Routledge Frontiers of Criminal Justice

THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF POLICE

Edited by
Kevin G. Karpiak and William Garriott

The Anthropology of Police

What are the potential contributions of anthropology to the study of police? Even beyond the methodological particularities and geographic breadth of cultural anthropology, there are a set of conceptual and analytical traditions that have much to bring to broader scholarship in police studies.

Including original and international contributions from both senior and emerging scholars, this pioneering book represents a foundational document for a burgeoning field of study: the anthropology of police. The chapters in this volume open up the question of police in new ways: mining the disciplinary legacies of anthropology in order to discover new conceptual tools, methods, and pedagogies; reworking relationships between "police," "public," and "researcher" in ways that open up new avenues for exploration at the same time as they articulate new demands; and retracing a hauntology that, through interactions with individuals and collectives, constitutes a body politic through the figure of police.

Illustrating the various ways that anthropology enables a reassessment of the police/violence relationship with a broad consideration of the human stakes at the center, this book will be of interest to criminologists, sociologists, anthropologists, and the broad interdisciplinary field invested in the study of policing, order-making, and governance.

Kevin G. Karpiak is Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology at Eastern Michigan University. His work focuses on policing as a useful nexus for exploring questions in anthropology, politics, and ethics. He serves as the General Editor of the group academic blog *Anthropoliteia* and co-editor of the Cornell University Press monograph series *Police/Worlds: Studies in Security, Crime and Governance*.

William Garriott is Associate Professor in the Law, Politics, and Society program at Drake University. The focus of his current research and teaching is the relationship between law, crime, and criminal justice, broadly conceived, with specific interest in drugs, addiction, policing, and governance.

Routledge Frontiers of Criminal Justice

For more information about this series, please visit: www.routledge.com/Routledge-Frontiers-of-Criminal-Justice/book-series/RFCJ.

Restoring Justice and Security in Intercultural Europe
Edited by Brunilda Pali and Ivo Aertsen

Monitoring Penal Policy in Europe
Edited by Gaëtan Cliquennois and Hugues de Suremain

Big Data, Crime and Social Control
Edited by Aleš Završnik

Moral Issues in Intelligence-led Policing
Edited by Nicholas R. Fyfe, Helene O. I. Gundhus and Kira Vrist Rønn

The Enforcement of Offender Supervision in Europe
Understanding Breach Processes
Edited by Miranda M. Boone and Niamh Maguire

Diversion in Youth Justice
What Can We Learn from Historical and Contemporary Practices?
Roger Smith

Police–Citizen Relations Across the World
Comparing Sources and Contexts of Trust and Legitimacy
Edited by Dietrich Oberwittler and Sebastian Roché

Critical Perspectives on Coercive Interventions
Law, Medicine and Society
Edited by Claire Spivakovsky, Kate Seear and Adrian Carter

The Anthropology of Police
Edited by Kevin G. Karpiak and William Garriott

The Anthropology of Police

Edited by Kevin G. Karpiak and William Garriott

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2018
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

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

© 2018 selection and editorial matter, Kevin G. Karpiak and William Garriott; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Kevin G. Karpiak and William Garriott to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

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

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

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Karpiak, Kevin, editor. | Garriott, William Campbell, 1977– editor.
Title: The anthropology of police / edited by Kevin Karpiak and William Garriott.
Description: Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY : Routledge, 2018. | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2017059495| ISBN 9781138919655 (hardback) | ISBN 9781315687759 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: Police. | Anthropology.
Classification: LCC HV7921 .A598 2018 | DDC 363.2–dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2017059495

ISBN: 978-1-138-91965-5 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-1-315-68775-9 (ebk)

Typeset in Times New Roman
by Wearset Ltd, Boldon, Tyne and Wear

Contents

Figures

Contributors

Avram Bornstein is Professor in the Department of Anthropology at the CUNY Graduate Center and at CUNY John Jay where he also serves as Dean of Graduate Studies. His research and teaching focus on violence and ethnic conflict. He has done extensive ethnographic research over two decades in Israel-Palestine and published on issues such as border enforcement, work, political prisoners, healthcare, international intervention, and ethnographic reflexivity. In recent years, Bornstein has also focused on the psycho-cultural elements of policing in New York City, with particular attention to community policing, police ethnicity, and police education.

Heath Cabot is an Assistant Professor at the University of Pittsburgh in the Department of Anthropology. She is the author of *On the Doorstep of Europe: Asylum and Citizenship in Greece* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014). Her research interests include political and legal anthropology, asylum and human rights, the anthropology of ethics, advocacy, and activism. Her current research concerns social insurance and community-based healthcare in Greece. She is currently the co-editor (with William Garriott) of the *Political and Legal Anthropology Review*.

Didier Fassin is the James Wolfensohn Professor of Social Science at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton and Director of Studies at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales in Paris. Anthropologist, sociologist, and physician, he has conducted extensive research in Senegal, Congo, South Africa, Ecuador, and France. His most recent inquiry has consisted in a critical engagement with philosophical approaches to punishment, which was the matter of his Tanner Lectures at Berkeley, and to life, which was the topic of his Adorno Lectures in Frankfurt. His theoretical reflection on the public presence of the social sciences was the subject of his recipient lecture for the Gold Medal in anthropology at the Swedish Royal Academy of Arts and Sciences. He is the author of *Enforcing Order: An Ethnography of Urban Policing* (Polity, 2013) and *Prison Worlds: An Ethnography of the Carceral Condition* (Polity, 2016).

