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Introduction
New racial missions of policing: comparative studies of state authority, urban governance, and security technology in the twenty-first century

Paul Amar

(First submission September 2009; First published December 2009)

Abstract
Why do police worldwide continue to reproduce race, racism and ethnic conflicts even as more members from historically stigmatized groups participate in policing, and as states adopt explicitly post-colonial, anti-racist policy agendas? Why do new policing practices and technologies affirm racial, caste and ethnic distinctions even as diversity and anti-racial profiling campaigns become central to defining norms of police professionalism in every world region? In this introduction to this collection, I will begin by acknowledging how the intersections of policing and race have returned to the forefront of public and academic concern in the US and UK. I then provide context by highlighting the gaps in the literature that this set of contributions addresses. I conclude by sketching the outline of a comparative, international framework for studies of race and ethnicity that aims to offer fresh avenues for scholarship and policy-making.
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named after an Irish militant nationalist, identified strongly with new post-racial professional norms and was described as a leader in implementing anti-racist reforms within a racially integrated police department. In fact, Sgt Crowley had been promoted by a black mayor of Cambridge; and a black police chief of Lowell chose the sergeant to lead a training course on ending practices of racial profiling within the police, which he had done since 2004. But at Professor Gates’ front door, the achievements of decades of police reforms around race seemed to evaporate.

In an emergency call to the police, a neighbour had reported seeing two men possibly attempting to open the door to Gates’ house. In fact, the men in question were Gates and his driver, who were simply prying loose a screen door that was stuck. The cautious neighbour had not reported the men as black and had underlined that they might, in fact, be residents of the home. But when the police operator relayed the message to the officers on duty, the operator raised the urgency level by mis-stating that the neighbour had reported two black men breaking in. When Sgt Crowley arrived, Gates was already inside and settled in his own home. The officer demanded to enter and ordered Gates to produce his identification. Gates complied, but also angrily demanded to see Crowley’s identification and badge number. Crowley refused to comply and decided to punish Gates for his pride. Crowley did not, it would seem, draw upon his own sensitivity training and the new values of anti-racist professionalism that he had taught others for so long. Crowley arrested the professor in Gates’ own home, charging him with a baseless disorderly conduct charge that was dropped after Gates spent a few hours in jail.

Meanwhile, in the United Kingdom, another model police service, known for its world-standard, race-conscious reforms was also redefining itself around issues of pride, fear and insecurity rather than legal accountability or racial justice. A few months earlier, on 12 December 2008, a jury in the United Kingdom had found that police had acted ‘unlawfully’ when they shot dead the mixed-race, 27-year-old Brazilian electrician Jean Charles de Menezes. But this was an ‘open ruling’ which held no specific officers or police administrators accountable. The London Metropolitan Police had killed the young man in the London underground in July 2005 in the days following the terrorist attacks on subway trains, carried out by young British Muslims. Ten years earlier, following the police mishandling of the investigation of the racially motivated murder of black teenager Stephen Lawrence, Judge Sir William Macpherson released a report on the London Metropolitan Police that included seventy recommendations for how to change police cultures, institutional practices and accountability structures in order to root out institutional racism. This report became a template for police reform around the world.
As in the Gates case above, interpretations of the Menezes case split into two irreconcilable camps. Some focused on the persistence of racism in a police force that had served as a world model. Others refused all engagements with questions of race and, instead, asserted the authority of police as heroes whose security and pride must be bolstered as they struggle to defend the city from the new threat of suicide bombers. In July 2009, the Metropolitan Black Police Association said they would not advise black and Asian officers to join the force, as they may face intimidation and violence within the institution.

