This book offers a sociological analysis of the history of international police cooperation in the period from the middle of the nineteenth century until the end of World War II. It is a detailed exploration of international cooperation strategies involving police institutions from the United States and Germany as well as other European countries.

The study provides a rich empirical account of many dimensions in the history of international policing, including the role of police in the nineteenth-century movement towards national independence; the evolution from political cooperation towards international criminal enforcement; international policing aspects of the outbreak of World War I and the Bolshevik Revolution; the early history of international police organizations, including Interpol; the international implications of the Nazification of the German police; and the rise on the international scene of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

To account for these historical transformations, this book develops an innovative theoretical model of bureaucratization based on the sociology of Max Weber and theories of globalization. It is argued that international police cooperation is enabled through a historical process of police agencies gradually claiming and gaining a position of relative independence from the governments of their respective states. Furthermore it shows that international police cooperation relies on expert systems of knowledge on international crime, which police institutions across nations develop and share. Paradoxically, in spite of this spirit of cooperation, national concerns of participating forces remain paramount.
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General Editor's Introduction

The Clarendon Studies in Criminology was inaugurated in 1994 under the auspices of the centres of criminology at the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford and the London School of Economics. It was the successor to Cambridge Studies in Criminology, founded by Sir Leon Radzinowicz and J.W.C Turner almost sixty years ago.

Criminology is a field of study that covers everything from research into the causes of crime to the politics of the operations of the criminal justice system. Researchers in different social and behavioural sciences, criminal justice and law, all make important contributions to our understanding of the phenomena of crime. The Clarendon Studies in Criminology series tries to reflect this diversity by publishing high-quality theory and research monographs by established scholars as well as by young scholars of great promise from all different kinds of academic backgrounds. We especially welcome manuscripts representing theory-driven empirical research. The inter-disciplinary nature of criminology makes it apt for research that crosses disciplinary boundaries. We therefore also particularly welcome manuscripts that draw upon or integrate knowledge from different disciplines, for example, cross-level analyses of causes of crime or integrative approaches to criminal justice and crime prevention. Much criminological research is parochial in nature. There is a great need for more high-quality historic and cross-national comparative research that addresses, for example, the generality of criminological knowledge and the role of systemic factors for the patterns of crime and criminal justice. We welcome such contributions to the series.

In a globalised world the issue of international policing is an important topic. In his book 'Policing World Society' Mathieu Deflem presents a long overdue comprehensive analysis of the history of international policing, with a particular focus on the history of international collaboration of the US and the German police. His main thesis is that 'the extent to which national police institutions acquire formal bureaucratic autonomy or institutional independence presents structural conditions favourable for international cooperation, regardless of whether the nation-states of those police institutions approximate
one another in political, cultural, legal, and other respects’ (p. 219). Deflem’s book is informative, and at times provocative. It raises important questions about international policing, but also more generally, makes an important contribution to the understanding of the interaction between local and global processes. It will appeal to a readership that extends far beyond those narrowly interested in issues of policing.
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Introduction
Historical Foundations of International Police Cooperation

It is 12 April 1946, the 106th day of the trials of major war criminals before the International Military Tribunal in Nuremberg, Germany. Ernst Kaltenbrunner takes the stand. Kaltenbrunner was the Chief of the Security Police and the Reich Security Main Office from 1943 until the fall of the Nazi regime. Charged with crimes against peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity, he is interrogated by Rudolf Merkel, the defence attorney for the Gestapo. Lord Justice Lawrence presides over the hearings.

DR. MERKEL: Do you know of the so-called ‘severe interrogations’? Are these in force in other countries, too?
KALTENBRUNNER: I was President of the International Criminal Police Commission, and in this capacity I had the opportunity to speak about this topic at a meeting in the autumn of 1943. From this conference and also from my reading of the foreign press over a number of years I gathered that the police system of each state also makes use of rather severe measures of interrogation.

DR. MERKEL: Could a State Police official . . .
THE PRESIDENT: What happened at some international police commission does not seem to be relevant to anything in this case.
DR. MERKEL: I only wanted to question him as to whether these ‘severe interrogations’ were applied not only in Germany but also in other states.
THE PRESIDENT: We are not concerned with that.

Policing world society

A steady road leads . . . to the current position of the policeman as the ‘representative of God on earth’.
Max Weber.

Some books urge the reader to see old problems in a new light; others present fresh evidence. This work is of the latter sort, but not decidedly. It offers a sociological analysis of the historical antecedents of those police practices that transcend the boundaries of national states. This book has the dual task of uncovering empirically the relatively
neglected aspects of the history of international policing and of developing and applying a theoretical perspective that can account for the nature and evolution of these developments. The empirical emphasis of this research is on international practices involving public police institutions from Germany and the United States in the period from the middle of the 19th century until the end of World War II. The selection of these specified time periods and police institutions is, as I hope this book will clearly show, based on their significance in the historical paths and turning-points of international policing leading up to its contemporary forms. The scope of the research, however, will by virtue of its international focus necessarily also involve police institutions from other nations. The thematic focus of this book includes, amongst other issues, the role of police institutions in the 19th-century development towards national independence; the evolution of international police cooperation initiatives from political to criminal enforcement tasks; the early history of international police organizations, including the origins of Interpol; the international implications of the Naziification of the German police; the rise of the FBI on the international police scene; and aspects of policing involved with World War II and its aftermath.

There is presently, at the dawn of a new century, much talk about such notions as the internationalization of social life, the new world order, the fluidity of boundaries, the permeance of temporal and spatial barriers, and many other aspects of a general globalization of society. This attention to developments beyond national states has also been of growing concern in the social sciences. In much of the contemporary discourse, the internationalization of social life is argued repeatedly to involve a decisive break with past societies. Yet, the scholarly attention to issues and developments that cross local and national boundaries has mostly not involved discussions of the function and institution of the police. To be sure, the internationalization of policing has increasingly been paid attention to by a range of social-scientific scholars, and, additionally, it has to some extent already begun to infiltrate the collective consciousness. Although relative to discussions of globalization in the economic and, to a lesser extent, political realm, international policing has not yet become central to theoretical debate and public policy, this situation may well be changing. Among the primary conditions of these ongoing transformations, I suspect, are contemporary developments in relation to certain well-publicized and increasingly more publicly recognized international police concerns, specifically in relation to the flow of drugs across nation-state borders, illegal immigration and related concerns of border control, the criminal opportunities enabled by an ever-expanding arsenal of computer technologies, and, since September 11, more importantly than anything else, the patterns and dynamics of international terrorism. What these international dimensions of crime and control have brought about is a more clearly and widely recognized urge to re-think our traditional, territorially-bound conceptions surrounding the locale of criminality and the appropriate jurisdictional authority of police control and judicial processing. With an increasing globalization and trans-localization of crime and police, these connections are much less fixed and clearly defined than they were before (Marx 1997). Moreover, at the very same time when problematic developments are taking place with respect to international crime and global security, our age has also been witnessing an unprecedented expansion of rights and freedoms, both nationally as well as internationally. At the world level, in particular, a normatively oriented debate without reference to human rights has become unthinkable.

It is in light of the undeniable relevance and increasing importance of concerns surrounding the international dimensions of policing in the modern era that this book hopes to make a distinctive and distinctly scholarly contribution. The aim of pursuing the research objectives of this book originated from the fairly straightforward idea that the recently discussed internationalization of society also pertains to the function and institution of the police, and that, moreover, the development of international policing is not a completely new phenomenon and must have its roots in history. Therefore, as a study in the historical sociology of social control across borders, this book seeks to present timely empirical data on, as well as introduce a theoretical model of, the history of international policing. To account for the historical transformations of international policing in the selected time periods and societies, in particular, this book will develop and apply a theoretical model of bureaucratization rooted in the sociology of Max Weber. Additionally, insights are taken from the globalization literature to account for the predominant forms under which the internationalization of policing has historically taken shape. Thus, the analyses of this book are situated in the sociological discourse on globalization, on the one hand, and the sociology of police and social control, on the other. These two intellectual traditions provide the contours of this book's analytical framework in which a more specific explanatory theoretical model of police internationalization will be situated.
The sociology of world society: Elements of orientation

It may cause little surprise that the scholarly interest in processes and structures beyond national states and other confined localities is not the invention of recent sociological reflection. Yet, because sociology is routinely associated with the rise of the national state, basic sociological premises and concepts have increasingly come under scrutiny to allow for a more dynamic approach to account for the transcendence of a variety of social forces beyond state borders. As such, it is no coincidence that globalization or internationalization, broadly conceived to designate the growing interdependence between dispersed social units, forms one of the prime challenges of contemporary social theory. However, a reading of the classical theories of the likes of Karl Marx, Max Weber, and Emile Durkheim brings to light that the founding fathers of sociology acknowledged that several dimensions of society were not restricted to the confines of the national state (Marx and Deflem 1993; Robertson 1992:108–114). Specifically, Marx (1846:181–186) addressed the territorial spread of capitalism and the formation of a global market economy; Weber (1922:520–527) discussed the fact that national states have a tendency to expand their powers geographically; and Durkheim (1900:28–41) acknowledged the tendency of nationalism to become engulfed in world-patriotic sentiments. In the course of modern sociology, too, there have been various manifestations of an attention for cross-border social phenomena. I will here not present a detailed intellectual history of these developments, but a brief review may suffice to indicate some of its basic elements.

Among the oldest sociological studies to focus specifically on internationalization are contributions by Charles Horton Cooley (1918) and George Herbert Mead (1929). Both scholars discussed the implications of the growth towards international society in the wake of World War I. Next to migration, warfare was indeed one of the first topics of sociological reflection that aroused an attention to the study of international issues. It was the topic that was the primary motivation for sociologists L.L. Bernard and his wife Jessie to write a review of the sociology of international relations as early as 1934 (Bernard and Bernard 1934). The theme of war further stimulated sociologists from Werner Cahnman (1943) to Louis Wirth (1948) and Talcott Parsons (1961) to discuss international phenomena. But apart from an interesting discussion with the likes of Pitirim Sorokin debating historical developments across dispersed societies (see Moore 1966; Bierstedt 1966; Sorokin 1966), the internationalization of society did not attract much sociological attention until the mid-1980s and particularly the early 1990s, when under the influence of such diverse developments as the computer revolution and the expansion of information technologies, the fall of communism, and the global development of a capitalist world-system, many contemporary social theorists began to address issues of globalization (e.g. Giddens 1990; Habermas 1992:632–660, 1998; Wallerstein 2000). Debated, in particular, has been the status of globalization as a new phase of modernity with more or less momentous implications for the sociological enterprise (Albrow and Eade 1994; Beck 2000; Robertson 1990; Robinson 1998). Increasingly, scholars have addressed globalization themes in relation to various dimensions of society, including culture (e.g. Boli and Thomas 1997; Featherstone 1990), law (e.g. Gessner 1995; Röhl and Magen 1996), politics (e.g. Deflem and Pampel 1996; Meyer et al. 1997), and market (e.g. Hirst and Thompson 1996). Furthermore, analytical models have been advanced to make theoretical sense of globalization (e.g. Albrow 1997; Robertson 1992; Robertson and Khondker 1998; Sassen 1996).