William Garriott is Associate Professor in the Law, Politics, and Society program at Drake University. His research and teaching focus on the relationship between law, crime, and criminal justice, broadly conceived, with specific interest in drugs, addiction, policing, and governance. He is the author of *Policing Methamphetamine: Narcopolitics in Rural America* as well as editor of the volumes *Policing and Contemporary Governance: The Anthropology of Police in Practice* and (with Eugene Raikhel) *Addiction Trajectories*. He currently serves as co-editor (with Heath Cabot) of *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review*.

Kevin G. Karpiak is Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology at Eastern Michigan University. His work focuses on policing as a useful nexus for exploring questions in anthropology, politics, and ethics. He serves as the General Editor of the group academic blog *Anthropoliteia* and co-editor (with Ilana Feldman, William Garriott, and Sameena Mulla) of the Cornell University Press monograph series *Police/Worlds: Studies in Security, Crime and Governance*.

Erika Robb Larkins is Assistant Professor of Anthropology and Sociology and Director of the J. Keith Behner and Catherine M. Stiefel Program on Brazil at San Diego State University. Her research and teaching focus on violence, urban life, and inequality in Brazil. Her recent book, *The Spectacular Favela: Violence in Modern Brazil* (University of California Press, 2015), explores the political economy of spectacular violence in one of Rio's most famous favelas. She is currently working on a new manuscript on Rio's private security industry.

Peter K. Manning holds the Elmer V. H. and Eileen M. Brooks Chair in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Northeastern University, Boston, MA. He is the author and editor of some 20 books, including *The Technology of Policing: Crime Mapping, Information Technology and the Rationality of Crime Control* (New York: NYU Press, 2008) and *Democratic Policing in a Changing World* (Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, 2010). His research interests include the rationalizing and interplay of private and public policing, democratic policing, crime mapping and crime analysis, uses of information technology, and qualitative methods. He is currently researching the transformation of policing in Ireland since the Patten Report.

Jeffrey T. Martin is an Assistant Professor in the Departments of Anthropology and East Asian Languages and Cultures at the University of Illinois in Urbana-Champaign. He studies policing in China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and the United States of America. His research agenda focuses on historical continuity and change in the cultural qualities of police power, the ways these qualities reflect their larger political milieu, and the way they are connected to various technical and organizational elements.

Paul Mutsaers is an anthropologist who gained his Ph.D. from the Department of Culture Studies at Tilburg University. He was previously employed by the Police Academy of the Netherlands and is now working as a postdoc at the Tilburg School of Humanities and Digital Sciences. His work on police has appeared in journals such as *American Anthropologist*, *The British Journal of Criminology*, *Critique of Anthropology*, *Social Anthropology*, and *Anthropology of Work Review*. He recently completed his manuscript "Police Unlimited: Policing, Migrants, and the Values of Bureaucracy," which will be published by Oxford University Press in 2018.

Tom van Nuenen is Assistant Professor in Online Culture at the Department of Culture Studies of Tilburg University, the Netherlands. He has held visiting positions at Western Sydney University and Shanghai International Studies University. His research and teaching focus on technologically mediated, "plugged-in" travel, and his articles have been published in *Tourist Studies*, *The Journal of Popular Culture*, and *Games and Culture*.

Yağmur Nuhrat received her B.A. in Sociology from Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, after which she moved to the US to pursue a Ph.D. in Anthropology at Brown University. She completed her M.A. degree on the reception and perception of migration in Istanbul in 2008. That year, she began to work on fair play and the concept of fairness in football (soccer) in Turkey. She completed her Ph.D. in 2013 on this subject ("Fair Enough? Negotiating Ethics in Turkish Football"). Currently, she resides in Istanbul and is Assistant Professor at Istanbul Bilgi University, Department of Sociology.

Laurence Ralph a Professor of Anthropology and African and African American Studies at Harvard University. He is the author of *Renegade Dreams: Living Through Injury in Gangland Chicago*, which grapples with the consequences of the "war on drugs" together with mass incarceration, the ramifications of heroin trafficking for HIV-infected teenagers, the perils of gunshot violence, and the ensuing disabilities that gang members suffer—not to mention the legal trials of police torture victims. Investigating this encompassing context allows him to detail the social forces that make black urban residents vulnerable to disease and disability. Ralph earned a Ph.D. and M.A. in Anthropology from the University of Chicago, and a B.Sc. from the Georgia Institute of Technology where he majored in History, Technology, and Society.

Jennie M. Simpson is the Staff Lead for Criminal Justice at the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). In this role, she supports the coordination of the agency's criminal justice activities and leads policy initiatives and activities. Over her career, Dr. Simpson has focused on the intersections of behavioral health and criminal justice systems, with an emphasis on law enforcement and behavioral health diversion programs for individuals with mental and substance use disorders. Prior to

joining SAMHSA, Dr. Simpson provided technical assistance to law enforcement agencies, building law enforcement and behavioral health diversion programs, and worked in community mental health to build partnerships across the criminal justice system, including law enforcement departments, pre-trial services, specialized treatment courts, and community supervision agencies. She has also conducted research on law enforcement diversion programs and behavioral health and law enforcement collaborations. Dr. Simpson received a Ph.D. in anthropology from American University.

