologie)s for an international sociology of IR, a decolonizing of IR, and critical security studies (see, for instance, Vrasti, 2008; Sabaratnam, 2011; Hönke and Müller, 2012; Aradau *et al.*, 2015). As Aradau *et al.* (2015) recently re-emphasized,

10 *Jana Hönke and Markus-Michael Müller*

treating methods as afterthoughts to theory already (re)produces a particular (political) practice of knowledge production. Embracing a critical, reflexive approach to methods in their interplay with methodology and theory opens up space for rethinking and theorizing the global making of policing. Down-to-earth engagement with empirical case studies provides for a more fine-tuned analysis than the prevailing metanarrative engagement with the postcolonial relationship between empire(s)/metropole(s) and peripheries. We hope that this will contribute to developing empirical research strategies for decentering and decolonizing our understanding of the global making of policing, and international security more generally.

We suggest three analytical strategies that appear particularly useful in this regard. A first analytical perspective that we would like to single out revolves around ‘laboratories’. The laboratory refers to situations in which new, often exclusionary and violent technologies of policing are being developed and tested with the active contribution of Western actors in (post)colonies deemed in need of being policed differently. However, these modes and technologies constitute policing in Springfield as much as in Afghanistan. They travel across the globe and back to shape ‘homeland security’ in the metropole. An important channel for such travelling back is the growing global economy around homeland security (see Stockmarr, this volume). Such processes are also evident in the growing interest in the use of drones (first massively deployed in the ‘War on Terror’ abroad) for ‘domestic’ urban policing and border enforcement in the United States (see Graham and Baker, this volume).

The second analytical axis revolves around ‘South–South’ security encounters and whether these contribute to decolonizing policing. Global policing is global in the sense that such entanglements are not limited to North–South encounters, which continue to dominate most research on transnational security governance. An example of South–South connections are UN peacekeeping operations in which Southern countries like Bangladesh, India, and Pakistan play an increasingly important role as personnel-providing nations (see, for example, Krishnasamy, 2001, 2003). Latin American countries like Brazil and Guatemala have also added to this trend with active participation in UN missions like the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH, see Müller, this volume) or the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) (on these issues, see *International Peacekeeping*, 2010). South–South security transfers also take on more commodified forms on the growing global “market of force” (Avant, 2005), where private military companies tend to recruit former military personnel from countries in the Global South for security operations in places like Iraq or Afghanistan. Furthermore, about one-third of the assumed 30,000 private military contractors that formed part of the international intervention in Iraq came from other countries than the United States and Great Britain. A substantial number was in fact ex-military personnel from Latin America, leading one observer to call their presence “Latin America’s hidden war in Iraq” (*Foreign Policy*, 2007). Hence, the

global character of global policing is also reflected in such entanglements identifiable within, between and across different postcolonies (Khalili, 2010; Müller, in this volume; Tickner, in this volume). Questions to be explored are how global policing is made in these encounters, a making largely invisible so far; and whether these entanglements make for a different, perhaps also a – as some have called for – more decolonial global policing?

Third, it is important to scrutinize how policing is made, performed, enacted and shaped by multiple actors and their everyday practices in global security assemblages, and how this is shaped by the postcolonial condition. Security experts and practitioners operate as part of transnational social fields in which what counts as ‘security problems’ and ‘standard practices’ is constantly (re)produced and shaped. “[T]ransnational professional guilds” (Bigo, 2011: 250) are crucial for tracing how ideas, technologies and practices of policing are turned into something global, but also for how these get made and transformed. The role of the postcolony in these contexts requires more attention though. Many of the Bourdieu-inspired studies of professional security fields have concentrated on Europe (but see Müller, 2014), or on professional knowledge and routine practice as generated from traditional Weberian-state military and police institutions or multinational private security and military companies. This is, however, only part of the story and postcolonial insights help here to decentre and sharpen critical attention to the postcolonial. The hybrid regime of policing practices prevailing around the sites of multinational oil and mining companies is a case in point here. Far from ‘the local’ corrupting ‘global’ norms of corporate social responsibility, routine practices of producing order by way of clientelist, indirect rule and physical coercion, alongside community engagement, has been co-produced by African politicians and security agents with multinational companies and commercial security professionals working with them (Hönke, 2013). A postcolonial lens helps to shed light on how postcolonial hierarchies shape dynamics within these fields, but also on how ex-centric sites and actors play a role in producing and shaping global policing (Laffey and Nadarajah, Sinclair, this volume). Likewise, new transnational subjects deemed problematic surface, as transnational security assemblages evolving around diaspora (see Laffey and Nadarajah, this volume). A postcolonial lens here captures the socially and geographically dispersed agency in the global making of policing.

