Introduction: Policing Citizens

Damas Pikada, an Ethiopian-born Israeli, and Freddie Gray, an African American, shared nothing but their skin color until the spring of 2015. The police beating of Damas Pikada, an Israeli soldier in uniform, caught on tape and aired on national television on June 2015, sparked the rage of young Israelis of Ethiopian descent. The young people who took to the streets and clashed with the police protested against what they described as police racism. A few weeks earlier, African Americans in Baltimore took to the streets after 25-year-old Freddie Gray died during police arrest. International media and the demonstrators themselves were quick to point to the similarities of young black people protesting against what they described as police racism and brutality. In Tel-Aviv and in Jerusalem young Ethiopian protestors carried signs in English that read "Black Lives Matter," alluding to the events in the United States and the African American protest against ongoing police brutality.

Police violence against minorities, or violent clashes between minorities and the police, tell us something about citizenship and its internal hierarchies. These incidents, are often indicative of deep-seated tensions, the result of everyday interactions and negative perceptions, that impact police and policing. While policing rests on implied consent, the disenfranchising and de-incorporation of certain citizens from the structures of government and the use of the police to enforce a particular social compliance implies that "in many respects policing is against the resistance of certain communities in order to retain the respect of other communities" (Findlay, 2004: 7). Thus, police legitimacy and trust in police varies between majority and minority citizens of marginalized groups, sometimes demonstrated in violent incidents that spark public debates.

While it is "shocking" incidents – like those of Pikada and Gray – where the public are exposed to undeniable violence or humiliation that capture attention, everyday encounters matter no less. The relations between

minorities and police are embedded in social and political contexts that shape these seemingly mundane encounters, which in turn reshape those contexts. Differently stated, minorities and police officers engage each other not as abstract individuals. Rather, it is an encounter between representatives of state power, carrying also their personal preferences and prejudices, and members of groups with particular perceptions, concerns and expectations derived of personal and collective histories. The fact that particular minorities are vulnerable, suffer from police abuse or neglect and are exposed to violence, is indicative of their status as citizens. For minorities marked by "visible" characteristics like skin color, negatively stigmatized and rendered a security threat, encounters with police (or the fear of them) are a daily reminder of defunct citizenship.

Police not only represent state power and its claim for the monopoly over (legitimate) violence, they exercise them in its everyday interactions. Authorized to provide security and public order, police both serve citizens and hold power to restrict the freedoms of those defined as security threats or disturbing public order. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that police legitimacy is questioned by those citizens subjected to what they perceive as unfair treatment, especially when abuse and neglect are attributed to specific identities. "Minorities" is a generic term that includes different groups with characteristics – language, skin color or religion – that distinguish them from the majority and is often associated with discrimination and marginalization. Minority groups, however, have different goals and prospects for integration, have different experiences with the state and its institutions and, consequently, different perceptions of citizenship and belonging. While the "state" is often an abstract or invisible concept, police and policing are very present in everyday life, especially for minorities. The conclusions that citizens of minority groups draw from significant encounters with police, whether it is their own or of others they relate to, have a direct bearing on perceptions of status and belonging, both shaping and shaped by those encounters.

Setting the study of police and policing within a broader theoretical framework allows us to grasp their institutional role in society, as well as the political and social transformations that police are part of. More important, however, is what the study of police reveals about states and citizenship regimes, namely inclusions, exclusions, privileges and hierarchies. Class, ethnicity or skin color can explain both unequal provision of security, and police violence. Racial profiling, to take one

example, negatively affects racialized minority populations subjected to police stops and searches with no apparent reason other than their skin color and their vulnerability. Who is policed and how, therefore, is a question of status and power established through discourses articulated by government, police and other authorities and by everyday practices that enforce them. Overall, the study of police and policing is a study of state and society, their transformations, and the complexity of modern citizenship.

Police violence and public reactions to it are all too familiar in an age when pictures turn viral and spark emotions and demands for justice. The year 2015, however, when we began to assemble our data, was an especially difficult one for Israeli police. In Rahat, a Bedouin town in the south of Israel, the arrest of a suspected drug dealer ended with the killing of an innocent bystander. The following day, the funeral turned into a demonstration and the killing of two more citizens by police, another milestone in the tense relations between police and the Arab citizens of Israel. In Jerusalem, a violent attack on a gay parade by a religious zealot resulted in a young woman being stabbed to death. The police failed to prevent the assailant – released a couple of weeks before from prison after serving time for a similar attack – from approaching the parade. In addition, six officers of the high command had to resign one after another under different allegations of corruption, misconduct and sexual harassment. The public image of police was at one of its lowest points, among minorities and the public at large. The image of police, however, as we argue throughout this book, is reflective of the current state of governance and deepening schisms.