Katherine Verdery is Julien J. Studley Faculty Scholar and Distinguished Professor of Anthropology at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. Since 1973 she has conducted field research in Romania, resulting in several books including *The Vanishing Hectare: Property and Value in Postsocialist Transylvania* (Cornell University Press, 2003). Her teaching interests include contemporary and socialist Eastern Europe, the anthropology of property, and time and space. Her most recent project takes off from her Secret Police file, which she received from the Romanian government in 2008. Using it, she has written her field memoirs from the vantage point of the police who followed her. The book, *My Life as a Spy: Investigations in a Secret Police File*, is being published by Duke University Press.

Matthew Wolf-Meyer is the author of *The Slumbering Masses: Sleep, Medicine and Modern American Life* and an Associate Professor of Anthropology at Binghamton University. His research focuses on the biology of everyday life—the ways that human biological experiences interact with the expectations of American capitalist institutions, and how medicine is used to ease these frictions. *The Slumbering Masses* explores how consolidated sleep developed over the 19th century into the basis for sleep medicine in the 20th century, and how this conception of sleep foreclosed other possible ways to sleep while shaping American work, school, and family schedules. His forthcoming book, *Unraveling*, focuses on neurological injury and communication, and he is currently working on a project about the history of the use of excrement in American medicine and the rising interest in fecal microbial transplants in the treatment of human microbiomes, entitled *The Colony Within*.

Acknowledgments

The fruits that fed this volume have been both rich and numerous. We would like to thank everyone who has provided their bounty over the years. In particular we would like to thank participants and audience members at the panels "Collaborative Engagements in Policing: A Roundtable Discussion on Anthropology, Police and Oversight" and "The Anthropology of Police: Challenges and Opportunities" at the 2015 Annual Meetings of the American Anthropological Association as well as the panel "Thinking Through Police, Producing Anthropological Theory: Ethnography as a Tool for Critical Thought" at the 2014 Meetings. Nate Graulich provided a crucial burst of energy and attention in the final stages of manuscript preparation, from which the volume benefited greatly. Eastern Michigan University's Faculty Research Fellowship provided significant support, allowing Dr. Karpiak the space and time to help see this project through to its final form. In addition, we'd like to thank the contributors to and readers of the blog *Anthropoliteia*, from which so many of these conversations have emerged.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Disciplines, fields, and problems

Kevin G. Karpiak and William Garriott

The purpose of this volume is to explore a deceptively simple question: what are the potential contributions of anthropology to the study of police? The question is deceptively simple because embedded within it are two much thornier questions: first, what is disciplinarily distinctive about anthropology? Second, what exactly do we mean by "police"?

Let's start with the second question. The challenge of defining "the police" as an object of inquiry can be fruitfully illustrated through an examination of its origins. It is conventional to trace the origin of modern police to London in the year 1829. A product of Robert Peel and the Metropolitan Police Act, the London Metropolitan police embarked on its first patrols on September 29 of that year, forming the blueprint for police as we know them today. The blue uniforms. The urban orientation. The tension between a mandate toward law enforcement and one of order maintenance. The correspondingly complicated relationship to (state-sanctioned) violence.

But this account is contested (Brogden 1987; Sinclair 2011; Styles 1987). Some have traced the origins of police not to London, but to one of its colonial contemporaries, the Irish Royal Constabulary (IRC). The IRC was likewise formed under Peel, during his time as Irish Secretary. It came into being with the passing of the Irish Peace Preservation Force Act in 1814 (Jeffries 1952, 53). The IRC was quite different from the London police. Whereas the London "bobbies" (a nickname in honor of their progenitor, Robert Peel) were formally accountable to the citizens—indeed, the low pay that seems to accompany police work everywhere gained its philosophical justification here as Peel insisted on the importance of not setting police officers too far above those fellow citizens whom they were policing (Taylor 2017)—the IRC had no such mandate. As constituted, the IRC was closer to what we would today call a paramilitary force: adopting tactics more oriented toward outside occupation than co-existence with fellow citizens (Jeffries 1952; Brogden 1987).

That there is a tension between different models and histories of police is, on its own, not the point. The point is that these models (amongst others) developed along different trajectories that have indelibly shaped the police institution as it exists today, even "returning home" to their purported point of origin. Indeed, if

police are today a "global form," able to be decontextualized and recontextualized across time and space, then this is the result of this earlier history (Garriott 2013). This insight sheds light on why there continues to be such strong debate regarding the proper role of police in contemporary social and political life. That police today are the subject of both valorization and vilification is a reflection of this history in which they have been tasked with serving as both an outside occupying force and as fellow citizens working to maintain the conditions of civil coexistence; as both a mechanism for preserving state authority and as a mechanism for administering and maximizing the public good; and as both a state-based, public institution and a private, for-profit enterprise (Brogden 1987). To speak of "police," then, is to speak of a particular configuration of these various, and variously intersecting, tasks as made manifest within a particular moment in time and space.

At this point we might return to the first question: what of anthropology? What makes anthropology distinct among the disciplines in its approach to police? This is a question with which anthropologists themselves grapple. It is also a question coming from scholars of police in other disciplines (such as sociology and criminology) where the interest in police is longstanding. Here there are interesting parallels, for just as specifying what is meant by "police" raises many questions, so, too, does the effort to specify anthropology's distinct disciplinary identity. Not only does the professional self-imagination of anthropologists differ from how they are perceived by their extra-disciplinary colleagues, but the question of anthropology's core *raison d'être* has been and remains exceptionally contested.

