

EU SECURITY IN THE GLOBALIZED WORLD: THREATS, CHALLENGES AND THE NEW STRATEGY

Raimundas Kalesnykas¹

*Assoc. Prof., Dr., Department of Public and Private Law, Faculty of Law,
International School of Law and Business (Lithuania)*

ABSTRACT

The article is based on the author research and examines the issues of the EU security development in the globalized world with the purpose to highlight the threats, challenges as well as the future perspectives of the creation a new European Security Model among Member States. Today, security has become a key factor in ensuring a high quality of life in EU society, guarantee respect for human rights, the rule of law and solidarity and in protecting our critical infrastructures through preventing and tackling common threats.

The EU security study has undergone a fundamental shift over the last decade. At first glance, it seems that in the Member States there is a single understanding of the existing threats (terrorism, organized crimes, trafficking of human beings, economic crimes and corruption and etc.), but we have to admit and accept that the new type challenges for maintaining security at EU level is constantly changing due to the global, social, legal, economic or political environment (the growth and development of private security sector, public-private partnership for providing security services, the ongoing processes of privatization of security services).

Scientific validity of the proposed relevant and problematic assertions imply that the Member States must start the discussion on the implementation of common standards of EU Security Strategy as well as the most importantly on the development of a European Security Model. Strategic directions set out by the Lisbon Treaty, the Stockholm Program and the Security Strategy for the European Union will create a safe environment in which EU citizens feel protected and secure.

KEYWORDS: *security, public and private security sector, globalization, EU Security Strategy Model.*

INTRODUCTION

A characteristic feature of the beginning of 21st century is intense processes of globalization, embracing all spheres of political, social and economic development and manifesting in all EU regions. In the process of globalization an EU society of a new type is being formed, with its typical new values and new striving, which creates new patterns for lifestyle and is confronted to new problems and searches for solutions to these

¹ Assoc. Prof., PhD. Department of Public and Private Law, Faculty of Law, International School of Law and Business; Dean of the Law Faculty at International School of Law and Business. Contact: Laisves av.58, LT-05120, Vilnius, Lithuania, tel.: +370 5 2460280, e-mail: raimundas.kalesnykas@ttvam.lt

problems. One of them is creating secure Europe serving and protecting citizens². Globalization processes are very well showing themselves in the modern Europe. It is quite possible to state that the key-feature of globalization in Europe is the fact that an integral European society is being born, which creates and builds on an integral security space, as well as integral spaces for social, economic, political, technological, ecological and information development. From this point of view, we could show *the relevance of the research*, which is related with the analysis of development of the integral security space in EU. Looking for the new EU Security Strategy can be seen, that this strategy not only makes preconditions for basic change in citizens living environment and conditions of all EU Member States, but also determines the fact that a brand new EU Security quality is being shaped, both of the EU society itself and of each EU.

This empirical study of EU security development in the context of globalization has undergone a fundamental shift over the last decade. There has been a growing realisation among academics, that public security sector are not the only organization engaged in the process of maintaining the global security³. This change in thinking is largely the result of the recent growth of the private security industry. In fact, a new era (after the entry into force of the EU Constitution) in EU Member States internal and external security presents public and private security services with opportunities to integrate their resources for the purpose of establishing an efficient EU security 'network'. In many EU countries we could find a number of groups and officials other than the public security forces that play key roles in the prevention of crime, the regulation of conduct, and the maintenance of order. Indeed, governments have not discouraged the expansion of the regulatory roles currently being assumed by private security personnel, private investigators, special agencies and non-government 'policing organisations. For this reason, the role of private security in EU security market still is quite eclectic basically because of vagueness of its powers⁴.

The publication also presents the outcomes of the research done by other over the recent several years, dedicated to the diagnostics of the problems of globalization as well as of national and international security in various regions of EU. The main attention is dedicated to the analysis of threats and challenges in context of the integral EU security space.