Israel and the four minority groups selected for this study – Palestinian/Arab citizens, ultra-Orthodox Jews and Ethiopian and Russian immigrants – allow us to explore, theoretically, comparatively and empirically, different paths of citizenship and the stratification of the citizenship regime through relations with and perceptions of police. We study different aspects of policing and society in relation to the context in which they develop – a conflictual society with deep schisms – but also in a broader comparative perspective. Israelis of Ethiopian descent are a visible minority with experiences that resemble those of visible minorities elsewhere. Arab citizens are a national minority demanding equality and recognition, that often clash directly with police, but also suffer police neglect and insecurity. Ultra-Orthodox Jews are a religious minority determined to protect their way of life and resisting state

intervention enforced by police. Immigrants from the former Soviet Union provide an example of a relatively successful immigration that integrated in society and its views of police and policing, despite past suspicions, resemble those of the majority. Finally, we examine also the perceptions of Israelis who do not belong to any of the minority groups, to learn about the general attitudes and perceptions of police.

Policing amidst Controversies

For the modern state, the institutionalization of police was another articulation of its national identity. Police played instrumental and symbolic parts in the formation and reproduction of modern states and national cultures. The uniformed police force and the police officer on the street provided for the public an "important aspect of the iconography of the nation state" (Loader and Walker, 2001: 20). Beyond the direct provision of essential security for citizens, the police symbolize the promise embedded in the state, its sovereignty, the norms and rules associated with it and the sense of community. The possibility to imagine the nation through the concrete practice of policing and the rules it enforced provided police with authority and the practice of that authority has reenforced the sense of nation-ness and statehood. The police were enforcing a unitary body of law imagined as the consensual expression of the nation, embodied in the rule of the state. In this reciprocal relation, police benefit in terms of legitimacy and effectiveness from the state's capacity to create a community; but at the same time, they symbolize, participate and contribute to this very community.

The monopoly of the state over violence, always partial, may have further diminished in the era of globalization. "While the nation state still looks imposing in its shiny uniform, and people's bodies and souls are still routinely tortured around the world," writes Manuel Castells, its monopoly of violence is all but a myth. "The state still relies on violence and surveillance, but it does not hold its monopoly any longer, nor can it exercise it from its national enclosure" (1997: 303). The state monopoly over the means of violence may have diminished in the face of global transformations and shifts of authority upwards, downwards and sideways, but functioning states still hold significant powers and violence at their disposal, exemplified by police actions. Indeed, for many citizens, and even more so for noncitizens, the police are the most

visible face of government they encounter in everyday life or in critical events. Police and policing, and expectations from them, have accordingly changed in light of new challenges.

Policing has become a fundamentally controversial topic by the late twentieth century in light of two societal changes, diversification and privatization. These changes underscore questions about police authority and new concerns regarding trust and legitimacy. A multicultural reality presents challenges for many contemporary democracies which, in contrast to their image of homogeneity, face new demands from ethnic and cultural groups for equality and recognition. State institutions, among them police, need to accommodate to new needs and demands and to a decline of public trust. The significance of policing to everyday life, mentioned above, is largely about the "heavy symbolic load" it carries (Bradford, 2014: 22). Unfair treatment of citizens communicates to them that they are not valued members of society (Jackson et al., 2012: 1053) and demonstrates the stratified nature of citizenship. Groups who suffer from police discrimination and mistreatment may have low levels of trust towards the state, government and institutions. Indeed, studies from across the world, elaborated upon later, show a marked difference between majority and minority groups in the trust of police. Lower trust is attributed either to direct experiences of police discrimination and/or to minorities' refusal to identify with a single set of legal and political values held by the dominant group, which may lead to alienation from the state, government and its institutions (Michelson, 2003).

The privatization of police forces and the commodification of policing also affect its relation with citizens and raises more questions about trust and loyalty. The so-called privatization revolution of the 1980s included also police services that were partially privatized, either through user-financed police services or by contracting out and allowing for private provision of police services (Fixler and Poole, 1988). These trends accelerated in the wake of the Cold War and globalization and the rising demands for privatized security. The establishment of private security companies across the world has raised questions about their authority and accountability, and concerns over the security gap between those who could afford private services and those forced to rely on public services. Policing provided also by private sources may no longer be a public good, administered by an institution committed

to general welfare but rather a service on behalf of those who have the means to pay for it, introducing new forms of discrimination, excluding "undesirable" individuals and groups from public spaces.