Much of the debate centers on the continued relevance of disciplinary markers that have enjoyed hegemonic status in the past. One might ask, for instance: What about the higher tendency amongst anthropologists to do research in "non-western" locales (a tendency that is, of course, a legacy of anthropology's own connection to various forms of colonialism)? While the legacy of scholars such as Bronislaw Malinowski, often credited with establishing the standard paradigm for anthropological research, still exerts significant influence over anthropology (Manning, this volume), the discipline has long since moved away from the exclusive focus on so-called "primitive," "savage," "pre-modern," "non-western," or small-scale societies that once served as a disciplinary boundary between itself and other social sciences (Wolf 1982; Trouillot 1991; Baker 1998; Fabian 2014). And anthropology has worked hard to rid itself of the theoretical burdens implicit in the "cultural areas" paradigm that once defined research agendas (Malkki 1997). At the same time, it remains the case that a disproportionate amount of anthropological work does focus itself outside the Anglophone West, particularly in comparison to neighboring disciplines that likewise study police. Moreover, though anthropology has largely ceded the terrain of formally comparative studies—including comparative policing—to scholars formed in other disciplinary traditions, anthropologists continue to write with an implicit comparative, global awareness. This has led some to try to rework what a global

approach itself might look like (Hannerz 1996; Tsing 2005; Inda and Rosaldo 2002; Appadurai 1996; Collier and Ong 2005), while the majority engage with work written about a diverse set of locales by virtue simply of reviewing the relevant literature on their particular topic of inquiry (such as police, cf. Karpiak 2013b; Karpiak 2016). Finally, there is an increasing tendency to design projects focused less on discrete, geographically bound populations and more on multi-sited inquiries that productively blur the distinction between locales (Marcus 1998).

What about culture? The culture concept, particularly in the United States, is the concept most centrally associated with (cultural) anthropology. Yet its prominence has been challenged, particularly over the past four decades. During this time the culture concept has been subject to intense critique for, amongst other things, its inattention to questions of power, to history, and to the politics of representation (Gupta and Ferguson 1992; Wolf-Meyer 2007; Abu-Lughod 1996; Rosaldo 1993; Clifford 1988). This is not to say, however, that culture has disappeared from the anthropological lexicon. On the contrary, as Michael Fischer has argued, "[w]ithout a differentiated and relational notion of the cultural (the arts, media, styles, religions, value-orientations, ideologies, imaginaries, worldviews, soul, and the like), the social sciences would be crippled, reducing social action to notions of pure instrumentality" (Fischer 2007, 1). But the very need to make such a claim—and in the journal *Cultural Anthropology*, no less—demonstrates the degree to which culture has lost some of its hegemonic status. Moreover, anthropologists can no longer pretend to enjoy a monopoly over the term (Holmes and Marcus 2005, 2006; Deeb and Marcus 2011), as the insights of both "cultural criminology" (Hayward and Young 2004; Kane 2004; Ferrell, Hayward, and Young 2008) and studies of "police culture" (Skolnick 2008; Loftus 2010; see also Martin, this volume) can attest.

What about ethnography? To be sure, anthropology is unique in its commitment to ethnography as *the* research tool of choice (Van Maanen 1988; Fassin 2017). But anthropologists are by no means the only discipline to employ the method. Ethnography and other forms of "participant observation" or fieldwork abound across the social sciences (one need only browse the pages of the journal, *Ethnography*). And within anthropology, the central place accorded ethnography continues to be rethought. For example, Gupta and Ferguson (1997) have shown that the idea of the anthropological "field" itself, and its concomitant sense of transformative experience, serves largely as a micropolitical academic practice that maintains a sense of disciplinary identity even as the methods themselves may seem inadequate to the analytical task at hand. In this vein, several prominent anthropologists have articulated visions of what an anthropology less centered on fieldwork might look like (Asad 2002; G. Feldman 2011), while others continue to stand by ethnography's value, working instead to reimagine and rework the practice of "fieldwork" and the ethnographic project itself.[1] Notably, several of the contributions to this volume do not take a strictly ethnographic or even fieldwork-based approach. Instead, they offer reflections on practical

engagements with police (Bornstein, Simpson), media analysis (Mutsaers and van Nuenen), and critical analysis of official documents, such as Department of Justice reports (Martin) and legal case files (Ralph). While none of these constitute an ethnography in the strict sense, all are informed deeply by the contributor's more conventional ethnographic work.

Thus none of these tendencies, whether toward privileging ethnography, focusing on culture, or engaging in research outside "the West," provides a stable point of orientation around which to organize an effort like the one pursued here: developing an anthropology of police. This is not to say, however, that they do not remain important tools. Didier Fassin's recent collection, for instance, shows just how powerful ethnography can be when applied to the "world of policing" (Fassin 2017). And Beatrice Jauregui's recent book shows how guiding theoretical presuppositions must be rethought when viewed from the perspective of a different geographic, cultural, and political context (Jauregui 2016). All the same, the anthropology of police envisioned here is a capacious enterprise, notable for the diversity of projects operating under this name more than for the singular perspective it promises. Just as police can be seen as a particular configuration of historically derived trends and tendencies, so, too, does anthropology operate in the shadow of, but not thereby defined by, its particular development as an institutionalized scholarly enterprise.