### **Contributions: on laboratories, ‘South–South’ encounters and postcolonial transnational assemblages**

Building on the above outlined understanding of the uneven yet entangled and co-produced security topographies of our present, the following chapters offer alternative histories of the making of global policing. They engage the theoretical and methodological issues developed above through in-depth analyses of specific security encounters and processes of making policing institutions and practices. By so doing they create space for constructing

## 12 *Jana Hönke and Markus-Michael Müller*

alternative categories for making sense of our contemporary world, and overall contribute to broaden and deepen postcolonial perspectives in security studies and IR more broadly.

The first set of chapters revolves around laboratories. Chapter two, by *Alfred McCoy*, traces the origins of US internal security back to America's imperial conquest of the Philippines and the related emergence of the US as a global power from circa 1898. McCoy demonstrates how, from the start of the US occupation in 1898, the Philippines served as the site of a social experiment in the use of police as an instrument of state power. At this periphery of empire, freed from the constraints of courts, constitution, and civil society, the US colonial regime fused new information technologies, the product of America's first information revolution, to create what was arguably the world's first full 'surveillance state'. A decade later, these illiberal lessons percolated homeward through the invisible capillaries of empire to foster domestic US surveillance during the social crisis surrounding World War I. These innovations have persisted, in various forms, for nearly a century, informing robotic regimes and digital surveillance today.

Looking at US–Israeli collaboration in urban policing, *Stephen Graham* and *Alex Baker* explore, in the third chapter, the connections between the militarization of policing and pacification within the United States – and the tightening connections between the parallel efforts of the US and Israeli militaries to reorganize themselves in ways that counter non-state mobilizations in occupied cities during counterinsurgency campaigns. Opening up with a discussion of recent controversies surrounding paramilitarized policing in places like Ferguson, Missouri, the chapter connects these to a range of deep connections between US and Israeli military 'urban operations' in Gaza. Discussions centre, in turn, on legal and biopolitical issues; the role of Gaza as a 'laboratory'; urban walling; drone operations; the commercialization of 'homeland security' materiel; and, finally, joint economic ventures in the blurring worlds of 'homeland security' and urban counterinsurgency operations.

From a different angle, *Leila Stockmarr* examines in the fourth chapter the export of security practices from the Gaza showroom to the global homeland security economy. Israel's practices of policing in and around the Gaza Strip have created a model of security that is exported to a variety of settings globally. Stockmarr traces how a growing industry of Israeli security companies has developed a range of tools in cooperation with the Israeli military to govern people and places with a minimum of human contact and friction. Based on the long-term experience of settler colonial rule, this has turned Gaza into a security 'laboratory' for a global market of policing. In drawing upon original empirical data collected at arms fairs and interviews with producers of security technology in Israel, the chapter shows how logics of control are transferred into exportable and commercialized homeland security products; the 'Gaza experience' being packaged in ways that fit other contexts not necessarily linked to warfare and anti-terrorist enterprises. The global security market relies on such productions of technologies of policing in



localities such as Gaza, and it is hence argued that the transnational movement of security logics and technology creates a tight connection between warfare, border control and mundane policing. In this way, Israeli practices and private companies' involvement in Gaza provide input to a broader industry of inequality management and pacification, which encompasses militaries, private security and police forces on a global scale: a global making of policing.