These recent police controversies in the US and UK allow us to glimpse changing patterns of governance and social structure, and to identify trends and paradoxes of interest to students of race, ethnicity and modernity. The cases above reveal the tensions that arise when new industries of security, which equate high degrees of social difference with dangerous levels of risk, are married to new forms of publically-minded professionalism that champion diversity (Bolton 2004). Also, we see how outward-looking reformist governments, whose leadership now includes members of historically stigmatized groups, have reached out to tutor the world and export ‘progressive’ models (Weitzer and Tuch 2006), all while seeming to reproduce or intensify racial logics at home (Phillips 2007). And we witness how city spaces have become repressive zones of surveillance and racialized fear (Keith 2005; Wacquant 2007), riddled with cameras and civilian informants, just as law enforcement consolidates an international consensus on the need to ensure community trust and provide equal protection to each individual. But what can we learn about these seemingly incompatible trends in police and security agendas by leaving behind the much explored cases of the US and UK to adopt a more global, comparative approach to these issues?

This research taken as a whole, represents a comparative project that tracks country-by-country distinctions in national legal norms, security technologies and discourses of state authority that converge around changing policing systems. We argue that intersections and contradictions between these trends are often managed through agendas that continue to essentialize and reproduce race and ethnic identities and hierarchies, even as law-enforcement professionals insist on the eradication or denial of racial and ethnic discrimination.

Anti-racial policing in a world of diversity

Police services in racially hierarchical and ethnically conflictual societies increasingly incorporate citizens from historically stigmatized groups as officers or administrators. But, paradoxically, in many of these same societies, levels of police violence and racial targeting of
ethnic and caste groups are increasing just as police are implementing diversity and desegregation goals. What mechanisms allow these two trends to coincide and sometimes to reinforce each other? Why do new policing practices and technologies affirm racial, caste and ethnic distinctions, even as diversity and anti-racial profiling campaigns become central to defining norms of police professionalism in every world region?

Part of the answer to these questions lies in the ways that contradictory agendas – between intensive state-driven development and market-oriented neoliberalism, as well as between militarized humanitarianism and anti-militarist human rights politics – have been forged together locally and transmitted internationally by expanding the moral charges and civilizing undertakings of policing. The title of this collection highlights the increasing resemblance of police operations to travelling ‘mission’ organizations – their increasing links to humanitarian rescue missions, their historical relationship to colonial civilizing missions, their interest in exporting and inculcating morals and values, and their increasing tendency to operate as ‘missionaries of modernization’, carrying new forms of social control, urban spatial order and security technology into urban and international zones represented as ‘savage’ or ‘at-risk’. Although the new missions of policing appear, in the frameworks of liberal and humanitarian understandings, as neutral, secular, techno-professional innovations, we argue that the symbolic and social power of these new missions of policing is not fully comprehensible without recognition of their embededdness within racial, ethnic and/or caste orders, and the illiberal economic, religious and governance structures that draw power from them.

This special issue of Ethnic and Racial Studies brings together interdisciplinary and international work by social scientists to probe shifts and patterns in racialized practices of policing and related security and justice systems in Africa, Latin America, North America, Europe and Asia. The range of work in this collection addresses certain gaps in race studies literature, which I will discuss briefly below. Together, these essays also provide a new framework for a comparative analysis of race and policing. In the remainder of this introduction, I detail this new framework by drawing directly upon the contributors and their convergence around three objects of analysis: (1) new forms of authority deployed by the neoliberal state; (2) projects that remake urban space, territory and class; and (3) technologies and professional norms linked to globalizing security industries. Rather than walk through the authors’ contributions in the order they appear, this introductory essay traces how these contributions converse with each other around these three themes.
Methods for analyzing police and race