In that spirit, this collection has been put together such that this multiplicity is highlighted rather than (superficially) disciplined or tamed. Indeed, what perhaps distinguishes current anthropological examinations of police from those taking place in other disciplines is that, in anthropology, it remains an emergent enterprise. Many anthropologists have come to their study of police unexpectedly, even reluctantly, pushed toward a consideration of police in the process of seeking answers to other questions, rather than in an effort to understand the police in and of themselves.

This is true of the current volume's editors. For instance, Garriott (2011) began his research in the rural United States expecting to examine the treatment trajectories of those using (or working to stop using) the drug methamphetamine. He found, however, that such treatment trajectories could not be understood apart from the broader criminal justice apparatus in which police (as institution) and policing (as practice) played a disproportionate role. Similarly, Karpiak (2010, 2013a) came to study police only tangentially. It seemed a promising site to address one of the fundamental themes motivating his work: how to study and describe the operation of multiple modes of power and resistance simultaneously. In this pursuit, he found his fieldwork following these lines of flight well beyond the bounds of institutions and interactions traditionally understood as "police." Stories in this vein are shared by many anthropologists who have turned to police as an object of inquiry. This emergent quality of the anthropology of police thus brings an openness and multiplicity to the various projects currently operating under this name. Rather than springing from a single scholarly canon, inquiries may be framed by a variety of theoretical concerns

(the anthropology of violence, or drugs, or the state, for instance) or geographical interests.

But as the anthropology of police continues to develop, we imagine such intellectual trajectories will become less normative. This volume appears at a moment in which anthropologists are increasingly designing projects that make police an explicit object of inquiry. As they make this shift, many are confronted with a unique cluster of questions, at once conceptual, methodological, and ethical. Put briefly, contemporary anthropologists are the inheritors of what Jean Comaroff has called a "classic legacy" in which there is a distinct tendency to focus on "the underdog, on marginal populations" (2010, 133). The power of this approach is that it has been and continues to be "profoundly counter-hegemonic" (ibid.). As Comaroff notes:

> As anthropologists, we question surface categories; we question the stories that social institutions tell about themselves. In that sense, there is a tendency in anthropology to assume that authoritative structures and institutions should be questioned rather than accepted at face value. We "come from below" methodologically and theoretically.
>
> (Comaroff 2010, 133–134)

But this tendency creates challenges as well, specifically for anthropological studies of police (Karpiak 2010; Jauregui 2013; Comaroff and Comaroff 2004). Chief amongst these is the challenge of mobilizing the ethical, methodological, and theoretical modes developed by anthropology in order to study police, the formal representatives of violent state power. This violence is often perpetuated against precisely those marginal communities that are the more conventional subjects of anthropological inquiry. How anthropologists grapple with this predicament is the subject to which we now turn.

Violence and the human

Any study of police must reckon with their unique capacity to use violence. This is as evident from a consideration of current events, such as the police killings of civilians throughout the world, inspiring social movements ranging from the Arab Spring to Black Lives Matter (Camp and Heatherton 2016), as it is from a survey of Western political institutional development: the capacity to use violence is, today, that which makes police, police (Bittner 1970; Neocleous 1998).

The problem of how to negotiate this fundamentally violent capacity with the practice of anthropological inquiry was taken up by many contributors to the current volume in the fall of 2015, during a roundtable on the anthropology of police at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association in Denver, Colorado. A critical mass of contributors participated in the roundtable. Questions of how to respond to police violence were central to the discussion. A particular focus was on how to represent police in anthropological writing.

Specifically, they asked whether there was an obligation to "humanize" the police. Certainly in most anthropological work, there is an onus placed on the anthropologist to present a complex, often sympathetic portrait of those with whom one has worked and about whom one is writing. Indeed, it is for precisely this reason that police have been and continue to be a problematic object of anthropological inquiry (Karpiak 2010). For who, in the end, could be less sympathetic as an interlocutor than the police—particularly those who engage in the kind of violence work described in the contributions to this volume by Ralph, Martin, and others? For many they occupy the same space in the anthropological imagination as *genocidaire*, neo-Nazis, and other "repugnant cultural Others" (Blee 2007; Harding 2000) who present as fundamentally inappropriate objects of anthropological inquiry (Holmes 2000; Daniel 1996). Moreover, one cannot overlook the current political context, particularly in the United States, in which police violence, particularly against communities of color, has become a political flashpoint, bringing to light deep histories of police and other forms of racialized state violence which demand critical engagement.[2] In this context, what are the ethical and political stakes of trying to humanize the police? What would such an act of "humanization" look like? And are there any grounds on which one could even justify an approach that took up such a project of humanization over and against one centered on cataloguing, critiquing, and decrying police-perpetuated harms?

Many rejected the idea that a critical appraisal of police behavior was incompatible with an effort to humanize. Many more rejected the idea that "humanization" meant generating sympathetic, uncritical portraits. As panelist and anthropologist of police, Julia Hornberger, observed, "Just making police look nice isn't actually our contribution." Echoing this sentiment, Kevin Karpiak stated that he viewed his work as humanization, but not because it was about presenting police officers in an exclusively good light. Rather, his was about acknowledging fallibility and other traits that are just as essential to what makes police—as both individuals and as an institution—human. In this regard, Karpiak was extrapolating from anthropologist Paul Rabinow's (2003a) reimagining of the anthropological project around a concern with *anthropos*, or as he translates it, the "human thing" (Karpiak 2016).