The second set of chapters moves away from the 'laboratory' settings above and zooms in on newly emerging powers and the making of global policing in 'South-South' security encounters, which have received very little attention in the policing literature so far. In chapter five, *Markus-Michael Müller* examines the entanglement of pacification strategies between Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, and Port-au-Prince, Haiti. The chapter analyses attempts by the Rio de Janeiro city government to implement a new community-oriented policing scheme, symbolized by the creation of the so-called 'Pacification Police Units' (UPPs), in order to 'pacify' and 'develop' the city's most marginalized urban areas for two mega-events (the 2014 Soccer World Championship and the 2016 Olympic Games). It is shown that the UPPs are directly inspired by the experiences of the Brazilian peacekeeping efforts in Haiti within the context of MINUSTAH (Mission des Nations Unies pour la stabilisation en Haïti) and the underlying practices of counterinsurgent urban pacification efforts and 'population-centric' militarized policing. In analysing the travelling of urban counterinsurgency policing practices between Rio de Janeiro and Port-au-Prince this chapter illustrates how Brazil's participation in MINUSTAH converted Haiti into a counterinsurgency laboratory. As these counterinsurgent policing practices travel back and forth between Haiti and contemporary Rio de Janeiro, they re-articulate a pattern of authoritarian Brazilian urban policing that was modelled upon the French counterinsurgency approach in the Algerian war. Moreover, they also interact with the domestic postcolonial legacies of Brazilian policing and its deeply embedded practice of suppressing the racialized urban 'other'. In tracing these postcolonial counterinsurgent policing entanglements in the Global South, Müller demonstrates how 'population-centric' policing contributed to the resurgence of torture, disappearances and extralegal killings in 'pacified' Rio de Janeiro.

Moving us from Brazil and Haiti to Colombia, *Arlene Tickner* demonstrates in chapter six that the triangulation with the United States has become a key component of Colombian efforts to export security regionally (to other Latin American countries) and globally (e.g., to West Africa). The chapter analyses this new mode of 'North-South-South' security interaction through the lens of 'associated dependent cooperation', which is characterized by the continuation of asymmetry and non-zero sum interaction between the core and periphery. Tickner shows that Colombia's status as a security provider is premised on recognition of the superiority of US knowledge and efforts to gain favour within the core-periphery structure rather than challenging it.

#### 14 *Jana Hönke and Markus-Michael Müller*

However, by tracing how US readings of security were transferred first to Colombia and then re-exported, the chapter also illustrates the mimicry, and hence Colombian agency, at play in asymmetrical international security cooperation.

The third set of chapters revolves around the making of global policing in postcolonial transnational security assemblages. In chapter seven, *Mark Laffey* and *Suthaharan Nadarajah* explore the transnational security governance of diasporas as a window onto the global making of policing. It starts from the observation that scholarly and policy research identifies the diaspora as a key source of insecurity for the state. For example, diaspora is now prominently linked to armed conflicts elsewhere as well as to the possibilities of foreign danger while threatening to penetrate the domestic arena. Viewed in this way, the diaspora prompts the production of forms of power/knowledge centred on securing the nation-state and, by extension, international order. Using the Tamil diaspora in Britain as a case study, it argues that policing – understood as governance directed to the production of security – is interwoven with and co-constituted by the challenges to order that policing articulates as transnational threats and seeks to extinguish. Against accounts that situate the origins of such knowledge and practice in Eurocentric diffusionist models of the international, the chapter reveals the intimate relations between policing in the metropole and liberal order-making in the periphery. All of this demonstrates the mutual implication of the ‘global’ and the ‘local’ and of ‘liberal’ and ‘non-liberal’ worlds.

Chapter eight then moves on to the global making of international police assistance. *Georgina Sinclair* examines how deploying police to provide overseas assistance has markedly increased since the mid-1990s. Focussing on the experiences of UK police officers undertaking overseas missions from 1999 to 2014, she shows how the transfer of a ‘Western’ (in this case, ‘British’) policing style is confronted by other diverse police nationalities, many originating from the Global South. It is argued that international policing (assistance) in practice has indeed started to move away from a North–South police dialogue to becoming a global policing exchange. Through fieldwork and oral testimonies of UK police officers professional-cultural exchanges have been described as a process of ‘exchange of capacity’. It is argued that the international policing experiences gained by these officers when working alongside multiple international police partners also reshape police work at home.

The ninth chapter by *Lars Ostermeier* uses a translational perspective for analysing the global making of policing, taking international police-building programmes in Afghanistan as an empirical example. Analysing the performativity of processes of translation, it discusses how ‘progress’ in police-building programmes is enacted across transnational organizational and cultural spaces. For doing so, it draws on interviews conducted in Afghanistan and Germany, policy papers and academic studies. It is shown how through processes of translation, multiple realities of ‘modern’ and ‘Western’ concepts of policing are interwoven with concepts and empirical practices in use in

Afghanistan. Challenging the presumed existence of fixed policing knowledge that is available for transfer and implementation, it is argued that knowledge about policing is simultaneously globalized and differentiated across multiple levels and localities. These processes of translation enact ‘progress’ by constantly reformulating concepts for police-building projects and their objectives – a process of a global making of policing.