Foregoing a more detailed analysis, there are at least two important analytical issues in the globalization literature that will prove relevant in the context of this book. First, globalization is a very broad concept covering a variety of events and activities in a multitude of social domains, often laden with strong normative connotations (Amin 1997; Silbey 1997; Woodiwiss 1996). In this book, globalization is understood in strict analytical terms as designating a degree of interdependence between geographically distinct social units, especially national states and their institutions. On the basis of this conception, two basic forms of globalization can be distinguished. On the one hand, some social developments are not restricted to any one national state or otherwise bordered social unit. The spread of capitalism, for instance, affects many societies at once and is as such a phenomenon supra-national to

---

1 A fairly extensive literature existed, especially in the years after World War I, which went under the heading of 'international police'. However, it dealt not with police institutions of criminal law enforcement, but with ways of establishing and maintaining international peace, in which meaning the term is sometimes still used today (e.g. Perritt 1999).

2 For overviews on the globalization literature, see the bibliographies in Albrow 1997; Boli and Thomas 1999; Featherstone 1990; Robertson 1992; Sassen 1996.
localities. On the other hand, other international patterns originate from one country or locality, or involve forms of cooperation and/or conflict between various entities. These forms of internationalization indicate, respectively, a trans-national intrusion across and an international relatedness between distinct localities.

Secondly, and relatedly, the globalization theme has often been addressed in terms of the relationship between international and national (or local) social structures and processes (e.g. Robertson 1992:124–125, 176–177). This relationship pertains to important issues of sovereignty and self-determination (or the loss thereof), and it entails analytically the question of whether internationalization and nationalization are conflicting trends, revealing tension and opposition (Ruggie 1993), or whether they complement one another in a more or less harmonious fashion (Amin 1997). These two questions are also at the heart of this study on the internationalization of the police function to consider the form under which international police practices take place and how a variety of such activities relate to local and intra-national police tasks and organizations. Before I offer a theoretical model of these issues, I will clarify relevant aspects of the sociology of social control, the second subfield in sociology in which this study is situated.

**International policing and the sociology of social control**

Although the sociology of law and social control can rely on a long history dating back to some of the discipline's most prominent founders (e.g. Durkheim 1893; Weber 1922:387–513), relatively little contemporary work of an explicitly sociological nature is devoted to uncovering institutionalized responses to crime and deviance, especially the function and institution of the police. While it cannot be denied that sociological research has successfully been devoted to the study of the police, both in terms of gaining a broad understanding of the role of the police in society as well as on more distinct aspects of policing (e.g. Bayley 1985; Black 1980; Bittner 1970; Jacobs and Helms 1997; Manning 1977; Marx 1988; Skolnick 1966), it is a truism indeed that, as Jacobs and O'Brien (1998) argue, coercion and the police remain conspicuously understudied by sociologists. Instead, there has been a trend towards the specialized treatment of the police outside the sociological mainstream, especially in criminal justice studies. No doubt pushed by social pressures (especially for police research to serve policy needs), this has brought about not only a fragmentation of knowledge, but also an instrumentalization of research questions in terms of administrative goals, a condition often and rightly lamented by sociologists in search of a more analytically justified outlook (Farrell and Koch 1995; Leo 1996). Regardless of whether this lack of attention to the police by sociologists parallels societal significance (for instance, the relative weight in national and world affairs of the polity versus the police), it has in effect impeded a maturation of social control and the police as serious sociological research themes. Perhaps most striking is the neglect of the police by political and comparative-historical sociologists, some notable exceptions notwithstanding (e.g. Tilly, Tilly, and Tilly 1975; Tilly 1986). It is especially remarkable that political sociologists have neglected the state's coercive apparatuses when we consider that Max Weber related his conception of the state explicitly to the institutionalized means of force. Weber defined the state in instrumental terms as 'that human community which within a certain territory ... claims for itself (with success) a monopoly of legitimate physical coercion' (Weber 1919:506; see also Weber 1922:514–540, 566–567, 815–868). But despite Weber's explicit reference to the coercive agency of the police in his definition of the state, sociologists have mostly been interested in the state as the centre of political power over a territory, rather than in the bureaucratic apparatuses of legitimate force the state has at its disposal (but see Torpey 2000). However, in this book I do not seek to argue against a trend in political sociology. Yet, I do hope to demonstrate that the study of the police as a distinct theme of sociological analysis and reflection makes sound sense.

Corresponding to this book's intention to bring out the unique place of the function and institution of the police, the gradual delineation of social control as a separate theme of reflection has been the central development in the history of sociological theorizing on social control (Cohen and Scull 1985; Coser 1982; Liska 1997; Scull 1988). The concept of social control was since its 19th-century origins, especially in American sociology, at first virtually synonymous with social order, denoting the capacity of a group or society to regulate itself and secure harmony among its members. Since the 1950s, however, social control has come to be conceived more narrowly in relation to deviance and crime. Despite some attempts to redefine social control again more broadly (e.g. Janowitz 1991), social control has become a mainstay in this more restricted conception, referring to a variety of social processes and structures that—corresponding to the three dominant sociological theory groups (functionalism, social-constructionism, and conflict
sociology)—redress, create, or reproduce more than crime and/or deviant behaviour (e.g. Cohen 1985; Deflem 1994b; Marx 1981).

The understanding of social control in relation to crime does not of course imply that social control is conceived only as reactive to crime or as being in one-to-one correspondence with the amount and intensity thereof. Nor does this conception imply the assumption that social control has no connection to broader issues involved with social order and integration, questions which, of course, any sociology must address. The notion of social control conceptually tied to crime and deviance only intends to take advantage of a methodological strategy that analytically disconnects various dimensions of society to analyse them separately, despite their empirical interconnectedness. It was precisely in this way that the most notable founders of our discipline were able to develop relevant theories of law and social control: Marx in criticizing the modern criminal justice system as contributing to, and justifying, conditions of socio-economic inequality (Marx 1846); Weber in his discussion of the formal rationalization of law in elective affinity with developments in economy, politics, and culture (Weber 1922:503–513); and Durkheim, perhaps most clearly, through a masterful analysis of quantitative and qualitative changes in law and punishment that, irrespective of the level and nature of crime, corresponded to changes in societal organization (Durkheim 1893:200–225, 1901).

Situated within the more delineated perspective of social control, sociological research has also been devoted to the institution and function of the police. The sociology of policing has, relevant to the present research, drawn considerable attention to the historical roots and transformations of modern police systems (Fijnaut 1979; Funk 1986; Liang 1992; Raeff 1975; Siemann 1983a). Among the critical topics of research on police history are the transformation of the police function, especially the relationship between the institution of the police and the political context of national states. In this respect, the gradual delineation of the police function to the enforcement of rules formally defined in criminal law, relatively independent of the political goals of established regimes, counts among the most interesting, yet also most problematic, developments. Further, it can be noted that most studies in the historical police literature are confined to developments at the urban and national levels. Scholars, moreover, have often treated issues of the police in relation to patterns of crime and/or as an aspect of formalized legal systems. These developments have hindered the development of the study of international police practices, and have additionally impeded the treatment of the police as a research topic in its own right.

Yet, although the history of international policing is a much neglected topic of sociological inquiry, an explicit focus on international dimensions of the police has been of growing scholarly concern. Among the growing sociologically oriented literature in the area are, to be mentioned especially in the context of the United States: Ethan Nadelmann’s (1993) study of the role of US law enforcement in a global war on drugs; David Bayley’s (1995, 1996, 1997) work on the role of US police in the promotion of democratic regimes abroad; William McDonald’s (1997c, d) research of the policing of illegal immigration; Martha Huggins’ (1998) work on US-controlled police training programmes in South America; Otwin Marenin’s studies of police organizations’ role in foreign policy (Marenin 2001; Cottam and Marenin 1999); and Dunn’s (1996) and Kraska and Kappeler’s (1997) analyses of the militarization of US police organizations. Also of growing concern in the context of the United States have been police issues involved with the control of the US–Mexican border (see, e.g., Andreas 1994, 1996, 2000; Deflem 2001, forthcoming). In Europe, international policing has been discussed in an even more flourishing literature, a trend that has been accelerated with the unification of Europe in the European Union (e.g. Anderson and Den Boer 1994; Benyon 1996; Fijnaut 1991, 1993b; Hebenton and Thomas 1995, 1998; Heindensohn 1997; Klosek 1999). Other investigations have focused on international police organizations and criminal developments in a global context (e.g. Anderson 1989; Deflem and Henry-Turner 2001; Findlay 1999; Fooner 1989; Koenig and Das 2001; Pearce and Woodiwiss 1993). In addition to these studies, comparative perspectives of policing have sought to learn from police experiences across the world (e.g. Bayley 1985, 1991; Maguire and Schulte-Murray 2001; Mawby 1990, 1999). Many studies on international policing are rather technical in nature or written from a legal perspective (e.g. Gibney 1990; Santiago 2000; Zagaris 1996), but other contributions offer more theoretically oriented and general discussions (e.g. Bayley 1996; Deflem 2000; Deflem and Swygart 2000; Marx 1997; McDonald 1997a, b; Sheptycki 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998b; Vagg 1993).