For Rabinow, anthropology is best understood not as a shared methodological toolkit or epistemological canon but as a set of open problems,[3] the outcome of which will have profound implications for what it means to be human in the contemporary world (Rabinow 2005). Over the past several years Rabinow, along with collaborators and students, has put forward a compelling vision for anthropology that does not rest on specific nonwestern locales, reified cultural differences, or traditional ethnographic research techniques for its *raison d'être* (Rabinow and Bennett 2007; Rabinow and Stavrianakis 2013). Rather, it puts its focus on the nature of "the human" *as an open, central, question*. Such a project is necessary because of the ways in which "the human" has itself been thrown into question by contemporary developments, most notably, for Rabinow,

biotechnology and its attendant forms of biopolitics (Rabinow 1996, 1999; Collier, Lakoff, and Rabinow 2004; Rabinow and Rose 2006). But one could also add such developments as the discourse of human rights, new forms of diagnosis, treatment, and expertise in medicine, and the emergence of "security" as a paradigm enabling intervention into a range of human projects, from war, rights, and terrorism, to food, commerce, and health. "Anthropology," in this vein, is less centrally an endeavor to make final truth claims about "what the human is" as it is an invitation to explore the under-determined problem space opened up by such developments (Rabinow and Stavrianakis 2016; Faubion et al. 2016).

Putting "the human" question at the forefront of an inquiry into policing is, we believe, one of the strongest threads connecting the chapters in this volume, and among their greatest contribution, even if most authors do not explicitly build off of Rabinow's framework. It reframes the question of humanization as discussed at the AAA roundtable. No longer is it about denunciation versus "making the police seem nice." Rather, it is about pursuing modes of inquiry that ask: How are police implicated in the question of what it means to be human in the world of today? How are notions of "the human" mobilized or remade in current policing and security practices? And, which tools of inquiry are best suited to exploring these questions?

This framing enables us to return to the question of violence and the problems it poses as anthropologists turn their attention to police. Each of the chapters of the current volume addresses the question of violence in unique ways, bringing critical nuance and contextualization, even forcing a reconsideration of the police/violence relationship itself. Contributors to the present volume do this in several ways. First, Peter K. Manning highlights the formative role of the question of violence for classic "police studies" and a cultural anthropology of modernity. Second, there is close examination of under-considered policing traditions, such as the Romanian secret police discussed by Verdery. Such police forces were a mainstay of communism and state socialism during the Cold War and remain staples of state authority in most states. They have received particular attention in studies of Latin America (Larkins 2015; Willis 2015; Penglase 2014; Caldeira 2001; Goldstein 2012; Smith 2016; Hautzinger 2007), but they are hardly limited to this region (I. Feldman 2015; Karpiak 2013a; Beek and Göpfert 2012; Ralph 2013). Similarly, Wolf-Meyer provides a glimpse at a genealogical dead end in his consideration of the "medical police" in the United States. Why doesn't such a police force exist, he asks, that would concern itself with such issues as the mismanagement of human waste on private property? And what are the consequences of the absence of such a force for those who face such concerns? In still another approach, several contributors examine how police function as an index or vector for violence. Nuhrat and Larkins, working in Turkey and Brazil, respectively, show how security practices tied to sporting events can metastasize well beyond the institutions formally labeled "police," and even into the very populations that are their targets. Finally, several contributors face the question of police violence head on. Notably, both are case studies

of the United States. Martin, in his chapter, uses the United States Department of Justice report following the shooting of Mike Brown by police officer Darren Wilson in Ferguson, Missouri as a context from which to think through the concept of "police culture." In a complementary case study, Laurence Ralph provides a critical examination of racialized police violence in Chicago, particularly the use of torture over several decades by members of Chicago's Area Two police precinct.

There are more approaches that could be highlighted, as well as additional connections between the chapters that could be mentioned. But what this sampling shows is that amidst the diverse range of projects surveyed here is a unified concern with police as implicated in what it means to be human today. To this end the question of violence is, again, unavoidable. But the chapters that follow illustrate the various ways anthropology enables a reassessment of the police/violence relationship by putting a broad consideration of the human stakes at the center.

The chapters

The chapters that follow are organized into three Parts. Each Part centers on a core tension animating the human dimensions of contemporary policing. The first Part, "Legacies and lessons," provides a framework through which to understand the relationship between anthropology as a discipline and policing as an object of study, looking backwards to reexamine classical tools, methods, and practices in order to reassess their value for a forward-looking anthropology of police.

Eminent scholar of police Peter K. Manning begins this discussion with an essay that serves as a synthetic overview of two disciplines—police studies and cultural anthropology—at the same time as it offers programmatic suggestions for the new research opportunities opened up by their intersection. Reading the development of English, French, and American cultural anthropology over the course of the long 20th century against the contemporary development of what can best be called "police studies" in sociological criminology, Manning highlights several crucial turns in the latter which, as he argues, set the stage for the contemporary emergence of an "anthropology of policing" (or AOP). In the face of this development, Manning compels its adherents to mine the now-vast scholarly archive of qualitative work on policing in order to place its insights on police "content" within a framework that is comparative (geographically, culturally, temporally), concept-focused, synthetic, and attuned to the illustrative power of "the case." A disciplinary program so oriented, Manning argues, can offer tremendous insight into several as-yet under-explored dimensions of policing in modern life: secrecy, deviousness, surveillance, violence, danger, and the sacred.