Diversity and privatization further erode the nation-state nexus and open new forms of identity, new demands for equality and recognition and new challenges for state institutions. These changes are no less than dramatic for police, previously benefitting from a sense of community that legitimizes their action and at the same time representing and contributing to this very sense of community. Conversely, in divided societies, police are part of a controversial social order, protective for some but oppressive for others. Where marginalized groups seek recognition and equality, and where controversial issues challenge the existing order, police can be a visible and daily proof of their discrimination. Demonstrations broken by police force, frequent stops and searches of visible minorities, crime-ridden neglected minority neighborhoods and occasional police violence are all evidence of marginality. Police discrimination, real or perceived, often more visible than that of other institutions, demonstrates the stratification of citizenship behind the veil of equality. Protests against police, demands for reform and growing distrust are articulations of citizenship demands, demonstrating that police and policing cannot be divorced from politics.

Studying Police

Political scientists have paid scant attention to police and policing, a somewhat surprising neglect considering its presence and impact. Weber's classical definition of the state as the holder of the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force (or violence) alludes to the importance of two state institutions, the military and the police. Interestingly, while the study of the military has been part of political science literature, police and policing have remained almost alien to the discipline and largely understudied by political scientists (Isaac, 2015). The role police perform in everyday lives of citizens, the power entrusted to police officers, the growing concern of citizens with public safety and the tensions between police and minority groups that exploded in different places, all demonstrate its political significance. The study of police and policing, beyond its immediate relevance, is a study of state and society, their exclusions and hierarchies revealed in the ways citizens perceive police and their treatment by police. Everyday interactions between

police officers and citizens, therefore, are political tales of trust and cooperation, or, conversely, of neglect and discrimination.

The debate that surrounds police and policing, both academic and professional, has taken a new course in light of developments and events in different countries that seem to undermine police legitimacy, especially among minority groups. Against traditional conceptions that police can rely on force, deterrence and effective action to gain trust and legitimacy, the decline of public trust became a concern for police officers and policy makers. First, many studies concluded that the ability of police to perform their role requires public cooperation and that without trust and legitimacy cooperation is unlikely. Second, trust in many cases differs between majority and minority groups but also between minority groups with different experiences and needs. Citizens' trust of police, as often measured in surveys, is a "fuzzy" concept that depends on perceptions, expectations and interests. For some groups police will be measured by their "efficacy," namely the ability to provide security or fight crime, while for other groups it is about the "image" of police, the way they treat citizens and their commitment to equality and fairness (Worrall, 1999). Thus, third, police reforms aimed to increase public trust and cooperation must account for a multicultural or multinational reality that presents different challenges to the state and its institutions and requires attention to diversity.

Police is a constitutive element in the production and reproduction of political order and community (Loader and Walker, 2001) but both order and community are often contested markers in contemporary societies. In divided societies, not only the ability of police to secure social order is questioned, the concept itself is politically charged and contested. Contemporary police forces simultaneously embody the quest for general social order and the debates regarding the meaning and consequences of that order, set against inequalities, prejudice and demands for equality and recognition. Almost any examination of police roles and practices suggests that policing is well beyond a bureaucratic task measured by efficiency and is often a "political" question embedded in political and social structures and dynamics. Police, as such, are political in the very essence of their functions as they operate within a political environment (Manning, 2006) that shapes expectations and demands of society, and delineates the authority vested in the hands of police officers.

Police work is somewhat different from other bureaucracies as it is both visible and invisible to the public. Everyday policing involves constant contact with the public, often more intensive than most bureaucrat–citizens interactions, which makes police work visible and under constant scrutiny. At the same time, the behavior of police officers is hidden from the public at large and not systematically monitored by supervisors, allowing police officers great discretion in deciding how to enforce the law (Weitzer and Tuch, 2006). Consequently, policing "is simultaneously both partial and universal, interested and disinterested, divisive and inclusive" (Loader and Walker, 2001: 13). The discrepancy between visibility and invisibility involves questions of power and status, rendering some citizens more vulnerable to abuse and exposed to violence. Consequently, citizens' perceptions of police derive from individual and group exposure to police and policing and from experiences that shape their perceptions of expectations from it. While for some groups, police are a key representative of state, nation and community, and provider of essential service, for others police represent and enforces their marginalization and injustices.