Clearly, as international police specialists James Sheptycki (2000b) and Monica den Boer (1999) argue, internationalization may be considered among the most critical challenges of policing today, though, as I will show, with considerable historical roots stretching far back in
time. Research in the area of international policing has particularly centred on the mechanisms of interchange among national police forces, involving trends of standardization across nations as well as the development of informal and formalized cooperation among national police systems (Marx 1997). Among the critical issues addressed are the tensions and relationships between national and international police operations, concerning especially issues of sovereignty and legal jurisdiction (Deflem 1997b; Fijnaut and Marx 1995). Relatedly, a key issue revolves around the changing functions of national police systems with the appearance and increasing penetration of international dimensions of policing (Bayley 1996; Herbert 1997; McDonald 1997b).

The growing body of scholarship on international policing has done much to advance our understanding of various aspects of the historical and contemporary dimensions of international police structures and processes. However, while international policing is of growing scholarly interest, its historical antecedents have not yet been sufficiently researched. Among the most noteworthy exceptions are Fijnaut’s (1979) comprehensive comparative study of national police systems in Europe, Liang’s (1992) study of European police history, and Nadelmann’s (1993:15–102) chapters on the history of the internationalization of US law enforcement. Yet, most studies of policing that have paid attention to the history of police systems have focused on state-internal developments, specifically the separation of the police from the military and the role of the police in maintaining autocratic political regimes. As such, this book hopes to fill a void in the contemporary literature by illuminating various aspects in the history of international policing.

**International policing across and between Germany and the United States**

This book investigates the internationalization of policing in the context of international practices that emanated from and took place between Germany and the United States from the second half of the 19th century until the end of World War II. While the rationale for the value of the delineation of my research topic will hopefully increase as the argument in this book unfolds, Germany and the United States present unique cases of national development, similar in some ways and contrasting in others, in terms of economic, political, military, and, indeed, police power. As I will explain in more detail in a later section of this chapter, among the most striking features is the fact that politically Germany did not turn to democratic government until the end of World War II, while the United States was built on the democratic ideal, however restrictively understood. Despite marked differences in the nature of political rule, both countries developed a federal structure of government and, perhaps most critically for this study, both Germany and the United States matured in political, military, and economic respects in roughly the same period—the second half of the 19th century—but with sharply different repercussions, culminating in both countries’ antagonistic involvement in two world wars. In matters of policing, too, the respective and related histories of Germany and the United States may provide an interesting, empirically rich, and theoretically provocative field of inquiry. Despite my concentration on these two countries, I will traverse the fixed national-geographic borders to the extent that it serves the analysis of pertinent issues of international policing. The role of Germany in the history of Europe, and that of the United States on the American continent, may justify this broadening of the research perspective. Likewise, the time frame of police developments discussed in this book has no rigidly fixed boundaries. As a sociologist, I am interested, not in places and periods, but in issues of social significance that may or may not vary over space and time, to be illuminated with methodologically and theoretically appropriate instruments of analysis.

I conceive of international policing broadly as police activities that relate to citizens—investigators and/or suspects—or jurisdictions of different nations. Occasionally, I may also hint at other police activities which involve the breaking of some physical or social barrier and which can be more broadly understood as dimensions of cross-border policing, but only when they relate to international police practices. I centre attention, moreover, on various forms of internationalization which, on the basis of the typology of internationalization discussed above, ideally or typically involve the following: German and US police practices affected by similar conditions; police plans and operations originating either from Germany or from the United States that affect other countries or their nationals; and bilateral and multilateral international cooperation efforts, including joint German and US police practices.

I define the police as the institution formally charged by states to lawfully execute the monopoly over the means of coercion (Manning 1977:105). In identifying the police as an important dimension of social
control, I do not define the category of the police beyond inclusion of all those functions, institutions, and activities which are so labelled in the societies at hand. My analysis, also, is mostly not about the police (in the plural) as a force of law-enforcement officials, but about the police (in the singular) as a function and/or institution. Emphasis will be on public police institutions that are formally sanctioned with the legitimate exercise of force at various levels of government in national states. Also, my analysis is not about coercion or violence, nor about the use of force, but about that organizational institution of states that has a legitimate right to use force under specified circumstances, a point more often than not obscured in the literature (e.g. Jacobs and O'Brien 1998:838).

Bureaucratization and international police cooperation

In the modern state, real authority . . . rests necessarily and unavoidably in the hands of the bureaucracy.

*Max Weber.*

I already drew attention to the fact that the relative neglect of the theme of the police in sociology is particularly striking in the light of the centrality of the bureaucratic apparatus in Max Weber’s conception of the state. Besides conceptually incorporating bureaucracy in his definition of the state, Weber went as far as to equate modern power with bureaucracy: ‘domination (Herrschaft) is in everyday life primarily administration (Verwaltung)’ (Weber 1922:126). It is Weber’s incorporation of a perspective of bureaucracy into his theory of the state that provides the foundation for the theoretical model of international police cooperation advanced in this book.3

To date, Weber’s writings on bureaucracy have mostly been applied in normative terms and have relatedly served as a basis for conflict theories (Collins 1986). When bureaucratic theories are used in the study of social control, they similarly tend to emphasize the dangers involved with state agencies operating without sufficient democratic control (e.g. Benson, Rasmussen, and Sollars 1995; O’Reilly 1987; Gamson and Yuchtman 1977; Useem 1997). The relevance of these studies cannot be denied, but based on the notion that critique cannot be constitutive of analysis, I follow a different route and develop a Neo-Weberian model to empirically uncover historical developments of the police. Let me first briefly repeat the key elements of Weber’s perspective of bureaucracy.

**Weber on bureaucracy and bureaucratic autonomy**

Corresponding to Weber’s perspective of societal rationalization as having gone in the direction of an increasing reliance on principles of efficiency in terms of a calculation of means (Weber 1920:13–17, 1922:514–516), Weber considered the modern state bureaucracy to be the most quintessential expression of formally rationalized societies (Weber 1922:551–579). Conceived as those institutional structures in charge of implementing policies decided upon in the polity, state bureaucracies of the modern type strive for an efficient management on the basis of the following organizational design: 1) bureaucratic offices are subject to a principle of fixed jurisdictional areas; 2) they are firmly and hierarchically ordered; 3) their activities are based upon written documents (files); 4) the public equipment of the official is divorced from their private property, and the executive offices are separated from the household; 5) specialized training is required; 6) the official activity is a full-time job; and 7) the management of bureaucratic offices is guided by general rules (Weber 1922:551–554). In addition to these organizational aspects, Weber specified various principles that guided bureaucratic activity. Most generally, Weber argued, the modern bureaucracy operates on the basis of a formal-rationality which entails that the technically most superior means are to be utilized. Officialdom operates without emotion on the basis of a ‘formalistic impersonality’ oriented at an equal application of rules and procedures to all, employing the most efficient, and only the most efficient means, given certain goals (Weber 1922:128, 561–566). Officials are appointed on the basis of their proven professional skills and the technical qualifications they acquired through special training (Weber 1922:128, 561–566). Bureaucracies are specialized, both from one another in terms of the various tasks they have to fulfil (e.g. collection of taxes, military protection, maintenance of order and crime control), and internally with respect to a specialized division of labor (e.g. investigations, evidence, personnel). Finally, with efficiency and specialization comes bureaucratic knowledge, including technical know-how (technical

---

3 My reading of Weber’s perspective of bureaucracy relies on the relevant sections from the posthumous collection *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* (Economy and Society) (especially Weber 1922:551–579, 815–837) and additional writings on bureaucracy in Germany (Weber 1918) and the political profession (Weber 1919). English translations can be found in Weber 1958, 1978.
expertise) and official information (the knowledge accumulated in the exercise of official business) (Weber 1918:352–354). Next to the organizational design and modus operandi of bureaucracies, Weber devoted attention to analysing the social consequences of bureaucratization. Among them, Weber found most significant the trends towards bureaucratic autonomy, that is, the gradual formation of a bureaucratic machinery free from political and popular control.

I rely on Weber's theories to put forward the main thesis of this book that national police agencies can form international networks with wide international participation when they are sufficiently disconnected from their political contexts and have developed a specialized agenda for the control of international crime. However, according to Weber, it is also important to discuss the societal conditions under which bureaucracies were formed and developed. Conforming to his perspective of elective affinity, Weber linked bureaucratic rationalization to economic, political, and cultural conditions, particularly the development of a monetary economy and the rise of the modern state and mass political parties (Weber 1922:556–566). Yet, while Weber argued that these conditions facilitated the development of bureaucracy, they were 'not indispensable' preconditions and could not account for bureaucratic activity (Weber 1922:558). In fact, Weber argued, it was the technical superiority of the bureaucracy that was 'the decisive factor' for its spread as the most dominant form of organization (Weber 1922:561). In other words, the development of bureaucratic activity to apply principles of efficiency and calculability 'without regard for the person' was, according to Weber, more than any other factor accountable for the spread of bureaucratic rationalization (Weber 1922:562).

The primary regard for a purposive-rational execution in the modern bureaucracy is what accounts for its drift towards stability and independence, beyond and possibly even against political control (Weber 1919:541–542). Under those conditions, Weber argued, the bureaucratic apparatus becomes a permanent 'almost unbreakable formation,' while control of the bureaucracy is 'only limitedly possible for the non-specialist: the specialist is in the long run frequently superior in getting his will done' (Weber 1922:570, 128–129). The officials are overwhelmingly powerful because of their expertise, knowledge, organizational skills, independent decision-making, and maintenance of 'secrecy of knowledge and intentions' (Weber 1922:572, 1918:333–342). Under these circumstances, then, the bureaucratic official has the real power and the political officeholder, whether democratically elected or not, is always in the position of 'a dilettante against the professional expert' (Weber 1922:572).

The bureaucracy of the police

It requires no great stretch of the imagination to conceive of public police institutions as bureaucracies. Formally sanctioned by states with the task of order maintenance and crime control, police institutions are arguably the most visible and concrete expression of the state's monopoly over the means of coercion. Weber himself put forward the conception of the police as bureaucracy when he specified among the functions of the modern state 'the protection of personal security and public order (police)' (Weber 1922:516). Weber also discussed as the most significant political factor that contributed to the furtherance of the bureaucratization process 'the increasing need, in a society accustomed to pacification, for order and protection ("police") in all areas' (Weber 1922:561). It was from then on, Weber continued, that the police had acquired the position of 'God's representative'.