The conclusion, by *Pinar Bilgin*, discusses the contribution of this book to current debates in IR, postcolonial and security studies. Bilgin puts particular emphasis on the relevance of ‘co-constitutive approach’ to the study of the global making of policing. With its focus on how actors from the Global North and Global South interact with and learn from each other, while simultaneously getting transformed in the process, she argues that this perspective allows to shed light on the roles played by both sides in the production of goods and ideas, and their mutual transformation through this interaction. It is through such a perspective, she concludes, that the hierarchical relationship between the core and the periphery, the agency exercised by the latter, and the limits of that agency, can be assessed in a comprehensive way that leads to a better understanding of the global making of policing from a postcolonial perspective.

## **Bibliography**

- Abrahamsen, R. (2003). ‘African Studies and the Postcolonial Challenge’, *African Affairs* 102(407): 189–210.
- Agathangelou, A.M. and Ling, L.H.M. (2004). ‘Power, Borders, Security, Wealth: Lessons of Violence and Desire from September 11’, *International Studies Quarterly* 48(3): 517–538.
- Aradau, C., Huysmans, J., Neal, A. and Voelkner, N. (2015). *Critical Security Methods. New Frameworks for Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Arendt, H. (1973). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. and Tiffin, H. (eds) (2007). *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts*. London: Routledge.
- Avant, D. (2005). *The Market for Force: The Consequences of Privatizing Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bachmann, J., Bell, C. and Holmqvist, C. (eds) (2015). *War, Police and Assemblages of Intervention*. London: Routledge.
- Barkawi, T. and Laffey, M. (2006). ‘The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies’, *Review of International Studies* 32(2): 329–352.
- Barkawi, T. and Stanski, K. (2013). *Orientalism and War*. London: Hurst.
- Bayley, D.H. (1975). ‘The Police and Political Development in Europe’, in: Tilly, C. (ed.) *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 328–379.
- Belcher, O. (2015). ‘Tribal Militias, Neo-Orientalism, and the US-Military’s Art of Coercion’, in: Bachmann, J., Bell, C. and Holmqvist, C. (eds) *War, Police and Assemblages of Intervention*. London: Routledge, pp. 109–125.
- Bhabha, H.K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

16 *Jana Hönke and Markus-Michael Müller*

- Bhambra, G.K. (2010). 'Historical Sociology, International Relations and Connected Histories', *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 23(1): 127–143.
- Bigo, D. (2011). 'Pierre Bourdieu and International Relations: Power of Practices, Practices of Power', *International Political Sociology* 5: 225–258.
- Boatcă, M., Costa, S. and Gutiérrez Rodríguez, E. (2010). 'Introduction. Decolonizing European Sociology: Different Paths towards a Pending Project', in: Gutiérrez Rodríguez, E., Boatcă, M. and Costa, S. (eds) *Decolonizing European Sociology: Transdisciplinary Approaches*. Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 1–12.
- Bowling, B. and Sheptycki, J. (2012). *Global Policing*. London: Sage.
- Brogden, M. (1987). 'The Emergence of Policing – The Colonial Dimension', *British Journal of Criminology* 27(1): 4–14.
- Brogden, M. and Ellison, G. (2012). *Policing in an Age of Austerity: A Postcolonial Perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Brune, N. (2011). 'The Brazil-Africa Narco Nexus', *Americas Quarterly* 5(4): 59.
- Buzan, B. and Hansen, L. (2009). *The Evolution of International Security Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chakrabaty, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe. Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Chatterjee, P. (2004). *The Politics of the Governed. Reflections on Popular Politics in Most of the World*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Chowdry, G. and Nair, S. (eds) (2002). *Power and Postcolonialism in International Relations: Reading Race, Gender and Class*. London: Routledge.
- Coaffee, J. and Wood, D.M. (2006). 'Security Is Coming Home: Rethinking Scale and Constructing Resilience in the Global Urban Response to Terrorist Risk', *International Relations* 20(4): 503–517.
- Collier, S.J. and Ong, A. (2006). 'Global Assemblages, Anthropological Problems', in: Ong, A. and Collier, S.J. (eds) *Global Assemblages: Technology, Politics, and Ethics as Anthropological Problems*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 3–21.
- Comaroff, J. and Comaroff, J.L. (2012). *Theory from the South: Or, How Euro-America Is Evolving Toward Africa*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Coronil, F. (1996). 'Beyond Occidentalism: Toward Nonimperial Geohistorical Categories', *Cultural Anthropology* 11(1): 51–87.
- Crosby, A. and Monaghan, J. (2012). 'Settler Governmentality in Canada and the Algonquins of Barriere Lake', *Security Dialogue* October 43(5): 421–438.
- Dubber, M.D. and Valverde, M. (2006). 'Perspectives on the Power and Science of Police', in: Dubber, M.D. and Valverde, M. (eds) *The New Police Science: Police Power in Domestic and International Governance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Ellison, G. and O'Reilly, C. (2008). 'From Empire to Iraq and the "War on Terror": The Transplantation and Commodification of the (Northern) Irish Policing Experience', *Police Quarterly* 11(4): 395–426.
- Fassin, D. (2013). *Enforcing Producing Order. An Ethnography of Urban Policing*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Foreign Policy* (2007). 'Latin America's Hidden War in Iraq', 11 October.
- Foucault, M. (2003). *Society Must Be Defended. Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–6*. London: Allen Lane.
- Gregory, D. (2004). *The Colonial Present*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Grossman, M. and Sparks, C. (2005). 'Unsettled States', *Postcolonial Studies* 8(3): 235–241.

