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Governing Security in Tourist Spaces
This chapter includes the following elements:

◆ An overview of the key themes in criminological literature on the changing ways in which security is conceptualised, organised and delivered in contemporary societies

◆ A discussion of specific examples of ‘tourist spaces’ that pose particular problems and solutions for the governance of security

◆ An analysis of four specific features of contemporary security governance that have particular relevance for policing and security provision/authorisation in these kinds of tourist spaces: diversification, the growth of risk-based approaches, social polarisation, exclusion and expansion

◆ A discussion of the normative implications of these changes in security governance and a consideration of implications for future research.

In this chapter, we examine the policing (and more generally, the ‘governance of security’) of a range of ‘tourist spaces’ such as enclave resorts, large hotel complexes, cruise liners, airports, and so on. In such spaces, security is often authorised and delivered primarily by ‘non-state’ policing agents. The chapter therefore speaks to some important themes in recent criminological discussion of changes in the organisation and delivery of security in contemporary polities (Jones, 2007). A key element within this work concerns the ‘pluralisation’ of policing, meaning that contemporary policing is increasingly authorised and delivered by a complex range of public, private and community agencies and organisations, as well as the public police (Crawford, 2008; Crawford et al., 2005; Jones and Newburn, 2006). Tourist spaces provide particularly interesting case studies of such trends, and present opportunities to consider the wider implications for security provision and governing more generally. The chapter is divided into three main sections. The first provides the conceptual and empirical context, summarising the main themes from the criminological literature on the ‘pluralisation’ of policing, and briefly touching on literature from tourism studies/sociology of tourism regarding the ‘tourist spaces’ to be discussed in later sections. The second section reviews the key dimensions of security governance in tourist spaces with a particular focus on
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diversification, the growth of risk-based approaches, polarisation/exclusion, and expansion. The final section considers some of the normative implications of these conceptual and empirical developments, and draws some general conclusions from the issues considered in the chapter.

**Conceptual and empirical context**

**From ‘policing’ to ‘security governance’**

From the birth of the ‘New Police’ in the early 19th century until the latter part of the 20th century, policing became firmly associated with the formal institutions of the state and viewed as a quintessentially ‘public’ service. This mindset has until recently dominated scholarly treatments of policing, which for the most part have focused upon the activities of the specialist state bureaucracy – ‘the police’ – tasked with law enforcement, crime investigation, public reassurance and peace-keeping. Such ‘state-centric’ ways of thinking about policing have been increasingly challenged on conceptual, empirical and normative grounds (Shearing, 2006).

Defined as the organised provision of peace-keeping, rule enforcement and investigation, it is clear that policing can be delivered by a range of individuals and agencies, and should not therefore be conceptualised in ways that exclusively focus upon state-organised arrangements (Johnston, 2000). Recent work has sought to deploy definitions of policing that capture the full range of ‘policing’ activities and agencies involved and do not restrict the conceptual gaze to the activities of state policing bodies (Newburn and Reiner, 2007; Jones, 2008). This broadening of conceptual focus has been accompanied by – indeed, emerged as a direct result of – a growing body of empirical research that explores the ‘policing’ activities of a range of public, commercial and voluntary agencies as well as the public police (Johnston, 1992, 2000; Bayley and Shearing, 1996; Jones and Newburn, 1998). Indeed, it has been suggested that these important conceptual and empirical shifts should be reflected in a change of terminology (Johnston and Shearing; 2003). For a group of influential writers (see Wood and Dupont, 2006), the term ‘policing’ is too closely associated with state institutions and its usage contributes to an ongoing scholarly ‘myopia’ about policing beyond the police (Shearing, 2006). For this reason, the term ‘security governance’ is suggested as capturing more effectively the fundamental changes that have occurred in recent decades (Johnston and Shearing, 2003). This draws upon the broader language of ‘governance’ that has emerged in political science, and challenges traditional conceptions of the way that governing power is exercised in contemporary polities. As Rhodes (1997) argued, governing power increasingly operates via ‘self-organising inter-organisational networks’. The central state has a far more fragile grasp on the shaping and implementation of policy than has generally been assumed. Relationships between the various parties within policy networks are characterised by ‘power dependence’ (Stoker, 1998). Since policy actors have access to different types and levels of resources –