This issue builds a bridge between critical race scholarship and the more public-policy-oriented fields of criminology and police studies. Since the 1960s, empirical studies and policy reforms in the law enforcement arena have been concerned with questions of race relations and racial prejudice. But many of the recent innovations in comparative race/ethnicity scholarship (Twine 2000; Goldberg 2002; Gunaratman 2003; Bulmer and Solomos 2004) have not been integrated by police/crime/justice studies. Likewise, some scholars of race have missed out on police studies work on political-economic structures, training regimes, professional cultures and the growing influence of private sector military companies (Shearing 1983; Bayley 1996, 2005; Amar and Schneider 2003; Andreas and Nadelmann 2006). What is lacking is an interrogation of how new forms of criminal-justice racism in the North relate to or diverge from forms of ethnic reification and racial formation in conflict zones of the Middle East and Southern Africa, and globalizing patterns and technologies of racialization and ethnicizing power (Banton 2002; Olzak 2002). Police studies and race theory can also work together to grapple with the social implications of changing security technologies deployed in the new populist states of Latin America or the booming cities of China. These disciplines can also collaborate on issues of multiculturalism and diversity taken up by police forces in the heterogeneous societies of South Asia and South-Eastern Europe.

In the North American and European academies, social science work in the area of race and policing has tended to focus on psychological dispositions and personal attitudes and prejudices. Studies of the cognitive or psychological aspects of race (Brubaker et al. 2004; Brubaker 2006; Holdaway and O’Neill 2007) have seen ethnic identities and racial attitudes, among groups like the police, operating as an epistemological framing device that both preserves and masks institutional ‘prejudice’. But these analyses have not specified how these cognitive states relate to broader power relations and state governance logics, and cannot explain patterns of change beyond the level of the individual mind or collective psyche. On the other hand, rational-choice methodologies offer close measurements of the strategic choices of ethnic ‘identity entrepreneurs’ or they examine the accumulation of social capital by unions, police or other public actors as they incorporate racialized or ethnic groups (Woolcock 1998; Szayna 2000, p. 48). Rationalistic methods are best at highlighting questions of agency and competition, but are less adept at situating racial questions in relation to broader systems of power and histories of hierarchy. Taking a much broader view, historiographers of post-coloniality (Gilroy 2002; Hesse 2004) have connected race with
European projects of colonialism and fascism, offering a deconstruction of white supremacy. These perspectives could be enhanced by engaging more broadly with comparative and international work in the global south, where European models and colonial legacies interact today with changing class orders, developmentalist governance frameworks, security agendas and patterns of transnational technological innovation and financial circulation.

This collection develops a comparative framework that builds on new work in critical race theory and political philosophy that examines the racialization of the governance state in the context of globalization, and that takes the challenges of international comparative analysis of the ‘racial state’ seriously (Goldberg 2002; Sayyid 2004; Winant 2004; Gilmore 2007; Simon 2007; Goldberg 2009). The papers included in this issue interrogate how racial projects of the state, operating at its margins and at the street level, struggle to re-deploy, naturalize and re-configure police identities and criminal justice practices under pressure from reform movements, legal changes, explosive conflict and neoliberal restructuring. These contributions trace fault lines, mapping where states in different world regions are shaken by the productive contentions and counter-hegemonic effects of disciplining and re-ordering racial categories through affirmative, inclusive and (at least rhetorically) emancipatory socio-legal policies. We draw upon the innovations of critical human geography and social movement specialists (Winant 1994, 2001; M. P. Smith 2000; Puar 2007; M. P. Smith and Bakker 2008) and their emphasis on participatory action, urban racial-political subject-formation, pragmatic interactions, and on the specificity and autonomy of state social-control agencies. These scholars’ case studies reveal how race and ethnic formations are produced or transformed in specific places, and particularly in urban or national border zones where collective agencies meet. Certain contributions also incorporate the insights of those who study race, law, fear politics and security through the lens of gender and sexuality (A. M. Smith, 1994; Alexander and Mohanty 2003; A. M. Smith 2007).