- Gupta, A. (1998) *Postcolonial Development: Agriculture and the Making of Modern India*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hall, S. (1992). 'The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power', in: Hall, S. and Geiben, B. (eds) *Formations of Modernity*. Oxford: Open University/Polity Press.
- Hall, S. (1996) 'When Was the "Post-Colonial"? Thinking at the Limits', in: Chambers, I. and Curti, L. (eds) *The Post-Colonial Question*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 242–260.
- Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2001). *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hills, A. (2009). *Policing Post-Conflict Cities*. London: Zed Books.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1987). *The Age of Empire: 1875–1914*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Hobson, J.M. (2012). *The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics: Western International Theory, 1760–2010*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hönke, J. (2013). *Transnational Companies and Security Governance. Hybrid Practices in a Postcolonial World*. London: Routledge.
- Hönke, J. and Müller, M.-M. (2012). 'Governing (In)Security in a Postcolonial World: Transnational Entanglements and the Worldliness of Local Practice', *Security Dialogue* 43(5): 383–402.
- Innes, M. (2003). *Understanding Social Control: Crime and Social Order in Late Modernity*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- International Peacekeeping* (2010). *Special Issue: South American Perspectives on Peace Operations*.
- Jessop, B. and Ngai-Ling, S. (2001). 'Pre-disciplinary and Post-disciplinary Perspectives', *New Political Economy* 6(1): 89–101.
- Johnson, M. (2011). 'Reconciliation, indigeneity, and postcolonial nationhood in settler states', *Postcolonial Studies* 14(2): 187–201.
- Khalili, L. (2010): 'The Location of Palestine in Global Counterinsurgency', *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 41(2): 413–433.
- Kienscherf, M. (forthcoming). "'A Struggle for Control and Influence": Western Counterinsurgency and the Problematic of Autonomy', in: Moe, L.W. and Müller, M. M. (eds) *Reconfiguring Intervention: Complexity, Resilience and the Local Turn in Counterinsurgent Warfare*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Knöbl, W. (1998). *Polizei und Herrschaft im Modernisierungsprozeß. Staatsbildung und innere Sicherheit in Preußen, England und Amerika 1700–1914*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.
- Krishna, S. (1999). *Postcolonial Insecurities: India, Sri Lanka, and the Question of Nationhood*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Krishnasamy, K. (2001). "'Recognition" for Third World Peacekeepers: India and Pakistan', *International Peacekeeping* 8(4): 56–76.
- Krishnasamy, K. (2003). 'Bangladesh and UN Peacekeeping: The Participation of a "Small" State', *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics* 41(1): 24–47.
- Laffey, M. and Nadarajah, S. (2012). 'The Hybridity of Liberal Peace: States, Diasporas and Insecurity', *Security Dialogue* October 43(5): 403–420.
- Ling, L.H.M. (2002). *Postcolonial International Relations: Conquest and Desire between Asia and the West*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Loomba, A. (2005). *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London: Routledge.
- McCoy, A.W. (2009a). 'Policing the Imperial Periphery: Philippine Pacification and the Rise of the U.S. National Security State', in: McCoy, A.W. and Scrano, F.A. (eds) *Colonial Crucible. Empire in the Making of the Modern American State*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, pp. 106–115.