Jeff Martin's point of entry is one of the key sites of overlap between classical anthropological work and police studies, the notion of "police culture."

While cognizant of the decades-long critique of the "culture concept," Martin argues nevertheless that attending to the ways the concept has been used differently by two sets of scholars points to a persistent challenge that can be fruitfully addressed by studying police: for, he argues, police are the point at which the abstraction of structural violence becomes disturbingly concrete and personal. By way of illustration, he shows how attending to police culture can illuminate the human stakes in current US debates over police violence. Focusing on the report following the killing of Michael Brown by a police officer in Ferguson, Missouri, Martin shows how conceptualizations of the human, as framed in the tensions of "police culture," are implicated in the report's assessment of the fatal shooting. This analysis provides important context to what has become an entrenched debate in the US over which lives matter (a conversation sparked by the Black Lives Matter movement and the social media-fueled counter-movements espousing counter-slogans such as All Lives Matter and Police Lives Matter).

Avram Bornstein also takes up issues of race and police violence in the United States. And, like Martin, his chapter likewise draws on some of the classic tools of anthropological work—a combination of Boasian antiracism (Boas 1940) and Lévi-Straussian *depaysement* (Lévi-Strauss 1963)—in order to reflect upon the ways that training in anthropology can work against some of the common prejudices of the police recruits he finds in his classes at John Jay College of Criminal Justice in New York City. More specifically, Bornstein finds in anthropology a way to generate understanding between the police and what police often perceive to be a hostile public. Its specific insights into race, and the ways racism can manifest itself, have proven to have the capacity to allow officers to better understand and address the source and context of the hostilities they experience from those they police. Such understandings mitigate the cloistered, siege mentality that has frequently been documented in police organizations by scholars of policing.

In a similar vein, Jennie Simpson's chapter makes the case for incorporating more anthropologists within applied and policy-oriented police programming. Anthropologists have a complicated relationship working with government institutions, particularly those with the capacity to use violence in pursuing projects of order and control. During the US wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, for instance, there was significant controversy surrounding the US military's effort to recruit anthropologists and other social scientists to aid with the war effort (Kelly et al. 2010). As the "shock and awe" of the conflict's early days became a mission of fighting for the "hearts and minds" of local populations, anthropological expertise took on a new value. A small number of anthropologists applauded the military's efforts to take cultural difference seriously, while many more condemned the effort as a potential breach of professional ethics.[4] In the wake of such legacies, Simpson, like Bornstein, finds in anthropology a significant set of tools and insights that can improve police practices, thereby directly addressing many of the longstanding issues surrounding police violence. While such calls for greater

collaboration between anthropologists and police institutions will continue to be controversial—and, in some contexts, completely inconceivable—these chapters provide examples in which anthropological inquiry can be a source of both illumination and intervention into police practice.

Finally, Matthew Wolf-Meyer's chapter explores the other side of the "legacies" question, that of the path not followed. He asks why, unlike Europe, did the institution of the medical police fail to take hold in the United States? The medical police, as Wolf-Meyer details, is part of the early history and genealogy of police in Europe. The medical police performed functions, particularly in urban environments, which are now associated with non-police institutions such as sanitation and public health. To explain this conspicuous absence (and its implications for today), Wolf-Meyer highlights the interplay of context-specific understandings of disease and political culture. In so doing, he sheds light on the specific place police occupy and don't occupy within contemporary practices of governance and formations of "the public" in the United States.

The second Part, "Publics and relations," centers on the relationship between the "public" and the "police." For reasons highlighted in the previous Part, the relation between "the police" and "the public" is one of the enduring tensions in the history of policing (Mutsaers, Simpson, and Karpiak 2015). For instance, five of the nine statements that comprise Sir Robert Peel's iconic and oft-cited "Nine Principles of Policing" deal with the police/public relationship. This is due in no small part to the fact that a defining feature of police is their focus on questions of domestic order rather than questions of external threats (the latter, of course, is traditionally the domain of the military). While this distinction is contingent on local circumstances and political histories, and is often much less clear in practice (as can be seen in Katherine Verdery's contribution to this volume), it remains a defining ideal for police organization and thus for police as an anthropological problem.

Katherine Verdery's chapter opens this Part. Over the past several years, Verdery has been analyzing a unique ethnographic object: her own police file. Verdery conducted fieldwork in Romania in the 1970s and 80s. During this time, she, like her interlocutors, was the subject of surveillance by the Romanian secret police. Reading her file, Verdery learned that she was suspected of being a spy, working for the US Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). Verdery's actions as an anthropologist fueled these suspicions. Those surveilling her made note of her interviewing techniques, her record keeping, her use of terms such as "informants," her interest in "socio-political information," and so on. Verdery's police surveillers were struck by the similarities between their work and hers. Reading her file decades later, Verdery, too, was struck by the similarity—so much so that it made her question some of the conventional anthropological techniques she employed in the field.