Yet, despite the rather obvious relevance of Weber's bureaucracy and state perspective to police, it has not been very influential in research on social control. Instead of focusing on police organizations as bureaucratic institutions, several police scholars have defended a state-centred theory of social control and police (Busch 1995; Fijnaut 1979; Huggins 1998; Jacobs and O'Brien 1998). Such a perspective holds that the dynamics of policing and international policing are to be accounted for with reference to the political-ideological dictates and interests of the governments of national states. As an elaboration of these political theories, it has also been suggested that police and social control are determined by economic developments associated with the expansion of capitalism (Robinson and Scaglion 1987; Spitzer 1985). Such an economic perspective views the police as a tool in the suppression of the working classes, or more generally, in the control of labour.

Whereas political and economic perspectives share a commitment to explain developments of police and social control in terms of an overarching external variable, a contrasting perspective suggests that police and international police practices cannot be explained in terms of the political and economic conditions they are no doubt confronted with, but are instead determined by internal organizational developments related to a process of bureaucratization. I will here develop such a
model on the basis of Weber's theory, but mention should be made of the fact that while a bureaucratic model has been far less applied in scholarly work on police and social control than political/economic perspectives, it has found some application in prior research (although not always with reference to Weber). Apart from the fact that many of these studies are rather limited in scope and apply to only one organization or singular aspect of policing (e.g. Ethington 1987; Ng-Quinn 1990; Theoharis 1992), they mostly find their primary relevance in a normative orientation to expose the negative impact of police discretion and lack of accountability (e.g. O'Reilly 1987; Skolnick 1966). This parallels a development in the sociology of organizations, where—often inspired by Weber's work (see Clegg 1994)—it has been a central concern to develop a critique of excessive bureaucratization (Jacoby 1969; Page 1985). In this literature, bureaucratization becomes virtually synonymous with dehumanization and oppression, and police bureaucratization is criticized in light of principles of democratic control and accountability. As mentioned before, my reliance on Weber serves purposes that are entirely analytical, using concepts from the Weberian bureaucracy perspective to construct a model that accounts for variation in empirical reality.

Finally, it should be mentioned that a more sustained development of studies of the police similar to the bureaucratic perspective has relied on the work, not of Weber, but of Michel Foucault, especially his theories of discipline and governmentality (Foucault 1975, 1978, 1982a, b). These studies have argued that various dimensions of social control are not justified in terms of a system of sovereign legality but are conceived as an efficient management of a depoliticized society of living subjects, irrespective of state and market (e.g. Simon 1988; Stenson 1993). Indeed, Foucault's governmentality perspective usefully brings out how certain modalities of power and social control cannot be accounted for with reference to formal legal systems and political orders. Foucault argued that the governmental form of power which developed since the 19th century did not rely on any justification in terms of a centred state or singular 'Prince', but was instead conceived in terms of an efficient economy directed at furthering the fertility of territories and the health and movements of the population. Governmentality broke with any form of state-sanctioned legalism: the legal system merely represented what was judged useful for, or harmful to, a society of living beings. In its effectuation, according to Foucault, governmentality relied on a triple alliance of criminology, statistics, and the police (see Garland 1985; Pasquino 1991b). Criminology provided the necessary knowledge about the regularities which criminal statistics had uncovered and upon which the police could act in both proactive and reactive ways. This perspective of the police, Foucault argued, was very broadly understood as 'a program of government rationality . . . to create a system of regulation of the general conduct of individuals whereby everything would be controlled to the point of self-sustenance, without the need for intervention' (Foucault 1982:241). In sum, these police activities were not intimately linked with and restricted to the dictates of formal legal systems but operated more independently on the basis of a broad, near total understanding of power.

A Foucauldian model can usefully bring out aspects of an autonomously operating technology of policing, but the theory has also been criticized, first, because it cannot deal satisfactorily with the ambiguous structures of law and social control in terms of justice as well as coercion (Habermas 1985:279–343), and, second, because it neglects the place of punishment and control in a broader societal context as well as the continued relevance of the formal legal order (Lacombe 1996; Smith 2000). Although there is some debate on the validity of these criticisms against Foucault (Deflem 1997a; Garland 1990, 1997; Simon 1994), it is clear that these two concerns were precisely of key significance from Weber's theoretical perspective. Indeed, on the one hand, Weber developed a theory of the effects of bureaucratization in addition to a descriptive-explanatory analysis of its course and outcome in a comparative-historical context, and, on the other hand, Weber developed a theoretical perspective that took into account the external conditions that favoured the bureaucratization process but that also emphasized its internal organizational logic (Albrow 1970:45–49; Page 1985:162–171; Mommsen 1987). Therefore, also, although a Foucauldian analysis can to some extent surely be complementary to a perspective based on Weber's bureaucracy theories, the model advanced in this book focuses attention on the dynamics that work towards bureaucratic autonomy without neglecting the external contexts in which bureaucratization takes place.

A Weberian model of international policing

Because my research on the internationalization of the police function centres on developments that accompanied the consolidation of Western national states since the middle of the 19th century, the model
of international police that I introduce in this book rests on the assumption that certain societal, especially demographic, political, and economic conditions favoured the formation of specialized police institutions that are sufficiently formalized to conceive of them as bureaucracies. I cannot here provide an in-depth analysis of this development but briefly summarize the existing research (Bayley 1985:23–50; Manning 1977:41–71; Ng-Quinn 1990). Among the conditions favourable to the development of police bureaucracies can be mentioned a greater need for a specialized organization of crime control and order maintenance as societies grew in size and complexity. This relates to demographic developments (growing population size and density) as well as to increasing urbanization, industrialization, and technological progress. The most relevant political factor is that states concentrated ever more policy tasks in a centralized administration. Although these developments have not been accomplished evenly from one society to the next, bureaucratization tendencies are witnessed wherever national states have developed (Jacoby 1969:156–159; Parsons 1964:303–307; Torstendahl 1991).

Rationalization processes have historically influenced the bureaucratization of the modern police function across Western societies (Bayley 1985:23–52; Mawby 1990:16–33). Despite national variations (which I will explain below in greater detail for German and US police institutions), modern police development has gone in the direction of the creation of a specialized bureaucratic apparatus in both functional and organizational respects (Bayley 1985:12–14; Manning 1977:109–111; Skolnick 1966:235–239). Functionally, public police institutions have gradually come to be responsible for order maintenance and crime control, tasks which are specified in a formal system of laws and for the fulfilment of which the police can legitimately resort to force. Organizationally, bureaucratization of the police is reflected in a variety of characteristics which closely follow Weber's typology: though separated from the military, police bureaucracies are hierarchically ordered with a clear chain of command and internal structure (discipline); agents are formally trained experts who, as full-time appointed officials (professionalization), perform specialized duties (division of labour); and policing operates on the basis of a legitimate system of rules and procedures (professionalism); and is driven toward the use of technically efficient means, such as secrecy and force (purposive rationality).

Based on the view of police as bureaucracy, I will outline a two-tier model that differentiates between the structural conditions and operational motives of international policing. Structural conditions refer to a social environment that needs to be present for national police agencies to be in the position to move beyond the confines of their respective national jurisdictions. These conditions are necessary but insufficient for police institutions to engage in international cooperation. When the structural conditions are met, I argue, international police organizations need an additional motivational basis to become operational. The fact that national police agencies are in a position to cooperate internationally does not yet provide any reasons for collaboration if there are no organizationally defined goals that international police operations should fulfil. Relying on Weber, I will specify the structural conditions and operational motives of international policing in terms of two aspects of bureaucratic autonomy: 1) as a structural condition for cooperation across national borders, police institutions must have gained a sufficient degree of independence as specialized bureaucracies from their respective governments; and 2) international police cooperation plans can be operationalized when participating police institutions share a system of knowledge on international crime, including information on its empirical state and expertise for its control.

My first proposition relates to conditions that need to be fulfilled to create the structural opportunity of international policing. These conditions must be met regardless of whether created opportunities will actually lead to successful and stable cooperation. Peter Blau (1964:64–68) has specified conditions for exchange among collectivities by suggesting that inter-organizational exchange can occur when organizations are interdependent, for instance because of utilitarian-economic considerations in terms of organizational tasks and objectives. In the absence of supranational enforcement duties, police bureaucracies cannot be interdependent in practical respects in quite the same way as other organizations are in terms of a functional division of labour. However, given similarity in the institutional position of police bureaucracies across nations, formal congruence among police institutions in terms of their positions of relative independence from governments can be considered a condition for inter-organizational cooperation across national jurisdictions. Thus, as a corollary to the
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4 The fact that my analytical model is rooted in theories of rationalization processes that have taken place in Western national states no doubt limits the generalizability of my research findings, and alternative models may be needed to account for non-Western developments, such as in the context of colonial policing (see, e.g. Dellem 1994a).
fact, police institutions have become specialized and segregated from other state administrations such as the military (Manning 1977:111), I maintain that they can engage in cooperation with corresponding bureaucracies, i.e. other police institutions, from other nation-states, because of their similar high degree of detachment from their respective political centres. This detachment, I agree with Weber, is enabled by an increasing rationalization of police organization and police tasks in an instrumental manner that is primarily concerned with efficiency and impersonal calculability of means. The conditions of these rationalization processes are, as I will explain in this book, primarily technical in nature, related to advances in the means of criminal investigation and police technique (see Chapter 2). An important consequence of increasing rationalization in police institutions is that highly bureaucratized police institutions can function ‘as a machine’ and are ‘capable of universal application’ (Weber 1922:561, 126). Such universal applicability of police bureaucracies cuts across the boundaries of national states.

A high degree of bureaucratic autonomy will be indicated by a relative independence of police institutions from their respective governments in respect of the organization of those institutions and their field of operations. Bureaucratic autonomy is revealed by a commitment to professional standards of policing, rather than political loyalty, as reflected in the appointment process, police training and recruitment, and, most importantly, the planning and execution of strategies. If institutional independence is not or insufficiently achieved, police cooperation will remain limited with respect to international participation and will not extend beyond the confines of politically akin states, i.e. national states that resemble one another in ideological respects and/or that entertain close ties in international relations.

The notion of institutional independence does not imply an absolute autonomy or complete detachment of police institutions from the political centres of states. On the contrary, public police institutions are always agents of state control and as public institutions they can derive their legitimacy only from states. The institutional independence of the police, therefore, remains a matter of degree relative to the (historically variable) control from national governments. Yet, with these qualifications in mind, the condition of relative autonomy of police from the political powerholders of the state relates to the fact that police bureaucracies rely on a means–ends rationality to employ what are held to be the technically most efficient, not necessarily the politically most opportune means given set goals. The irony is that police institutions can then perform enforcement duties they were formally sanctioned to perform by the centre of the state in a manner that is no longer bound to its political dictates.