Trust, central to our discussion here, is considered by political scientists essential for effective governance, and declining trust in politics, government and institutions a major concern (Arian et al., 2008; Boggs, 2000), diminishing the capacity of traditional governance (Pierre, 2000) and further undermining trust in governments. This general, and dismal, observation of declining trust alludes to two important questions, first, who (dis)trusts? And, second, how can trust be gained? Theories that explain the level of citizens' trust in the police were mostly developed and tested with "the people" or "the majority" in mind (Van Craen, 2013). But, past or present disenfranchising and de-incorporation of certain citizens and the use of the police to ensure social compliance implies that "in many respects policing is against the resistance of certain communities in order to retain the respect of other communities" (Findlay, 2004: 7). Measured aggregately, trust may provide a partial picture that overlooks ethnic, gender and class differences. Accordingly, political theories of ethnicity, class and identity provide an important supplement for the understanding of trust and legitimacy. These theories can explain why certain groups trust less the state and its institutions, and what particular policies and practices undermine trust of government and specific institutions. Developing a theoretical framework drawn from political science and

sociology will enable us to embed the study of police within a wider debate of citizenship, trust and legitimacy and in a wider social context of the changes of states and societies.

Minorities and Police: Context

The encounters between police and ordinary people are a display of citizenship, in its complexities and contradictions. Police discretion on whom to stop and question, separating those determined as normative civilians from those perceived a threat, pertains to existing divisions and stigmas that cut through citizenship. Citizens, who decide to approach police for help, or avoid police at all costs, display their own sense of trust and belonging in state institutions. For minorities, police can be an essential service, to protect their livelihood and property, but at the same time a threat and a proof of their defunct citizenship. Young men in French *banlieue* who flee when they see police officers, Black men in American towns careful not make a suspicious move or young Israelis of Ethiopian descent resentment of being stopped and search, articulate their citizenship in their fears and frustrations. Distrust of police or dissatisfaction with policing may be common to many minority groups, and possibly shared also by minorities, but distrust may reflect particular histories and political agendas. People and groups, to state simply, may have different reasons to distrust police and, consequently, different demands.

The rhetoric used by police to describe neighborhoods as "war zones" and their assignments as "war on crime" or "war on drugs" legitimizes not only their views of the situations facing them, but also the way they work to impose order (Fassin, 2013: 40). The warlike rhetoric, in Fassin's words: "has a cost in terms of democracy, leading to excesses that effect not only the criminals targeted, but also, through collateral damages, citizens who have done nothing wrong" (ibid.). Excesses and collateral excesses include not only overt police force but also daily stops and searches of individuals of stigmatized groups, labeled as security threats and singled out by their skin color or other identifiable features. These practices we describe as "over-policing," the targeting of particular individuals for stops, searches and arrests, and the use of violence against them, are directed against visible, stigmatized and vulnerable groups. Unequal citizenship, however, can take the opposite turn in what we describe as "under-policing," most

visible in neglect of minority neighborhoods, more exposed to crime and disorder. Minorities may perceive they are under-policed, over-policed or some combination of the two, and articulate their citizenship status and demands accordingly.

Concerns and frustrations of minority groups, as well as the dilemmas of policy makers and police officers, are part of wider social, economic and political changes. Ethnic and national minorities who protest discrimination and marginality, religious groups demanding autonomy and recognition and immigrants who struggle with integration, all challenge contemporary order. Those groups, and others, have different experiences and develop different expectations and demands, forming different paths for meaningful citizenship. These paths are shaped by overarching identities and ideologies, but also by material concerns of everyday life. Minorities, as argued before and throughout this book, differ in their relation to the state and society. First, they differ in the desire to be included and become part of nation and state. And, second, in the actual opportunities that state and society provide for them to do so. Translated into demands from police, those could stretch between equality and inclusion to recognition and separation, or between ending discriminatory practices of over-policing to providing adequate services to protect them from crime and violence.

Minorities: Experiences and Expectations

Frustrations and declining trust of minorities, part of what we describe as multicultural reality, pose significant challenges for police. We use the term multicultural reality to highlight that with the growing diversity, even in states previously perceived homogeneous, philosophical questions become concrete debates over distribution of resources, equal opportunities, nature of public services, group rights and individual liberties. Policies, planned and executed within a new context of diversity, need to not only ascertain the needs, preferences and demands of the different groups constituting their societies, but also examine whether those policies are likely to meet them adequately. For police, especially in divided societies, those include the provision of services that suit all segments of society, the diversification of the police force so it will mirror society, an improvement in the image of the police among minorities, and serious engagement with hate crimes against minorities (Oakley, 2001).