**Neoliberal authority and new state formations**

The contributions in this issue examine new forms of neoliberal authority in relation to institutions of law enforcement as they participate in the roll-back of the state through privatization, as well as the roll-out of new forms of interventionism. These interventions can be repressive or humanitarian, or mixtures of both. They can be deployed in the interests of human rights or dehumanization. This issue examines the concept of neoliberalism, not primarily in connection with processes of market formation but as a state-building ideology in Latin America, Africa, Asia and in post-colonial and post-socialist
Europe. By examining neoliberal globalization in a comparative light, we explore how the policing of race and ethnicity sustains (and masks) new extensions of state authority, all while enhancing the forms of expropriation and labour regulation that sustain models of a market-based society. Our collection extends the work of Stuart Hall in *Policing the Crisis* (1978) which analyses how the neoliberal state reduces the regulation of markets while it intensifies the targeting and regulation of social bodies. Hall argues that neoliberal forms of state authority broaden policing functions that aim for the punitive regulation of class and space, masking this shift by sparking race and ethnic panics which are then used as justification for repressive intervention. This work on governance through panic has grown into a sophisticated debate that utilizes the tools of political economy and political sociology to examine the production racialized insecurity as an essential tool of modern control (Balibar 1991; Parenti 2000; Garland 2003; Lee 2007; Lentin 2007).

In this issue, Dong Han’s analysis of policing in China explores the state’s massive drive to promote export-oriented industrialization, build massive urban concentrations of infrastructure and cultivate a neoliberal class of entrepreneurs and consumers. His study argues that police practices that racialize rural workers are central to China’s contemporary efforts to marry state power and market globalization. These rural groups’ status, movements, culture and physiognomy are identified and reconfigured by police as they enforce internal migration-control regimes in China. ‘Contemporary China’s economic growth took place when neoliberal capitalism swept through the West, and China’s growth model incorporated substantial elements of neoliberalism, in ways that enhanced rather than suspended authoritarian politics . . . . [T]he second-class status of rural migrants in the cities, are in line with the interests of both state and capital. The “temporary” status of rural migrants deprives them of state welfare and protection, and discourages them from self-organizing’ (Han 2009).

The jointly authored paper by João Vargas and Jaime Amparo-Alvez gathers together new empirical findings to produce an integrated mapping of distributions of violent death in neoliberal São Paulo. They develop a provocative analysis of the racial state in Brazil, focusing on how impunity and violence have come to dominate certain territories under processes associated with neoliberalization. More conventional statistical analyses that locate high rates of murder and crime in black and mixed-race neighbourhoods could reproduce old Chicago School-type models – ‘ecologies of violence’ or ‘cultures of poverty’ – that re-identify black behaviour or culture as implicitly or explicitly the cause of crime. Instead, compiling a vast register of new data on violent death and state violence, and drawing upon work on police cultures and racialized state violence (Huggins 1991, 2002; Amar 2003), this analysis maps the
‘geography of death’ back onto specific policing practices and institutionalized forms of state violence. They generate an illuminating reading of racialized violence that re-centres the actions and responsibilities of the state, which too often hides behind the racial myths of ‘black markets,’ gang masculinity and narco-trafficker power.

Neoliberalism as a vehicle for state extension and assertion also serves as a central focus of Tony Samara’s analysis of the racial character of corporate-managed security in Cape Town, South Africa. Samara draws upon the African Studies literature on the ‘privatized state’ in Africa and the ‘global cities’ literature on urban business development and ‘quality of life’ projects, challenging us to reconsider the growth of private-sector police powers in contemporary South Africa. Some scholars have even suggested that urban neoliberalism constitutes a new racial project under conditions of democracy (Hetzler, Medina and Overfelt 2006), one in which the regulatory functions of the state are transferred to the market, or to the heralded ‘public-private partnership’. Samara suggests that this type of neoliberal governance continues practices of the apartheid state under the guise of democracy, ‘in ways that secure the interests of property owners and more affluent consumers. Private policing in this context produces a form of social ordering based on emerging conceptions of racialized citizenship linked to market access’ (Samara 2009).