I focus on bureaucratic autonomy from politics although I discussed earlier political as well as economic perspectives of social control as alternatives to my model. Yet, it is to be noted that the economic model of social control is not far removed from a political outlook inasmuch as it views the state in instrumentalist terms as being controlled by the ruling economic classes. Indeed, when, as in this book, the focus is on public police institutions, there is an inherent imbalance between economic and political forces because only political states formally sanction the institutionalization of legitimate internal coercion. In other words, based on a state-centred theory, political elites control police institutions directly, whereas a neo-Marxian model would hold that economic elites exert influence via their control of the state. Therefore, my first proposition introduces independence of police institutions from the political context of nation-states.

Proposition 1: The greater the extent to which national police institutions have gained a position of institutional independence from their respective political centres, the greater is the chance that those institutions are in a position to engage in international cooperation.

An alternative way of formulating this proposition is that police institutions are in a position to cooperate internationally when they have gained bureaucratic independence from the political centres of their respective states (formal bureaucratic autonomy). Or, conversely, a lack or low degree of institutional autonomy will impede the formation of international police structures. Police institutions that remain tied to the political centres of their states will either insulate themselves from international duties to stay within the boundaries of their national jurisdictions, or will engage in transnational activities that are intimately related to national tasks. International activities under these circumstances will not go beyond unilaterally conducted police operations abroad, temporary bilateral cooperation for specific duties, or limited international forms of cooperation among police of politically like-minded states. My first proposition specifies structural conditions that allow for the possibility of international policing, but yet to be spelled out are the
operational motives police agencies must develop in order to accomplish international cooperation. These motives form the basis around which to form a new field of activities that transcends the borders of national jurisdictions. In this respect, I rely on Meyer and Rowan's (1977) thesis that the operational rules and procedures of bureaucratic organizations function as 'myths' that define problems and specify solutions in terms framed by and for the bureaucracy (see, also, Crank 1994; Crank and Langworthy 1992). It is useful to call these cultural systems of knowledge myths, not to convey the notion that they are empirically false but that it is not primarily relevant whether or not they are. Together with the level of attained organizational efficiency, these myths influence the organization's legitimacy, activities, and resources, while minimizing external inspection and control. In the case of policing, the organizationally defined myth that motivates police cooperation across national borders is provided by a professional interest in and conception of the control of international crime. The reasons the police can lay claim to define, and offer appropriate solutions to, the international crime problem relate to the fact that bureaucratic police institutions, as Weber (1918:352-354) argued about bureaucracies in general, accumulate specialized knowledge, including official information about the extent of and expertise to deal with international crime. Specialized systems of knowledge on international crime in terms of the proper means of objectives of international policing have operational consequences across national jurisdictions to the extent that they are shared among national police institutions.

Proposition 2: The greater the extent to which national police institutions can rely on a common organizational interest in the fight against international crime, the greater is the chance that those institutions will participate in international police cooperation.

Formulated alternatively this proposition states that international police cooperation is more likely when police institutions have established systems of expert knowledge related to the fight against international crime (operational bureaucratic autonomy). Or, conversely, international police cooperation is unlikely to succeed—even if structural conditions are favourable—when participating agencies do not share an agenda in the fight against international crime.

Bureaucratization, professionalization, and international police cooperation

The first two propositions of my theoretical model point to the bureaucratization of police institutions as a critical determinant of international police cooperation, arguing that formal and operational bureaucratic autonomy increase the chances of international cooperation on a broad multilateral scale. This perspective attributes special significance to the expertise of police officials and their position, skills, and commitment as professionals. Based on insights from the sociology of organizations and professions (see Abbott 1988; Halliday 1987; Macdonald 1995), a brief excursion may clarify my theoretical position on bureaucratization and professionalization.

In the context of this book, a professional understanding of the police function with respect to means and objectives refers to conceptions of policing that are determined on the basis of claims to expertise in formal-rational terms, i.e. that are formulated in terms of efficiency standards irrespective of any ideological persuasions and other dictates of the governments of states. A professional conception of policing, in other words, is in contradiction with a notion of police as a mere extension of the power of the centre of states. My perspective harmonizes with police historian Samuel Walker's (1977) conception of police professionalization as involving, in the first instance, a claim to expertise and knowledge and, as a result, professional autonomy and a commitment to a service ideal. Expertise and knowledge concern techniques of the proper means of policing and information on the empirical conditions of police methods of supervision and control (e.g. for promotion). The service ideal, finally, relates to the police function as fulfilling a publicly recognized concern that is relevant to all of society, rather than to the members of the profession alone. Thus, the profession of policing is an ideal, but as an aspired ideal nonetheless clearly a reality with important consequences, which in terms of the history of international policing, as
I will show in this study, reveals that the 'emergence of nearly autonomous police bureaucracies is one of the main themes of modern police history' (Walker 1977:xi). In this tendency towards autonomy, professional claims to knowledge of technical expertise and accumulated information will be reaffirmed as the central driving force (see also Macdonald 1995:157–186).

As such, I defend a neo-Weberian perspective that conceives of police professionalization and police bureaucratization as two complementary processes, rather than two opposing forces. It is theoretically appropriate to argue that professionalization and bureaucratization go hand in hand on the basis of the Weberian perspective to conceive of these processes as manifestations of broader societal developments of rationalization (see Halliday 1983, 1987; Murray, Dingwall, and Eekelaar 1983; Rueschemeyer 1983). Within a Weberian framework, indeed, the emphasis of research is resolutely on the legitimation and exercise of power within a broader context of societal rationalization, which in the case of Western societies has taken the form of instrumental rationalization, and which organizationally has found its purest expression in the bureaucratic forms accompanying states and markets. It is in the specific institutional setting of the state bureaucracy that the police bureaucrat as professional is confronted with, and claims autonomy from, the political power-holder as amateur.

To be sure, sociologists of organizations and professions have shown that professionalization and bureaucratization do not necessarily go neatly hand in hand, especially when it concerns those professions that manage to gain autonomy and create their own culture of rules and network of relations separate from the institutional settings in which they practice their profession (Davies 1983). The legal and medical professions are exemplary in this respect (see, e.g. Engel 1969; Halliday 1987; Horobin 1983). However, in the case of public police institutions a separation between professional and bureaucratic components is not accomplished. For indeed, the profession of public police officials does not exist outside the institutional boundaries of the bureaucratic apparatus of nation states. On the contrary, as the evidence presented in this work will demonstrate, Walker (1977) is right to suggest that unlike the professions of law, education, and medicine, 'police service has evolved along bureaucratic lines' and that 'police careers are largely restricted to closed bureaucratic structures' (pp. x–xi). Unlike the free professions, then, police professionals have evolved from 'humble servants' to self-conscious experts within the setting of state bureaucracies (van Rhee 1999; see also De Lint 1999; Walker 1996).6

Relatedly, to the extent that police professionalization implies a (sub)culture of shared values and an accompanying network of officials, and in this sense includes a personal dimension, police culture and police bureaucracy mutually reinforce one another. In fact, in the internationalization of the police function, as this book will show, a global police culture emerged that not only did not hinder, but critically contributed to foster international ties among police institutions that were highly bureaucratized. Although it is no doubt true that Max Weber in his work neglected the informal aspects of bureaucracy (Herbert 1998; Heyman 1995), an inclusion of such considerations need not undermine the value of a perspective of (ideal-typically understood) bureaucracies, but can on the contrary contribute to unravel an additional important component in the bureaucratization process (see Blau 1955).

How can the concomitant professionalization and bureaucratization be accounted for theoretically as two complementary developments? The key, I argue, is that the tendency of state bureaucracies to gain institutional independence is itself already a paradoxical development. The very notion of bureaucratic autonomy is paradoxical inasmuch as it refers to an increasing independence of state institutions from the very centres that created them and from which they derive the legitimation of authority. My notion of institutional independence, therefore, should not be understood to imply that highly bureaucratized police institutions do not remain related to the governments of states, but only that they are autonomous in the planning and execution of their operations and strategies on the basis of professional considerations of expertise and knowledge. As such, any potential challenges from professional police associations to the strict code of conduct of bureaucratic authority (as well as the potential tensions between high-level and low-level members within the profession) hint at a tension that in the case of public police institutions can only operate within the bureaucratic context. Historically, indeed, the police profession did

6 In respect of the liberation from institutional boundaries that marks the free professions, a parallel in the area of policing is found in the private police and security industry. The internationalization of private policing is a much more recent phenomenon, however. Although I will discuss some historical antecedents, it was indeed not until recent decades that the 'world' of private policing has acquired more than mere metaphorical meaning (see Johnston 1992, 2000).
not only emerge in the context of the bureaucratic state, the profession has in its further evolution not been dislodged from the institutional setting of state bureaucracies. In sum, the modern police institution must be conceived as a professional bureaucracy, their members as 'bureau-professionals' (Davies 1983:183). Therefore, also, the specialists of the internal and external coercion powers of modern states, in the institutions of police and military, respectively, complement one another as fellow 'professionals in violence' (Janowitz 1960:3).

The nationality of international policing

At the beginning of this Introduction, I discussed how globalization scholars have speculated on the various forms of globalization and its relationship with local and national processes and structures. In terms of the form of international police operations, I introduced the distinction between events that (supranationally) affect police institutions in nations across the globe, transnational police operations that are unilaterally instigated by one national police system, and international forms of conflict and cooperation. I have in the above outlined theoretical model of bureaucratization placed a premium on the form of international police cooperation because it involves an attempt to forge alliances among police systems jointly in order to transcend the jurisdictions of their respective national states. Cooperation, therefore, is quite unlike other forms of international police activities, specifically supranational processes affecting policing and transnational police strategies. Supranational events shaping police institutions in similar ways may not be recognized as such, although factual harmonization may be expected to increase the likelihood of cooperation. Transnational operations on foreign soil or against foreign nationals will not involve other police systems unless such operations become known (and often contested), again affecting the likelihood of cooperation. As such, international police cooperation and the formation of a police organization with broad international participation are clearly central among the various forms of international policing.

