

Friday, 23.09.2016

**23.9.2016 - F-Building F 029 2:15pm - 3:30pm****8.19 Convergence and divergence in policing agenda-setting in European metropolises**Chair: *Elke Devroe*

In the second phase of the "Policing European Metropolises Project (PEMP)" the first results answering the research question 'What processes of convergence and divergence exist in the policy formulation of policing strategies for European metropolises and how these can be explained?' will be addressed. In the PEMP project embedded case studies were developed in 10 European countries, for a total of 24 metropolises. This panel presents the results of 9 metropolises, more particular in the countries France, The Netherlands, Germany and Belgium. The conceptual framework is informed by Bourdieu's (2004) concept of 'semi-autonomous fields' as a structured social space, with its own rules, schemes of dominance and legitimate opinions which are, in turn, 'relatively autonomous' of the broader social structure. The different agendas and strategies inhabit a multiplicity of internal security fields rather than a (singular) European internal security field, which encompass competing objects of 'freedom, security and justice'. It is precisely in questioning how these are configured in particular metropolises but not others that explanatory theories about divergence and convergence in policing at the sub-national level in Europe can be built.

2:15pm

**764 [Policing Antwerp & Brussels. Two of a kind?](#)**\*[Evelien De Pauw](#)<sup>1</sup><sup>1</sup> UGent, Governing & Policing Security, Gent, Belgium**Abstract Text :**

The PEMP project focuses on the variation of agenda setting between different metropolises at the sub-national and national level. More specifically, the project studies the manifestation of plural policing, a process in which various players in public spaces are involved supervisory tasks, monitoring and enforcement (Edwards & Prins 2014, Devroe, Ponsaers & De Pauw, 2014). This abstract describes a number of specific Belgian conditions involved in developing the security policy of Antwerp and Brussels. Both cities deal with similar urban challenges such as 'glocal' threats to local safety and public order, large and multiple ethnic background populations and huge socio-economic differences. Nevertheless they both develop a customized approach to deal with the impact of these challenges on their urban safety. These differences originate from Belgium's national conditions including a complex state structure with multiple levels (municipalities/cities, provinces, regions, communities and the national government), contracts between local and supra-local authorities, and strong municipal autonomy and politics. Through various subsidies and plans, these government levels have an impact on the 'governance of security' in Belgian cities. Nevertheless, the elected mayor and his/her policy play a major role in the agenda setting of city security policy. To illustrate this, we will highlight the similarities and differences in the security policy approach of Antwerp and Brussels. This is based on insights gained from content analyses of policy documents in both cities. We found that certain steps are being taken towards 'convergence' (Edwards & Hughes, 2012). This tendency is largely impeded by the current Belgian State structure as the on-going regional interference on the one hand. However, the strong autonomy of the municipalities on the other hand, are simultaneously promoting 'divergence' (Edwards & Hughes, 2012). In conclusion, next to national policy also local politics can greatly modulate local security plans. This discrepancy between local and national influence results in increased implementation of criminal justice and law enforcement in Antwerp and a more social justice oriented approach in Brussels.

2:30pm

**765 [Local strategies for glocal challenges. Comparing policy agendas for urban policing in Amsterdam and Rotterdam.](#)**\*[Ruth Prins](#)<sup>1</sup>, [Elke Devroe](#)<sup>1</sup><sup>1</sup> Leiden University, , Den Haag, Netherlands**Abstract Text :**

In this paper we analyze the politics of policing, with a specific focus on policing agendas in the two largest cities in The Netherlands: Amsterdam and Rotterdam. The search for the regimes present in policing agendas in these two embedded case studies will reveal both convergence and divergence towards the national agenda and between agendas in both metropolises. Possible explanations for these trends could be found in the political 'circuits of

power' of the municipal ruling coalition and in wider governing arrangements in place. Both metropolises are considered metropolises facing 'glocal' challenges related to multicultural populations in urban areas, social inequalities in terms of household income, international harbors, crime and disorder. The term glocal refers to the interlinkages between global challenges and local societies. In order to get an understanding of the tendencies of divergence and convergence in urban policing in the metropolises under study we start with a summary of general trends in policing in the Netherlands in the first paragraph. In the second paragraph national, regional and local governmental constitutional arrangements, discretionary powers and public police management are presented. The remainder of the paper compares and contrasts policing agendas in Amsterdam and Rotterdam and concludes with an overview of their regimes and possible explanations for convergence and divergence between the metropolises.

2:45pm

766

### [Policing metropolises in a system of cooperative federalism: Berlin and Cologne compared](#)

\*Hartmut Aden<sup>1</sup>, \*Bernhard Frevel<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Berlin School of Economics and Law / Hochschule für Wirtschaft und Recht, Forschungsinstitut für Öffentliche und Private Sicherheit/Department of Police and Security Management, Berlin, Germany

<sup>2</sup> Fachhochschule für Öffentliche Verwaltung NRW, , Münster, Germany

#### **Abstract Text :**

This paper compares the political agenda for policing in two of Germany's biggest cities: Berlin and Cologne. These cities have been selected for comparison because they share a number of characteristics of all metropolises, while they differ considerably at the same time. This comparison considers the different police systems and the specific framework of a cooperative version of federalism in Germany. Against this backdrop, the paper explores two central research questions. (1) To what extent can similarities of the political agenda for policing in Berlin and Cologne be explained by the specific patterns of cooperative federalism and to what extent can they be explained by parallel trends, for example the pluralisation of policing and police strategies. (2) How can differences between the agenda for policing in these two metropolises be explained? Path dependency will be identified as a major factor.

3:00pm

767

### [Policing Metropolises in a Centralized Country: How the « Métropolisation » show the Limits of Decentralization in France](#)

\*Christian Mouhanna<sup>1</sup>, Jacques de Maillard<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cesdip, , Guyancourt, France

#### **Abstract Text :**

In France, even if the cities are involved in public security policies, the nationalization of police forces in 1941 prevent the mayors from managing the public security. The consequences of such an institutional structure is well-known: priority set by the national government and not local authorities; national-scale recruitment of police officers with no link with the territory and the population. In the 1980 and 1990's, the decentralization policies, the growing part taken by the cities in the management of prevention, the development of CCTV systems under the control of the cities' responsibility and the rise of local police forces in some cities, have led to rebalancing the power of the State. Now, the security policies are organized under the principle of co-construction. We have chosen four cities in order to illustrate the differences that can be found in France: Paris, with still a State monopoly in the field of policing; Lyon, which is trying to claim its autonomy in this field; Strasbourg, a model of a better cooperation between the State and the city, and Toulouse, changing its policy from a priority to mediation to a law and order way of policing. One reason for the relatively poor development of local police forces is the division of the French territory in 36 000 cities, each with a mayor with formal power in the field of security. Even big urban areas are divided into several local authorities. The national priority is now to build « métropoles », i.e. grouping together the cities. If this strategy has produced effective results in many fields -economy, public transportations, housing, social services-, the vast majority of the mayors still refuse to share their -poor- powers in the field of public security. As a result, the National Police forces mostly still keep control on it.