In AnnJanette Rosga’s analysis of policing in Bosnia, ‘globalization’ and ‘neoliberalism’ become identified with agents of international humanitarian intervention. In a fascinating divergence from the other cases presented here, the law-enforcement sphere of the state in Bosnia does not justify the extension of its repressive power by focusing on the deviance of local racialized or ethnically identified groups, as one might expect. Instead, a racialized image of globalization is projected onto international forces who are charged with implementing peacekeeping and state-building missions (Wheeler 2002). From the perspective of the Bosnian police, it is not the Serbian militias or ethnic Croats that stand as the ethnic ‘other.’ Instead, NATO and European Union peacekeepers are seen as white, effeminate and alien ‘civilizing missions’. And UN peacekeepers, often drawn from the police and military forces of India and Brazil, are seen as imposing a despised form of ‘black internationalism’ on the Balkans. Referring to Indian and Pakistani UN police trainers, ‘a fifty-year-old male officer who had been on the force some twenty-five years said: “This might sound hard, maybe I shouldn’t say this, but I feel [the] need to say it. Someone who’s coming from a country where they hit people with a stick cannot come in front of me and teach me about human rights . . . . Many who came to Bosnia were having opinions about us that we are totally uncivilised. I think that you could see for yourself that we are after all people with a high level of civilisation”’ (Rosga 2009).
Assembling class and territory in urban space

Many of the studies included in this issue draw upon original fieldwork in the urban context, in spaces where national-, local- and global-scale phenomena intersect. In the spaces of globalizing cities, patterns of deindustrialization and reindustrialization, migration and segregation, consent and coercion, intersect. Research presented here emphasizes the mutually constitutive relationships between issues of class, territory and race as these formations are interpreted and impacted by police organizations. Here we examine how police attempt to control the economic, symbolic and political status of rural or peripheral populations in the city, and to root out the symbolic and social residues of colonial domination or neo-colonial types of racial and ethnic segregation.

Working through the urban frame, this set of studies offers new empirical data and theoretical models for bringing together analyses of class, caste and race. Han’s paper on the policing of rural migrants in China’s rapidly developing cities carefully weaves together questions of race and class: ‘By “racialization”, I do not assert that a new ethnicity is taking shape, but that there is a “racial” aspect to the oppression and exploitation of rural migrant workers, which is usually analysed using a class framework. While rural migrants lack generally recognized “ethnic” features, I emphasize the importance of transcending existing racial and ethnical classifications and endeavour to contextualize forms of embodied control within specific social, political and economic circumstances (Bulmer and Solomos 2004; Virdee 2006). The “racialization” approach does not exclude or deny class-based approaches’ (Han 2009). The contemporary Chinese city, in Han’s study, also operates through a system of permit controls regulating internal migration from country to cities, called hukou (Florence 2006; Pils 2008). Through stops, searches and detentions within this hukou system, the police generate a spatially specific, race-like order that facilitates economic extraction and exploitation, reminiscent of apartheid systems or societies that depend upon racialized non-citizen labouring groups to create wealth: ‘Researchers have pointed out the de facto “immigrant” status of rural migrant workers in Chinese cities. Chinese law explicitly prescribes discriminatory treatment on the basis of hukou, and rural migrants are in a condition parallel to “illegal” Mexican immigrants to the US (He 2009). Through this system, rural migrants are deemed as ‘visitors’ in their own country, ‘strangers in the city’ (Zhang 2001), ‘second class’ citizens in urban China (Solinger 1999).’

