

INTRODUCTION

In the literal sense, “the police” usually refers to the government institution officially empowered to enforce a territory’s laws and regulations. It is easy to forget that it is also responsible for providing many other services to smooth out the difficulties of individual and group life in a structured social space. As an official state body, its members are also granted the famous “monopoly of force” that Weber called the hallmark of the modern state. Under normal circumstances, the police traditionally wield the state’s power on its sovereign territory, whereas the military forces project that power abroad.

With that said, this book deals with “policing” instead of the police. By that, we mean to include in our inventory a host of other organizations that also carry out missions and tasks roughly similar to those generally attributed to the police. Some may not have quite the same right to use coercive force, but, in reality, this distinction is much less significant than it may at first appear. In a democratic context, the use of force is strictly limited and codified (with imperfect results, we agree). It is also largely symbolic, floating at the horizon of eventualities, but avoided whenever possible. The widespread idea that policing is done through force stems from dominant representations of the police officer in written, film and television fiction. Conceptually, it is deeply rooted in the idea that the primary function of the police is security and crime-fighting, usually described with the language of force and violence. In practice, however, force is absent from most citizen-police interactions, which have nothing to do with crime and even less with violent crime. At the same time, several other entities also have the legal right to use force, including ordinary citizens in a situation of self-defence or the bouncer monitoring the behaviour of party-goers. Security guards have the right to open fire on individuals who wish to attack their cargo.

Broadening our topic in that way raises the question of whether the multiple agencies involved have missions and mandates in common. We think they do, and they fall into two general categories. First, the very classic “law enforcement,” which includes all activities where the agency is self-propelled, i.e. it initiates operations to detect violations of laws, regulations or contractual provisions applicable, as well as

those where it is mobilized by third parties who have identified such a violation. Second, “policing” includes preventive action, emergency response, crowd control, etc. Agencies involved in these activities fall into a broad category of “policing.” Of course, most, if not *all*, will also offer a more or less extensive range of ancillary services to a specific population, a government or a private client.

According to Brodeur (2010: 130):

Policing agents are part of several connected organizations authorized to use in more or less controlled ways diverse means, generally prohibited by statute or regulation to the rest of the population, in order to enforce various types of rules and customs that promote a defined order in society, considered in its whole or in some of its parts.

Brodeur’s definition is deliberately extensive and avoids a narrow conception of “police” that would be limited to uniformed personnel and crime investigators. It fits private security, intelligence agencies, government agencies with inspection and investigation powers, and border service officers. It also includes individuals and groups whose *primary* functions are of a policing nature. We add the qualifier “principal” to limit the scope since countless individuals have jobs involving surveillance and rules imposition, like supermarket cashiers, bus drivers or building caretakers. Policing is a category determined by a limited number of *functions*; in other words, it is a set of regulatory objectives within a specific framework of authorized means.

In short, the police do far more than policing, and others are also engaged in the same type of activity. They are one star in a complex constellation of policing agencies (we will see later whether, and to what extent, this is a functional “network”). That said, we do consider the traditional public police to be a dominant, central player in policing. This is reflected in the organization of the chapters of this book, where it is given the most attention.

Such a broad perspective aims to understand better the social, political, and cultural structure in which all policing entities must operate. As the missions, mandates, methods, and justifications of these

organizations tend to overlap, the number of sites where they interact (or *should* interact) is incalculable and profoundly modifies each player's operational environment.

The following work is organized around three main themes: 1) fundamental questions of social and political context, 2) administrative and structural aspects, and 3) issues of legitimacy and challenges. Following convention, our first chapter covers the history of policing in Canada. We will look at the sometimes slow, sometimes rapid succession of organic, private and state-imposed forms of social control and the problems they have faced. Some have been successful, others have simply not survived; quite a few were discussed, endlessly in some cases, but never actually implemented. In each case, we will see the extent to which the demographic, cultural, economic, social and political contexts shape the form of policing. The second chapter reviews the main theoretical approaches to public policing. In particular, we examine the right to use (lethal) force as the central concept of public policing. Chapter three reviews the main features of our national police map, including the variety of mandates and structures at municipal, provincial and federal levels. We also describe the world of private and hybrid security and propose a categorization.

The book's second section deals with the more empirical aspects of Canadian policing. Chapter four is the first to deal with a specific activity of the public police, namely, patrol. We explain its use, its particular features, and its results in terms of crime prevention and its proximity to the public. Chapter five follows with the investigation. We discuss the current state of knowledge, the evolution of investigative practices, and theoretical perspectives and propose a classification of investigative activities. This is followed by a chapter on intelligence, describing what intelligence is and what distinguishes it from other policing activities. We also present an inventory of public and private organizations active in industrial, criminal and national security intelligence. The chapter concludes with a brief overview of the "intelligence-led" policing model. It is followed by a chapter describing the state of private policing in Canada. This descriptive section ends with a chapter on transnational policing, analyzing the Canadian policing activities at the international level.

Chapter nine opens the section on legitimacy and challenges by showing how much public organizations depend on their image to fulfill their mandate. We show the interrelations between legitimacy, use of force and authority and their impact on the ability of police officers to solve the problems they face. The next chapter deals more specifically with image control and in particular, police-media relations. After showing how similar the media and the police are, we look in turn at how the media use crime and the police, and then at police strategies for using the media. The section continues with chapter eleven, on police oversight and control. We first explore the leading actors and institutions that have power over police organizations while describing the contours of this power. We then review the types of individual and organizational deviance that can manifest themselves in public police organizations and conclude with ways of combating them. Chapter twelve explores the concept of “community” policing, a model that was all the rage at the end of the last century but seems to have run out of steam. All that remains is the language, while most strategies and tactics have reverted to the pre-community, legalistic era. We conclude by showing how community policing has nevertheless left an essential mark on policing. The final chapter, written by our contributor Benoît Gagnon, looks at what has come to be known as “cybercrime,” both a rapidly developing concern for the population and a seemingly insurmountable challenge for traditional policing organizations.