In terms of the relationship between national and international processes and structures, my theoretical perspective relies on insights from globalization scholars who have argued that even though there are certain trends of harmonization and supranationality (Albrow 1997; Meyer et al. 1997), global processes also impact upon nations and other localities differentially (Robertson 1995; Rohl and Magen 1996; Yearley 1996). In terms of international cooperation across national states, this reaffirms those national states and their institutions as the central units of analysis inasmuch as they remain the participants in cooperation efforts. This viewpoint will in this book serve to defend the argument that international policing efforts are typically maintained as collaborative networks between national police systems, each of which separately also engages in unilaterally instigated transnational activities. These internal and external dimensions of policing, I argue, are to be conceived as existing side by side as two manifestations of the state-controlled monopoly of force. International police activities, therefore, typically do not conflict with national tasks, because international work is conceived explicitly as a dimension of the primary function of police to enforce the laws of the land (the police as representative of the state monopoly of force). Only in this way can police institutions make sense of the paradoxical fact that international police operations inevitably transcend the boundaries of the circumscribed national and otherwise localized jurisdictions police enforcement duties are formally subject to.

Proposition 3: National interests remain paramount in the planning and execution of international police activities and organizations.

This perspective conforms to the viewpoint that although national police institutions are not isolated from one another, they remain primarily involved with securing national-states' monopoly of legitimate coercion (Garland 1996; Herbert 1999). This is not only shown in unilaterally instigated transnational police activities responding to nationally defined police tasks, but also in international police cooperation efforts. Of course, planned and initiated cooperation efforts among police institutions across national borders represent a degree of attained internationality beyond the varied concerns of participating police. But even when united in joint organizational networks surrounding a common cause, as I will show, national police systems are influenced differently by, and variously react to, these global processes. Even despite collaborative activities and similarities in influencing factors, police systems across the world by and large keep their distinct traits based on national cultures and traditions and remain too varied in structure and activities to speak of a truly global trend of cross-cultural harmonization. I suggest an important persistence of nationality that researchers on police globalization must take into account.
The theoretical challenge of international policing

Before I proceed with my analysis on the basis of the outlined theory, a brief excursion may be useful to clarify my theoretical model relative to competing perspectives in the literature on international policing. Generally, it is clear that not only is international policing a relatively new and unexplored field of scholarly attention, many of its discussions are void of theoretical explorations and remain almost entirely or predominantly descriptive in nature (e.g. Anderson 1989; Benyon 1996; Foorer 1973, 1989). Of course, descriptively oriented empirical investigations do expand knowledge by exposing the hitherto relatively unknown dimensions and conditions of change and continuity of international policing. As such, these studies no doubt play a serious role in our scholarship. Complementary to this descriptive work are those contributions that seek to contribute to a better, more efficient, and/or more just state of international policing. These writings are, on the one hand, those that are technical in nature and attempt to contribute to the management and administration of international police strategies (see, e.g. contributions in Koenig and Das 2001). Although not meant to be scholarly, this work is at its very best surely informed by scholarship (e.g. Bayley 1995, 1997; Deflem 2001; Fijnaert 1991, 1995). On the other hand, normative issues in the world of international policing are addressed in work that focuses on concerns of justice involved with police internationalization and the potential or real threat in terms of human rights, democracy, and civil liberties (e.g. Brodeur 2000; Hebenton and Thomas 1995; Winer 1997). Such contributions play a critical role in a society’s public sphere, but they cannot form the basis for, nor should they be confused with, explanatory and theoretical work on the conditions and consequences of international policing.

While descriptive, technical, and normative studies of international policing can justly claim their distinct if limited place in the literature, it is more troublesome for the state of our knowledge of the field that a-theoretical contributions sometimes naively adopt a bland functionalist model which assumes that international police operations are designed and executed in response to international crime (e.g. Duino 1960; Foorer 1975; Forrest 1955; Santiago 2000; Tullett 1963). Then, it is supposed, rather than researched—let alone proven—that international policing has assumed greater relevance because of ‘the increasingly violent, crime-infested, and dangerous world of today’ (Das and Kratcoski 2001:25). No arguments are made to explain the dynamics of such causalities, not to mention that, as I will show in this book, they can by and large not be supported by available empirical evidence. Functionalist explanations merely restate, and assume it is legitimate to transpose at the level of scholarly explanation, the internal motives of international policing operations as they are put forward by participating agencies and officials. But, naturally, the rationalizations of the participants cannot be confused with the conditions of their behaviour.

Relatedly, there are contributions that assume that the dynamics of international policing can be explained solely in terms of the enforcement of international dimensions of national and local legal systems and/or regulations of international law (e.g. Gibney 1990; Möllman 1969; Walther 1968; Zagaris 1996; Zagaris and Resnick 1997). In this context, international policing is intimately connected with formal systems of law to suggest that the harmonization of national criminal codes and the codification of international criminal law are the central driving forces of international policing. Treaties between the governments of national states are conceived as the necessary basis of international law enforcement. But, revealing a shortcoming similar to functionalist interpretations, such legalistic perspectives of international policing merely assume and never even question the linkages and dynamics between law and policing that scholarship precisely needs to address. My study here will precisely show that the association between policing and legal systems, as between police and crime, is more problematic and dissonant.

Among the theoretically more informed perspectives of international policing, as I have already mentioned, are state-centred and economic-deterministic perspectives. These theories suggest that the structures and processes of international policing are determined by the political-ideological dictates of the governments of states and/or, relatedly, the interests of those classes that control the free market. Economic theories have been less popular among scholars interested in the dynamics of international police strategies involving public police institutions, but the approach has been applied to the internationalization of private policing and has had some impact in the literature that focuses on security and information issues in international policing. Les Johnston (2000), for instance, argues that trends in global capitalism have brought about a global security market, which is aligned with the international dimensions of public police to refashion the global state of international policing in a fragmented way. With respect to the role of information in economics, Peter Manning (2000) has emphasized the
role of information technologies in the constellation of international policing, and, relatedly, the changing world economy, the expansion of the free market, and the implications thereof for the flow of information across national borders. Information is thereby considered as having been commodified into a property, access to and use of which influences the planning of new, international methods of control (new methods of ‘cyber-policing’ are prototypical in this respect; see also Chan et al. 2001).

State-centred theories are a more common theoretical explanation of international police (e.g. Busch 1995; Fijnaut 1979; Huggins 1998). The popularity of this approach appears to be determined by the historical development that the institution of modern police was at its inception representative and protective of conservative political regimes and that 19th-century cooperation among national police systems, especially in Europe, was targeted primarily at the politically suspect opponents of established governments. The theoretically relevant implication, state-centred scholars argue, is that international police strategies are not only related to a nation-state’s foreign policy, but are deliberately constructed and executed as a politically motivated contribution to a powerful state’s international security agenda and quest for international dominance. Martha Huggins (1998), for instance, argues in favour of an internationalization perspective which posits that international policing, specifically in the form of assistance to police agencies abroad and operations on foreign soil, is ‘one mechanism for a country to gain political control over another state’ (p. 19). Thus, it is to be noted state-centred theories make a much stronger claim than political-science perspectives of international policing, which situate and research the dynamics of international policing in relation to a nation’s foreign policy and the world of international relations between the governments of states (e.g. Anderson et al. 1995; Andreas 2000; Cottam and Marenin 1999; Fijnaut 1993b; Liang 1992). Here, international policing issues are related to the foreign policy of nations without necessarily attributing to their planning and implementation any sinister motives of global domination. Important trends such as ‘imperialism’ in international policing and the involvement of intelligence and military agencies in police tasks now become questions of research, rather than assumptions (Sheptycki 2000b:9). Most ground-breaking in this line of thought has been Ethan Nadelmann’s (1993) study of the international aspects of US policing in the war on drugs. Arguing for a multi-causal perspective, Nadelmann is particularly interested in the diffusion of norms across national boundaries as influencing national policies of prohibition, including its impact on the institutions and practices of policing.

This book will show that the central problem of state-centred and economic perspectives of policing is that they fall short in terms of empirical adequacy requirements of constructing theoretical models that can account for variation in reality. Although some disagreement with respect to the analytical merits of their approach may remain, state-centred and economic perspectives take valid conclusions of research far beyond the immediate cases of their investigation to argue that all international police operations are politically motivated because certain developments in the 19th century were, or that interests of free-market control must be functionally implied in international policing because of the association of certain developments therewith, especially in more recent times. As such, only continued empirical research can strengthen our answers. Additionally, however, state-centred and economic theories are blinded by a hyper-normative understanding of their research subject and therefore fail to grasp the analytical strengths of a bureaucratization approach. Huggins (1998), for instance, writes that ‘in every sense all policing is political’ (p. 17). Such a proposition is not only conceptually meaningless, it can have no identifiable empirical usage. Instead, the variable connections and dissociations between the political centres of states, the one hand, and the state’s bureaucratic institutions, on the other, must be carefully examined. Thus, I agree with police scholar Neil Walker (1996), who formulated the conundrum of international policing very well: ‘Policing is obviously influenced by political ideas and interests, but how does this influence tend to be expressed? In what sense, if at all, does the sphere of policing retain a degree of independence from wider political forms and developments?’ (p. 251). As the evidence in this book will show, the answer is that police institutions cannot only maintain a considerable degree of independence in terms of means and objectives, but that such conditions of bureaucratic autonomy are indispensable for the planning and execution of successful forms of international police cooperation.

Importantly, to posit an institutional independence of police institutions does not mean that the police and policing are not related to wider societal, especially political conditions. On the contrary, formally charged with order maintenance and crime control, public police institutions are arguably the most visible and concrete expression of
the state’s legitimate monopoly over the (internal) means of coercion (see Bittner 1970; Melossi 1990; Reiner 1985). In fact, the proclaimed reliance of police institutions and other bureaucracies on principles of efficiency and their presentation in strictly professional terms are themselves important strategies of domination (Weber 1922:122-130). However, what is avoided in my theoretical model is a ‘naive determinism’ that commits the correlational fallacy that political influences on the police are all-explanatory of the dynamics of policing (Walker 1996:274). Instead, I suggest, the structures and mechanisms of international policing cannot be completely explained by the ideologically dictates of the political centre of states, and, furthermore, that international police cooperation on a broad multilateral scale is driven precisely by developments of bureaucratization related to the means and objectives of professional policing.