Samara’s analysis of new post-apartheid racialisms in South Africa integrates the literature on ‘race blindness’ discourse with the critical
urban studies literature on privatization. He argues that neoliberal urban redevelopment programmes, ubiquitous in the cities, ‘are powerful examples of “colour blind” discourse and public policy that are deeply implicated in the reproduction of racial inequalities’ (Omi and Winant 1994; Bonilla-Silva 2006) (Samara 2009). In the paper on São Paulo, Brazil, Vargas and Amparo-Alvez draw upon Henri Lefebvre’s neo-Marxist’s work on the production of space to generate a radical rereading of how police forces embed racialized violence in the operation and meaning of city space: ‘All urban spaces, all human geographies are the product of historical power struggles, and the social relations deriving from such struggles become spatialized according to the hegemonic political order: “Every mode of production . . . produces a space, its own space”’ (Lefebvre 1991, p. 53). While the resulting spatial relationships expressing degrees of subordination and privilege are normally maintained through consensus, there is often a need for explicit coercion. Police presence in general, but police lethality in particular, is a key element in the coercive apparatus as it enacts, to the limit, shared and normalized understandings about those it affects’ (Samara 2009).

In Body-Gendrot’s contribution on policing in France, the assemblage of class and race is interpreted as a territorializing dynamic based on how the nation space was transformed after Algerian independence, and the changing ethnic profile of urban working-class spaces during more recent processes of deindustrialization: ‘After the second oil shock, a new law passed at the end of the 1970s focused on access to home ownership rather than on subsidizing public housing. Numerous large households belonging to unskilled or semi-skilled families – a majority of those were of immigrant origin – were then invited to occupy the vacant public units deserted by upwardly mobile employees and workers’. In this study, we learn that it’s not the racialized populations who are identified as rural aliens, but the police. In the insecure peripheries of French cities, police are caught between the rigid apparatus of their state and the populations that the police, recruited in the provinces, have no capacity to engage or understand: ‘Police recruits are almost never selected from within similar communities as the high-risk urban zones. Ninety per cent of those coming from provincial localities have their first assignments in the Parisian suburbs. They are influenced by what they see continuously on television and are not familiar with the urban culture of the high risk zones. It is difficult for them to distinguish among youth, most of whom wear hooded sweatshirts and hip-hop style clothes, and to separate out actual offenders (Bellot and Thibau 2008)’ (Body-Gendrot 2009).
New security technologies and professional norms

This collection offers a comparative analysis of transnationally circulating professional norms and technologies of policing – from the ‘soft’ techniques of community policing, diversity promotion, gender mainstreaming and ‘access to justice’ promotion, to the hardware of crime mapping, closed-circuit surveillance and census-taking. These shifting sets of norms and technologies have been reconfigured, imposed or disposed differently in distinct urban settings. This is not only because of the influence of local legal, cultural and institutional dynamics, but also a result of conflicts within and between contradictory and irreconcilable policing norms and trends. These contributions share a commitment to analyzing how race, ethnicity and caste serve as the material that fuses incompatible professional trends and technologies (and embeds the social power that lies behind them).

How can one unite the police value of ‘community interaction and trust’ that has become the global ‘gold standard’ of police professionalism with the consolidation of a multibillion-dollar economy that funds the development and globalization of repressive counterinsurgency policing technologies? How do the police regularly pose as models for diversity and affirmative-action projects, while also elaborating crime-mapping and surveillance technologies that place entire communities into suspect status, thus cementing their racial status in the optic of the state as they are detained within exceptional curfew dictates, movement restrictions and punitive ‘quality of life’ codes? Our comparative, international analyses do not show that the circulation of these policing technologies and norms leads to a global homogenization of policing, nor to the integration of regimes of accountability or regulation (Walker 2005). Nor do we catalogue forms of ‘local’ resistance to these international policing trends. Instead, we utilize the lens of racialization/ethnicization to examine how these police norms and technologies justify themselves by generating fear, alterity and subjectivity in bodies and urban spaces.