18 *Jana Hönke and Markus-Michael Müller*

- McCoy, A.W. (2009b). *Policing America's Empire. The United States, the Philippines, and the Rise of the Surveillance State*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Mignolo, W. (2005). *The Idea of Latin America*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Millenium* (2011). 'Special issue: Dialogue in international relations', 39(3): 607–803.
- Müller, M.-M. (2014). 'De-monopolizing the Bureaucratic Field: Internationalization Strategies and the Transnationalization of Security Governance in Mexico City', *Alternatives* 39(1): 37–54.
- Müller, M.-M. (2015). 'Punitive Entanglements: The "War on Gangs" and the Making of a Transnational Penal Apparatus in the Americas', *Geopolitics* 20(3): 696–727.
- Müller, M.-M. and Ostermeier, L. (2014). *Decolonizing German Police Building: The (Post) Colonial Afterlife of the Deutsch-Afghanische Freundschaft*. Paper presented at the conference 'Policing Empires: Social Control, Political Transition, (Post)Colonial Legacies', Bruxelles.
- Muppidi, H. (1999). 'Postcoloniality and the Production of International Insecurity: The Persistent Puzzle of U.S.–Indian relations', in: Weldes, J., Laffey, M., Gusterson, H. and Duvall, R. (eds) *Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities and the Production of Danger*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 119–146.
- Neocleous, M. (2000). *The Fabrication of Social Order: A Critical Theory of Police Power*. London: Pluto Press.
- Paolini, A.J., Elliott, A. and Moran, A. (eds) (1999). *Navigating Modernity: Post-colonialism, Identity, and International Relations*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Porter, P. (2009). *Military Orientalism. Eastern War through Western Eyes*. London: Hurst.
- Reiner, R. (2010). *The Politics of the Police*. Fourth Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 39–114.
- Rosenau, W. (2014). "'Our Ghettos Too, Need a Lansdale": American Counter-Insurgency Abroad and at Home in the Vietnam Era', in: Gvener, W., Jones, C.D.M. and Smith, M.R.L. (eds) *The New Counter-Insurgency Era in Critical Perspective*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillian, pp. 111–126.
- Sabaratnam, M. (2011). 'IR in Dialogue, but Can We Change the Subjects? A Typology of Decolonising Strategies for the Study of World Politics', *Millenium*: 1–23.
- Said, E.W. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.
- Seth, S. (2013a). *Postcolonial Theory and International Relations*. London: Routledge.
- Seth, S. (2013b). 'Introduction', in: Seth, S. (ed.) *Postcolonial Theory and International Relations. A Critical Introduction*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–13.
- Sinclair, G. (2006). *At the End of the Line. Colonial Policing and the Imperial Endgame 1945–80*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Sinclair, G. and Williams, C.A. (2007). "'Home and Away": The Cross-Fertilisation between "Colonial" and "British" Policing, 1921–1985', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 35(2): 221–238.
- Slater, D. (2004). *Geopolitics and the Post-Colonial. Rethinking North–South Relations*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Steinmetz, G. (1999). 'Culture and the State', in: Steinmetz, G. (ed.) *State/Culture: State-formation after the Cultural Turn*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, pp. 1–49.
- Stoler, A.L. and Cooper, F. (1997). 'Between Metropole and Colony. Rethinking a Research Agenda', in: Stoler, A.L. and Cooper, F. (eds) *Tensions of Empire. Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, pp. 1–58.
- Thomas, M. (2011). 'Introduction: Mapping Violence onto French Colonial Minds', in: Thomas, M. (ed.) *The French Colonial Mind, Volume 2. Violence, Military Encounters, and Colonialism*. Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, pp. xi–liii.

*The global making of policing* 19

- Valverde, M. (2012). 'The Crown in a Multicultural Age: The Changing Epistemology of (Post)colonial Sovereignty', *Social & Legal Studies* 21(1): 3–21.
- Vasilaki, R. (2013). 'Provincialising IR Deadlocks and Prospects in Post-Western IR Theory', *Millenium* 41(1): 3–22.
- Vrasti, W. (2008). 'The Strange Case of Ethnography and International Relations', *Millennium* 37(2): 279–301.
- Washington Times* (2013). 'Massachusetts Police Take Iraq Counterinsurgency Tactics to Streets to Fight Gangs', 6 May.
- Williams, R. (2004). 'A State of Permanent Exception', *Interventions* 5(3): 322–344.
- Young, R. (2003). *Postcolonialism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.