The relative dissociation of the police from politics does not contradict the notion, which my theoretical perspective additionally defends, that the participation of police institutions in international initiatives continues to serve national policing interests. To conceive of these two components of my theory as contradictory, or to commit the mistake of not clearly differentiating between them, can only be based on a failure to distinguish between the two central components of nation-states as involving both a political and a cultural dimension. It need not concern us here that philosophers and social theorists from Hegel to Marx and Habermas have pondered the significance of a just connection between these two dimensions of nation and state (e.g. Habermas 1962), as to point out the relevance of the hyphen in nation-state and its consequences for the state’s bureaucratic institutions. Indeed, paralleling my perspective that the process of bureaucratization is an essentially paradoxical development, my theory of international police cooperation argues against state-centred theories without neglecting the continued persistence of nationality. In this connection it is relevant to recall that nationalism historically refers not to a political claim of national governments but to a cultural claim of a people and its traditions. In similar vein, I argue that under influence of bureaucratization processes police institutions gradually break with the political centres of state, but without surrendering the traits and ambitions of their respective national cultures and traditions. Therefore, also, while international police strategies by definition transcend the boundaries of national states, nationally defined concerns continue to influence policing, even when they relate to supranational, transnational, or international (cooperative or conflictual) developments. International police strategies always cross but never erase boundaries. In the tracing of these developments from the middle of the 19th century up until the relatively recent period of World War II and its aftermath, therefore, a Weberian paradigm remains useful.

Finally, some comment is in order on those theories of international policing that build on the governmentality perspective developed by Michel Foucault (1978). As I stated before, this perspective also, like a Weberian viewpoint, argues for a ‘relocation’ of police ‘away from the political centre’ (Shearing 1996:286). However, governmentality studies of policing extend this ambition to defend a postmodern perspective. Indeed, especially as appropriated and popularized by Nikolas Rose and his devotees associated with the journal *Economy and Society* (see, e.g. Barry, Osborne, and Rose 1996; O’Malle 1997; Rose 1999), the governmentality theory of policing argues against a state-centred or otherwise localized theory of control in favour of an uncovering of the increasingly complex shifts and re-alignments among and between the various components of governance, including formal police institutions. Reminiscent of Foucault’s (1981) statement that policing in the governmentality mode ultimately ‘includes everything’ (p. 248), governmentality scholars argue that the complexity of governmentality is such that it defies one model of explanation bringing logic to a constellation that is essentially a diversified patchwork. In consequence, to use the terminology of Jean-François Lyotard (1979), all that is left is a generalized ‘incredulity toward metanarratives’ (p. xxiiv). In the area of international policing, James Shepptycki (1998a, b) has contributed centrally to a postmodern perspective, arguing that cross-border policing comprises such a multifarious hybrid of strategies and agencies that it defies clear-cut categorization, particularly in terms of assessing the rise of transnational policing and its role in diminishing or strengthening state power.

The theory I advanced in this work and its application in the coming chapters will show the merit of rejecting a postmodern approach to international policing on more than theoretical grounds alone. As an approach, postmodernist theorizing must ultimately abandon a rational foundation to resort to aesthetic posturing or, at best, a crypto-normativism (Habermas 1985). As a model of explanation, more importantly, a postmodern approach appears to totally abandon standards of scientific inquiry, especially in terms of empirical adequacy. But what I wish to show in this book is that increased complexity in the...
internationalization of policing need not imply that its historical antecedents cannot be empirically traced and its various components unravelled in terms of a theoretically founded comprehensive approach. My bureaucratization perspective offers such a model that can be falsified.

Because in this study I adopt a perspective of the police to include all those functions, activities, and agencies defined as such in the societies under investigation, it is worthwhile to describe the development of the police in Germany and the United States within their respective political contexts. For the important variations that exist in the political histories of Europe and America will affect the organization and function of national police institutions and influence their involvement in international policing initiatives. The following sections explain the basic elements of these national histories in order to offer a useful historical context for the in-depth investigations of international policing dynamics in the chapters to come.

‘Omnes et singulatim’: On the origins of the modern police

Police is the state's system for order with respect to internal security, beauty, comfort, population, morality, and nourishment.

Carl Gottlob Rößig, 1786.

One cannot understand the difficulties [the police] meet without close acquaintance, and a closer acquaintance often shows that many of them are far wiser than the public knows. Yet it is equally true that many of them are ignorant, inefficient, simply bullies in uniform. They are often brutal, and the terror of the weak, rather than a terror to evil doers.

The Encyclopedia of Social Reform, 1897.

Foucault's theory of governmentality holds that the police function is aimed comprehensively at administering everything that can contribute to the constitution of social life. Importantly, this peculiar police concept is not an analytical tool of Foucault's invention. Instead, as I will show in this section, the governmental notion of the police was historically part and parcel of a theory and practice of power rooted in the development of modern national states. Particularly in Continental Europe, a broadly conceived notion of the police influenced the establishment of police institutions that would gradually develop into bureaucratic agencies with more delineated tasks.

Police and politics in the process of German unification

The history of German police systems is marked by waves of decentralization and centralization corresponding to a process of German political unification (see Barber 1993; Carr 1991; Droz 1983; Holborn 1982; Hughes 1992). A unified German nation-state did not exist until the formation of the German Empire in 1871. Until the Vienna Treaty of 1815, Germany was a collection of several hundred dukedoms, free-towns, and principalities, loosely united in the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. Between 1794 and 1814, large parts of the Holy Roman Empire were brought under French control. In 1815, after Prussia, Austria, and Russia had successfully allied against the French armies, the Vienna Treaty formalized a unification of the German territories in the German Confederation (Deutscher Bund), a federal union that comprised thirty-eight states, with Austria and Prussia as the dominant powers.

Transformations of German police institutions followed the political unification process. Initially, the police function in the German territories concerned the administration of all matters concerning the 'politeia', i.e. the constitution of town or state. From the 16th century onwards, this conception of the police merged with a notion of 'politesse' that conceived of policing in terms of the provision of order, welfare, and security (Loening 1910). In the 17th-century German states, this concept of 'good police' (gute Policey) concerned the observance and furtherance of all aspects of public life that affected the population's happiness (Gliickseligkeit). This police concept, then, aimed very broadly at positively instituting and advancing happiness rather than merely responding negatively to adversities or breaches of law. From the 18th century onwards, the German police function would begin to include tasks related to the prevention of public dangers and other matters of internal security. A counterpart to the externally oriented function of the military, this police ideal was in the German territories first codified in the Prussian Landrecht Law of 1794, which defined the police as 'the necessary apparatus for the establishment of public peace, security and order, and for the deterrence of dangers facing the public or single members thereof' (in Liang 1992:2).

7 Among the sources I used in this section are: Harnischmacher and Semerak 1986:1-71; Knemeyer 1978, 1980; Lüdtke 1982; Mawby 1990:16–33; Wolzendorff 1905, 1906.
although the police function was now conceived in terms of the dual tasks of order maintenance and crime control, police objectives were not defined with reference to formalized legal systems but were instead based on policies of life, health, and property, specified in a system of knowledge known as police-sciences (Polizeiwissenschaften) (Lüdtke 1992b; von der Groeben 1984:435-438).

In 1848, in the wake of a steadily growing capitalist system and the economic crises it produced, revolutionary unrest spread over Europe, aiming to overturn the dictatorial rules of Europe's autocratic governments (Holborn 1982:47-55; Langer 1971). Established regimes responded harshly and, in consequence, also strengthened their police. In Prussia, the police function was again comprehensively defined (e.g. Fallati 1844; Rau 1853). The Prussian Police Administration Law of 11 March 1850 stipulated as the tasks of the police: 'the protection of the person and of property; the care for life and health; the order, security and ease of traffic on public streets, roads and places, bridges, shores and waters; and everything else which from a police point of view must be included among the special interests of the towns and their members' (Harnischmacher and Semerak 1986:59).

The unrest of 1848 did not at first affect the precarious balance of power between Austria and Prussia. This would change from the 1850s onwards when Prussia witnessed more favourable economic developments. Tensions between the two countries continued to mount after the accession of Wilhelm I to the Prussian throne in 1861 and, even more so, in the next year when Otto von Bismarck became Minister-President. Bismarck’s aggressive foreign policy eventually led to the Seven-Weeks War between Austria and Prussia in 1866. Prussia’s victory led the state to further strengthen its conservative rule and establish the North-German Confederation (1867), a federal union that excluded Austria. Provoked by Bismarck’s tight control over Germany, France declared war against Prussia in 1870. A year after the French defeat, the German Empire was formed, uniting the northern and southern German states under Prussian dominance.

There was no one national police system in the German Empire. However, there were trends of harmonization of the police function throughout the Empire, particularly because Prussian police administration served as a model for police reform in other German states. Police institutions in the Empire also became more distinctly limited to order maintenance and crime control. But despite an increasing emphasis on criminal police tasks, the German police function remained very comprehensive compared to other modern police systems. In the period before World War I, for example, the Berlin police issued ordinances regulating the colour of automobiles and the appropriate methods of purchasing fish and fowl (Fosdick 1915c:350–361).

Law and order in the American Union

The earliest systems of American policing were a hybrid of selectively appropriated models imported from various countries. In colonial times, the local county sheriff was the main American law enforcer. In matters of crime control, the sheriff’s duties were exclusively re-active, acting only upon a complaint or other information supplied by the public. Yet, as cities grew, more local police agencies were established and these eventually assumed the form of a force constantly present in society. American municipal police systems were largely modelled after the London Metropolitan Police, established in 1829 by the British Home Secretary, Robert Peel. The London Metropolitan Police was a civilian force with uniformed but unarmed agents, whose primary duties were crime prevention and maintenance of order. Borrowing selectively from the London system, American city police, too, began to emphasize patrol and crime prevention. But rejecting the professional representation of national government, American municipal police institutions were organized locally and varied widely from one city to the next. Importantly, US city police agents were appointed by representatives of local government on the basis of favouritism rather than skill. As a result, police corruption and political partisanship were widespread and impacted negatively upon the public perception of the agents. City police boards were created to improve police practices, but it would not be until the early 20th century that US police officers became more accountable to law than influenced by the whims of politicians.