In the study here based on fieldwork in India, Anasuya Sengupta offers an analysis of new police training techniques that identify and manage explicitly marked gender, caste and ‘ethnicized religious’ identities within the police service of Karnataka. She traces how the threadbare doctrine of ‘diversity promotion’ has become revived within the specific local context. In Karnataka, a long-term socialist provincial government has been working to remake its police within a national context shaken by triumphant neoliberalism and resurgent populism, and divided between Congress multiculturalism and Hindu nationalist chauvinism. In its focus on caste instead of race, this case offers a uniquely creative example of the value of comparative work that examines the contradictions of diversity projects used as a technology
of reform and accommodation by professional organizations (Ahmed 2006). Sengupta identifies processes by which diversity projects reclassify Muslim citizens as a caste group or ethnic category, but fail to address the violence of Hindu nationalism or the persistent forms of structural inequality faced by Muslim Indians. The study also examines how police advocate the advancement of women without undermining certain ‘masculinist’ cultures or prerogatives, as has often been the result in gender-integrated police forces worldwide (Westmarland 2003). On a more positive note, this piece traces mobilizations within the police that offer an alternative framework of ‘dignity’ to substitute for the identity politics of ‘diversity’ that has become identified with governance technologies of patronage, cultural reductionism and racketeering rather than empowerment and citizenship: ‘We soon recognised that “dignity” was a powerful entry point, precisely because it was, as one woman police officer put it, experientially potent: “I know when my dignity is violated, though I may not know what my rights are”’ (Sengupta 2009).

Eduardo Moncada’s paper is based on fieldwork in Colombia, and upon new Latin American studies’ comparative race work (Applebaum and Rosemblatt 2007). He also focuses on how a self-consciously innovative local administration takes on international policing technologies and remakes them in the interests of local class, race and power relations. Moncada’s analysis of crime mapping in Cali challenges the reader to rethink this technology, which has become the holy grail of modern, reformed urban policing (Weisburd and Braga 2006). These computer-based data collection and visualization platforms plot and predict crimes by tracking them on maps of poor urban areas. Moncada explores how crime mapping redeploy and extends new forms of racialization even as the tool explicitly distances itself from the paramilitary and para-policing tactics of the war on narco-traffic: ‘In the absence of a broader political project that explicitly recognizes racial discrimination’s potential contribution to violence, crime mapping can both displace important questions about race from citizen security policy-making and generate seemingly “objective” findings that fuse with subjective assumptions regarding the links between criminality, violence and race’ (Moncada 2009). We see how crime mapping operates in ways that appear blind to the more ‘obvious’ racial hierarchies and attitudes that once governed this Afro-Colombian capital, but end in justifying the containment and symbolic and political disenfranchisement of black Colombians.

Vargas and Amparo-Alvez’s paper, by generating visualizations of structural violence, offers what we might interpret as a progressive ‘inside-out’ version of ‘crime mapping’: ‘Such maps suggest a geography of death that is constituted by not only the actual police and civil society’s lethal violence, but also a social climate that can be accessed
when we analyse various social indicators defining specific locations. This methodology allows us to gain entry into the perception of violence, including lethal police violence, graspable as socially shared and socially constructed knowledge that draws on the multiple, overlapping historical and contemporary forces affecting a particular geographical area’ (Vargas and Amparo-Alves 2009).

In the 1970s, critical criminologists, in their analysis of the emergence of uniformed policing and carceral prisons during the industrial revolution, and subsequently Michel Foucault, in his work on the origins of modern governmentality and biopolitics in the early modern ‘police state’, focused on how the gathering of statistics has always been intertwined with the racial missions of policing. As Body-Gendrot writes, in France ‘tools like ethnic statistics, which other countries use to fight racial discrimination, have not been gathered by the state, as this practice, itself, is still taboo (Body-Gendrot and De Wenden 2003). For example, after the GIA, a radical Algerian Islamist group, carried out terrorist attacks in 1995 and 1996 on French soil, the Commission monitoring the processing of personal data [CNIL] agreed that “objective, unalterable distinguishing physical marks” could be included in the police database. This was done despite loud protests by both civil rights advocates and right-wing conservatives.’ However, Body-Gendrot points out that when the police later referred to the skin colour of people suspected of participating in collective urban violence, the Socialist Minister of Interior said such racial identification was ‘against “the values of the Republic” … and the practice was discontinued’ (Body-Gendrot 2009).