The objective of the research is to evaluate new challenges, threats and perspectives, which could tantalize the security of the EU countries in the ongoing field of globalization processes. So in this *paper I will briefly outline* the relationship between security and globalization, the tendencies of the growth private security sector, the private – public dialogue in the EU security field, and the future vision of the implementation the EU Security Strategy Model. Also, additionally will be focus attention to the problems of privatization of security services. It is topical, because private security services now have the right to provide different types of services and actually are claiming the status of an individual policing entity. It's out of the question that in a security market the boundary of safety needs between public and private interests becomes variable. The borderline

² The Stockholm Programme — an open and secure Europe serving and protecting citizens, approved by Council of the European Union on 2nd December 2009, No. 16484/1/09 REV 1 JAI 866 + ADD// http://www.se2009.eu/polopoly_fs/1.26419!menu/standard/file/Klar_Stockholmsprogram.pdf

³ Kalesnykas R. Privatization Processes of Policing in Lithuania// SIAK Journal: Zeitschrift für Polizeiwissenschaft und Polizeiliche Praxis. – Wien: Bundesministerium für Inneres, 2007. Vol. 3/2007. P. 14 – 24; De Ward, J.J. The Private Security Industry in International Perspective// European Journal of Criminal Policy and Research, 1999. Vol. 7 (1), p.143 – 174.

⁴ Kalesnykas R. Possibilities to Integrate the Private Security in the System of Law and Order// Jurisprudence: academic journal of Mykolas Romeris University, 2002. T. 26 (18), p. 71 – 82.

between the relationship of the public security and private security is not clear yet. The importance of the tasks mentioned earlier suggests that theoretical and practical studies designed to better conceive and solve them can be considered as relevant both in scientific and practical sense.

1. SECURITY AND GLOBALIZATION

For more than fifty years the EU, its institutions and Member States have promoted and provided freedom and security. For citizens of the EU, security is one of the main priorities. Security became so complex and multi-dimensional, traditional national border-setting type of security perception is not capable of recognizing new threats that transcend the national borders. Nowadays EU consists of more 500 million people across the twenty-seven countries which make up the EU. Economic growth, together with the opportunities provided by a free and democratic society based on the rule of law, generate prosperity amongst Europe's citizens – but with such opportunities also come risks, as terrorists, organized crime and other types of criminals seek to abuse those freedoms in the pursuit of destructive and malicious ends. Furthermore, increased mobility of people in turn increases our common responsibility for protecting the freedoms which all citizens of the EU cherish.

Understanding the awareness of security not only among EU citizens, but also the researchers is changing in the globalization phase. There are exist different definitions of globalization. I.Clark globalization defined as an integration of economic, social and cultural relations across borders⁵. Today, many articles have gone beyond simply restating basic arguments about economic globalization and discuss political globalization and security globalization⁶. As S.Kay states, globalization is best understood as the creation of a variety of trans-boundary mechanisms for interaction that affect and reflect the acceleration of economic, political and security interdependence⁷.

Traditionally national security is understood as pooling the efforts of state and citizens to develop and consolidate democracy, to deter any potential attacker and defend the state independence, territorial integrity and constitutional order. With re-conceptualization of security, there are two dimensions⁸: broadening, i.e., consideration of non-military security threats such as environmental scarcity and degradation, spread of disease, cross-border crimes, refugee movements, terrorism; and deepening, i.e., consideration of the security of individuals and groups rather than focusing narrowly on external threats to states such as ethnic conflict, civil war, environmental threats and survival of individuals. Yet, it is not easy to separate the agenda of discussions on broadening of security from globalization of security. As stated by I.Clark, part of the broadening of the concept of security can be and has been attributed to the effects of globalization⁹. We have recognized that globalization challenges EU security strategy (2010), because with globalization separation between domestic (internal) and

⁵ Clark I. *Globalization and Fragmentation: International Relations in the 20th Century*. - Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

⁶ Hughes C.W. *Reflections on Globalization, Security and 9/11*// *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 2002. Vol. 15, No. 3, p. 421-433; Held D., McGrew A. *The End of the Old Order?* // *Review of International Studies*, 1998. No. 24, p. 219-243.

⁷ Kay S. *Globalization, Power and Security*// *Security Dialogue*, 2004. Vol. 35, No.1, p. 10.