Slowly, state and federal US police agencies also expanded, particularly when Progressive-Era concerns inspired plans to tackle a rising crime problem through expanded government powers. State police forces were organized from 1905 onwards to supplement inadequate...
law enforcement in rural areas and eventually became specialized in enforcing traffic laws. US federal law enforcement grew even more slowly than state police. Congress was reluctant to grant broad powers to federal police agencies, because national police systems were too closely associated with autocratic rule in Europe. Among the first federal agencies to be organized were the US Marshals Service and the US Customs Service, both created in 1789. In 1829, Congress founded a system of inspectors to enforce postal laws, and in 1836 Congress authorized the Postmaster General to pay expenses for agents who would later be called Post Office Inspectors. In 1865, the Secret Service was created in the Treasury Department to enforce counterfeiting laws. The Service gradually received more powers, and in 1902, a year after the assassination of President William McKinley, it was authorized to protect the US President.

Federal US police agencies would not acquire a significant role until several decades into the 20th century. The US Justice Department was created in 1870, but it was not until 1907 that US President Theodore Roosevelt—who between 1895 and 1897 had been Police Commissioner of New York City—asked Congress to legislate a federal detective force in the department. When Congress opposed the President’s idea, Roosevelt created the force by executive order. The Bureau’s jurisdiction included a variety of violations against federal laws related to interstate commerce, such as burglaries from shipments on interstate trains. The Bureau also responded to the need for police reform and professionalism and would eventually become the leading federal investigative agency in the United States, known since its name change in 1935 as the Federal Bureau of Investigation or FBI.

**The dynamics of international policing**

Although this study is not oriented at comparing police institutions across nations but at investigating actual connections between them, it must include a comparative focus on account of the fact that national police institutions are the participants in international activities. Characteristics of the police agencies that evolved in Germany and the United States will influence the intensity and form of their respective participation in international work. It is worthwhile, therefore, briefly to discuss their differences and similarities.  

10 This section relies on the sources mentioned in footnotes 7 and 9 as well as on the comparative analyses in Bayley 1975, 1985; Fijnaut 1979; Liang 1992; Mawby 1990.

**German and US policing in a comparative perspective**

Comparing the historical patterns of German and US policing, the most conspicuous differences are with respect to the influences of the autocratic nature of political authority in the German tradition and the liberal-democratic ideals of government in the United States. In Germany, political autocracy was manifested in a strong police, which was granted very broad powers and was responsible (together with the military) for political tasks emanating from the centre of the state. In the United States, on the other hand, democratic ideals of government—however limited in practice—prevented police from aligning closely with the political dictates of government. Separate police forces at different levels of government were responsible for well-circumscribed tasks that were rooted in formal systems of legality. But although US police agencies were in principle less representative of government, agents were historically less committed to professionalism and more dependent on political appointments.

While the distinct socio-political histories of Germany and the United States influenced variations in the function and organization of their police systems, there are also certain constants. In particular, the police function on both sides of the Atlantic developed gradually into a full-time profession involved primarily with maintenance of order and crime control. This trend towards police professionalization in Germany and the United States corresponds to a general rationalization process that took place across (Western) societies. Police in Germany increasingly developed on the basis of extra-legal systems of policing specified in the evolving Polizeiwissenschaften. In the United States, local police agencies became less influenced by political partisanship and more committed to professionalism. In Germany as in other parts of Continental Europe, police professionalization had already been taking place as early as the 17th century, whereas in the United States, police professionalization and, relatively, police federalization were much later developments that did not mature until the early 20th century. Nonetheless, in both countries can be noticed a gradual move of police institutions away from political dependencies towards the adoption of professional standards of policing.

11 Note that political policing in this context does not refer to intelligence activities organized in function of national security concerns, but to the powers of agencies of internal coercion to also investigate ideas and practices that are in conflict with the ideological persuasions of national governments.
Transformations of international policing: A look ahead

Differences and similarities between police organization in Germany and the United States will have repercussions for their involvement in international policing activities. Special attention must be given to the political conditions affecting the development of police institutions and their bureaucratization, for, as I explained earlier, public police agencies are formally sanctioned by political bodies of government. However, other factors besides politics, too, will shape international policing activities. A brief review of these conditions will bring out critical elements that the investigations in the coming chapters will focus on.

Among the most obvious influencing factors of international policing in Germany and the United States are matters of a socio-geographical nature. The European continent is characterized by a multitude of relatively small nations that are in close proximity to one another, marked by considerable differences with respect to custom, language, religion, and other aspects of historically evolved national cultures. The high cultural density of the relatively small space that marks Europe readily presents a situation that is conducive to concerns of an international nature, in police as well as other matters. On the American continent, however, the United States is bordered by only two nations, although the frontier demarcating the Union was not fixed rapidly in the course of national development. Furthermore, the United States also harboured considerable cultural and ethnic diversity within its borders, posing special problems for the maintenance of the social fabric. On the basis of these socio-geographical characteristics alone, one can anticipate that the need for police cooperation across national borders was higher among European than among American police. The geographically proximate national states in Europe may be expected to have presented a strong need for cooperation efforts to transcend the limits of jurisdictional boundaries. In America, cooperation with foreign police would have been less at issue throughout much of the 19th century. Instead, border issues relating to the expanding frontier will initially have shaped international policing with US involvement.

Because of the strong control on police agencies by central autocratic command in Europe, one can anticipate that international police activities during the 19th century were largely instigated for political purposes, attempting to suppress organizations and people believed to threaten the order of established rule. Furthermore, it can be assumed that strong sentiments over national sovereignty will have prevented multilateral efforts to organize international cooperation formally for political purposes. Instead, international political police operations can be expected to have been largely transnational in nature, conducted secretly on the basis of unilateral plans. Whatever police collaboration that may have taken place in political matters will have been informal and temporary on the basis of specific needs, or otherwise limited in international scope to include only police institutions of states approximating one another in political-ideological respects. International policing in 19th-century Europe, then, will have reflected the many turbulent events in international relations on the political scene.

In the United States, police institutions were never aligned with the goals of government in any sense comparable to European police, although there were during the 19th century strong influences from local politics. However, the formal commitment to systems of law separating criminal from political duties can be considered to have excluded US police from involvement in the political activities that were prevalent in Europe. Also, the sharp differences in policing styles in Europe and America, particularly with respect to the acceptability of political tasks and the level of centralization, will have barred any significant degree of transatlantic collaboration before the turn of the century. And with only moderately developed means of transportation and communications, the sheer geographical distance between the two continents will have additionally prevented such cooperation from taking place until more recent times.

Because police institutions in Germany as well as the United States gradually became more committed to professional standards of expert policing, it can be anticipated that a condition of formal bureaucratic autonomy was gradually created that enabled international cooperation. In particular, as the police function from the late 19th century onwards gradually depoliticized, police institutions became more involved more independently with issues of the maintenance of order and crime control. As police agencies of different nations came to similarly recognize these tasks, opportunities for cooperation across the borders of nationally circumscribed jurisdictions will have opened up. One may anticipate this process to have first taken shape in Europe, where a relatively high level of police professionalization was reached earlier than in America. But as the 20th century proceeded in the direction of enhanced police professionalization across the continents, participation in international cooperation will have steadily increased,
also enabling cooperation between the German and US police. Technological developments in the means of transportation and communication can be assumed to have further speeded up this process.

In sum, two central developments will guide my investigations of international policing in the chapters to come. First, in the early history of international policing, European police institutions may be expected to have initially taken on a leading role, specifically in terms of political tasks, while increasing police bureaucratization gradually enabled international work pertaining to criminal police duties. Secondly, accompanying this development is a transformation from intrusive to cooperative forms of international policing, replacing primarily unilateral and temporary plans with multilateral efforts to organize international cooperation on a more permanent basis.

**Methodology and structure of the argument**

The analyses in this study are based on a purposively selected sample of written documents gathered in a variety of libraries and archives (see Appendix 3). The collected documents contain primary and secondary sources, primary sources referring to documents produced as part of international police practices, and secondary documents offering interpretations thereof. Among the primary documents analysed in this book are internal police reports and correspondence, official government documents, proceedings of international police meetings, accounts written by police officials participating in international initiatives, and items published under the auspices of international and national police organizations. As an unobtrusive strategy, the document analysis will focus on naturally occurring instances of international policing. Following the logic of a case-based comparative strategy (Goldstone 1997), my research endeavours to obtain a theoretically informed understanding of international policing strategies. Data from various sources will be confronted to corroborate research findings. Detailed references to the collected documents will enable further testing of my findings.

I have chosen to present the analyses in this book in eight, more or less chronologically divided chapters. This division, however, is not meant primarily to indicate different historical time periods, but corresponds to the various phases and aspects of international police transformation that are relevant from the viewpoint of the theoretical perspective of this book. The chronological order is therefore not always respected. Each chapter will present relevant empirical evidence as well as theoretical reflections thereof. Also, I will typically start analysis with discussions of relevant developments in Germany and Europe, thereafter concentrating on the United States and the American continent. There is nothing principled about this choice other than that it harmonizes with the fact that international policing was at its beginnings in the 19th century more developed in Europe, where the bureaucratization of police institutions, too, relied on a longer history than in the New World.

The first two chapters examine the early forms of international policing from the middle to the late 19th century. This period roughly coincides with the decades leading up to and following the formation of the German Empire and the years of the American Civil War. In Chapter 1, I analyse selected European, especially German, international police initiatives that were mostly undertaken for political purposes. Also discussed are the efforts to formalize police cooperation through legal arrangements at the intergovernmental level of states, particularly in the areas of anarchism and white slavery. Chapter 2 discusses a variety of police tasks with a distinct cross-border dimension that took place during the 19th century in and across the United States. Special attention is devoted to the earliest forms of trans-Atlantic policing and the factors that enhanced the internationalization of social life, especially in police matters.

Chapter 3 deals with the most important development that was to come out of the 19th-century international police practices: the increasing efforts taken to establish multilateral police organizations that were explicitly oriented at criminal law enforcement tasks. I will discuss how and why such efforts were increasingly made from the late 19th century onwards and, especially, during the years before World War I, but, importantly, also why they failed. The turmoil of World War I presents an important, if temporary, break in the historical developments of international policing that had been taking place since the 19th century. Chapter 4 separately analyses the dynamics of international police activities in anticipation of, during, and immediately following World War I, including the impact of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia.

Chapter 5 examines how during the 1920s, when a fragile international peace had been accomplished, renewed efforts were made to normalize international police activities and establish an international police organization with broad international participation in pursuit of criminal law enforcement tasks. Particular attention is paid to the...