Verdery's chapter underscores what others have observed about the "secret" or "political" police, namely that their presence exacts a palpable yet complex impact on everyday life. For instance, Verdery notes how the Romanian police's

practices recruiting informants, mapping, and exploiting their networks for information impacted those networks while generating unique police-mediated representations of the Romanian public. Verdery likewise notes how Romanians developed and deployed a language of "otherness" to describe those individuals who filled the ranks of the police. They were described as lacking kin, or coming from outside Romania. Conversely, Verdery notes that, in the wake of the fall of the communist state, and the opening up of Securitate records, members of the Securitate have worked openly to manage their public image and stave off negative representations. In this way, Verdery highlights the multiple registers through which "humanization" occurred. Her own encounters with former members of the Securitate, for instance, were confounding in that those with whom she spoke were quite "normal," pleasant, even affable—a far cry from their characterization as violent, parentless monsters in the public imaginary. At the same time, she left questioning the trustworthiness and authenticity of these encounters. Was she, for instance, meeting the "true" person? Or a savvy performance by someone trained in the arts of disinformation? If it was, in fact, the true person, what should she make of it? Does "humanization" here provide a moment of empathy and understanding? Or does it serve as another reminder, *pace* Hannah Arendt, of the "banality of evil" (Arendt 2006)?

Yağmur Nuhrat examines the police/public relation by examining the ways in which football fans in Turkey have undergone unique police-inflected socializations. Examining the Gezi uprising of 2013, she analyzes how it is that football fans came to be key participants in the demonstrations, and an organized force of resistance against the police.

Nuhrat's analysis provides an example of anthropological work that approaches police through their effects, rather than directly as interlocutors (through interviews or the like). Starting with the ethnographic puzzle of football fans' participation in the Gezi uprising, she excavates the police/public relation by showing how specific policing techniques have become entwined with football—and attending football matches—in Turkey. In so doing, she shows how police practices, when focused on specific groups, can perform a collectivizing function. This collectivizing occurs at the level of the body itself, as responding to particular forms of policing becomes a "technique of the body" (cf. Mauss 1973). In this way, she outlines how police are not just central to contemporary political life (in Turkey and elsewhere), but are a crucial element in the making of the "body politic" in the most literal of senses. This mode of humanization involves a "making human" through the medium of police practice.

The chapter by Mutsaers and van Nuenen approaches the topic of policing and protest with a slightly different lens, although with similar insight. Writing in reaction to Diarmaid Harkin's (2015) argument that aggressively violent forms of policing reflect a general public will to punition, Mutsaers and van Nuenen hope to complicate the sense of "public" at stake in policing. They bring a growing body of literature on "hashtag" internet activism to bear on the singular case of Mitch Henriquez, an Aruban citizen of the Netherlands killed

during a confrontation with Dutch police at a concert in The Hague in order to both diversify our sense of "the public" that speaks in relation to police violence and to pay attention to the ways that social media technologies enable the constitution of transnational publics in opposition to police violence. Such protests make explicit the parallels between the Henriquez case and those more familiar to a US audience, in which mobile technologies make visible the forms of violence to which non-white bodies are subjected and, in so doing, open up the possibility to rethink forms of political action and opposition beyond and in relation to the nation state.

Robb Larkins' chapter troubles tidy distinctions between "public" and "private" in the realm of policing. Though such a distinction is fundamental to the conceptualization of the modern police institution itself, its assumptions about the state's monopoly on the legitimate use of force crumble in the face of realities on the ground. Here, the line between "public" and "private" becomes quite blurred amidst the panoply of institutions and actors engaged in the production of security. Robb Larkins' focus is "mega-event" Rio de Janeiro, Brazil—host to both the 2014 World Cup and 2016 Olympics. Hosting such mega-events is the result of a long, competitive process in which aspiring host cities and countries work to woo event organizers and sponsors. Part of this wooing process involves reassuring decision makers that the potential host is capable of meeting the infrastructural needs of the events, including those of security. Working ethnographically, Robb Larkins details the various components of the policing and security apparatus springing up around Rio. These range from formal infrastructural projects, such as transit and water system upgrades, to the hiring and training of droves of new security personnel. Proceeding in this way, Robb Larkins shows that policing today, particularly in urban locales, is better envisioned as webs of policing provision "co-constituted" by many public and private forces (cf. Brodeur 2010). In this sense, policing can be read as parallel to other mechanisms of "development" in the Third World, an insight that suggests Robb Larkins' account of policing urban space in "mega-event" Rio has much to teach us about how strategies of police serve to connect urban space to transnational regimes of capital.

One of the interesting contrasts between each work is the very different senses of police that emerge, an aspect particularly highlighted in the third Part titled "*Esprit de corps*."[5] To some degree this can be attributed to the very different contexts being examined, as well as the very different social positions occupied by each ethnographer vis-à-vis their subjects. However, even beyond these muddling factors, there remains a set of interesting contrasts that deserve further pause; a kind of specter (Benjamin 1986), or daimon (Rabinow 2003b), that hangs over many of the texts, uniting, if not conforming, them. In that sense, this section offers a "hauntology" (Derrida 1994), a pantheon of ghostly apparitions that haunt those in their ambit (including the reader). As they punctuate the lives of individuals and collectives, often in startlingly material ways, they play a decisive role constituting the body politic through the figure of police.