Every case presented here is one where ‘race’ is taboo and where the political prohibition of race as a governance category is a cornerstone or ‘founding myth’ of the modern or post-colonial state. In some cases, race (in South Africa), ethnicity (in Bosnia) or caste (in India) are identified with past forms of unjust governance that the state must banish into history in order to achieve local and international legitimacy. In other cases, states see present-day racialization processes as ‘national security threats’, as alien ways of categorizing the population, or as external attempts to challenge the state. For example, France defends its Republican race-blind position against ‘Anglo-Saxon’-style multiculturalists who, by tracking race in their censuses and surveys are seen as generating racial divisions. China insists on the inclusive mission of its coercive nation-building project and links racial studies to attempts to stir subversion and introduce recolonizing interests. Brazil and Colombia identify strongly with post-racial nationalism of mestizaje and ‘Racial Democracy’ ideologies. Although they are increasingly amenable to affirmative action and racial identity politics, they are careful to adapt the policies to their own national frameworks.
Conclusion

The group of studies included in this collection demonstrate that police are not reducible to artefacts of global capitalism, nor do they serve blindly as instruments for reproducing national or urban race, class, ethnic or caste hierarchies. Police services are complex assemblages of agencies, histories, class identities, masculinities and femininities, institutional and legal cultures. They are torn by internal class, gender and ethno-racial conflicts, not to mention the tensions imposed by jurisdictional limitations and, increasingly, by divergent corporate and municipal agendas imposed by privatization and decentralization processes. As the more ethnographically oriented studies here demonstrate, police officers themselves can also provide uniquely lucid analyses of the inner workings of these patterns of conflict and race and ethnic orders in the contemporary context, and can offer visions for radical change. There is a utopian dimension to some moments in these papers, demonstrating the subversive possibilities offered by fine-grained studies of the police. The edges of governance and constructions of racial and ethno categories, and the violence that sustains them, are brought into relief. And as many of the police interviews reveal here, law enforcement officers, at moments, can offer remarkable perspectives of clarity in how state processes, global forces and racial orderings materialize when they hit the street and are apprehended by the force of law. The studies presented here aim to encourage the development of new comparative approaches for the analysis of changing patterns of racialization in the global context. They contribute to a more nuanced reading of the coercive, symbolic and cultural-political power of the police services as state agencies and social formations.

The findings presented in this issue come together to generate a set of general conclusions or recommendations to be considered by those working on policy reforms, as well as by theorists of race and ethnicity. We find that: (1) Diversity promotion and social integration projects within the police cannot substitute for more rigorous, structural efforts that would ensure economic, cultural and legal equality and human dignity in the justice sector, and in the state. (2) New crime-mapping technologies will only intensify racial and ethnic animosities if they do not broaden their methodologies to cultivate measurement of the structural and institutional factors that drive racialization and ethnic stratification and that lie behind patterns of crime and violence. (3) The privatization of security and the militarization of policing in the urban context tend to escalate polarization rather than resolve race, class and territorial tensions in globalizing cities; for this reason, law enforcement needs to be folded into publicly administered, civilian-run, citizen-monitored organizations. (4) Forms of neoliberal state authority that designate large groups of citizens primarily as targets of
enforcement – as problems for the police rather than as subjects of justice or as agents of participation – will inevitably generate increasingly repressive ‘missions’ for policing that racialize and dehumanize. And, (5) international peacekeeping organizations or transnational police-training industries can import and export race and ethnic identities and hierarchies, even as they train police to be anti-racist and to pacify ethnic and caste conflicts; so critical race and ethnic consciousness and scholarship need to be integrated with these reformist international interventions. These problems illuminated by the findings compiled in this group of studies can be best addressed not by suppressing questions of race and racialization, but by expanding international, comparative analysis of these formations.

Notes
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