⁸ Karacasulu N. *Security and Globalization in the Context of International Terrorism*// *Review of International Law and Politics*, 2006. Vol. 2, No. 5, p. 1-17.

⁹ Clark I. *Globalization and Fragmentation: International Relations in the 20th Century*. - Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997, p. 109.

international (external) politics as well as the distinction between internal and external security is decreasing. Moreover, there are other implications of globalization for security. I. Clark has divided arguments about the implications of globalization for security into four groups¹⁰: first of all, he mentions the detachment of security from territoriality; second argument is security is increasingly structured into global networks; third argument is the creation by globalization of a new security agenda, fourth mentions the diminished capacity of the state to provide security for its citizens. Especially the difficulty lies in evaluating the precise effects of globalization on the EU internal security, because the impact of globalization varies from one EU region to another region (Eastern to Western Europe) and is determined to a large extent by the state's capacity to meet the specific challenges presented by the process of globalization. Thus, it is not easy to generalize stabilizing or destabilizing effects of globalization on the EU internal security.

First of all, globalization denotes that nation-state can no longer control non-physical security aspects, such as protection of information and technology assets. According to Kay, the more you protect your information and technology, the stronger you are¹¹. One of the challenges posed by globalization is that individual Member State can no longer control the movement of technology and information. Europeanization has blurred the division between EU internal and external security, so the Member States can no longer ignore the effects of globalization in forming their security policies.

Second, in the age of globalization, the emergence of information based-economies reduces the importance of national industries. For example, the increased foreign direct investment in local economies by the multinational companies decreases the Member State control on domestic economy and makes them more vulnerable to international crisis and intervention, which is threatening their economic security.

Third, as the nature and strategy of EU security have changed, the security threats became more difficult to measure, monitor or tackle with the globalization process. There are non-state groups and individuals, such as ethnic groups, extremist groups, cults, organized crime and terrorism groups were enhanced by the globalization of technology and information¹².

Fourth, globalization makes it easy for the EU country to reach to the weapons of mass destruction and other technologies, thus the Member States might pose threats that are asymmetrical and disproportionate to their size. Today the term widely used is the *asymmetrical strategy (asymmetric power)* by which a smaller power would attempt to defeat the largest powers in the globalized international system by striking against its perceived vulnerabilities¹³. Thus, globalization can give a chance to the strong Member States to enhance their powers; however, it also gives a chance for the weaker ones to challenge powerful ones.

Finally, summarizing up the relation between security and globalization be noted, that globalization has a major impact on the implementation of the new EU Security Strategy Model. In this process changing the perception of security, where the *concept of security* must be understood as a wide and comprehensive concept which straddles multiple sectors in order to address major threats and others challenges which have a direct impact on the lives, safety, and well-being of EU citizens. Besides, every Member State

¹⁰ *Ibid*, p. 114-123.

¹¹ Kay S. Globalization, Power and Security// Security Dialogue, 2004. Vol. 35, No.1, p. 16.

¹² Cha V.D. Globalization and the Study of International Security// Journal of Peace Research, 2000. Vol. 37, No. 3, p. 391-403.

¹³ *Ibid*.

should evaluate the threats and dangers for their national security within respect of EU security.

2. THREATS AND CHALLENGES FOR THE EU SECURITY

The security threats facing EU Member States are multifaceted, interrelated, complex and increasingly transnational in their impact and in that internal and external security are increasingly inseparable. No single Member State can achieve 'high level' or 'better' security alone. Nearly nine in ten EU citizens believe that security questions should be dealt with not just at national but also at EU level¹⁴. In this context, one of Europe's main objectives is to preserve its values of open society and civil liberties while addressing the increased security threat.

Implementing an efficient policy for EU security set of instruments covering law enforcement, intelligence, judicial, economic, financial and technological aspects. In a constantly changing and increasingly technological world, guaranteeing security without the support of knowledge and technology is almost impossible. Novel security solutions should provide ways to increase the security of our citizens without imposing additional unnecessary burdens on their daily lives. Technology makes it easier to detect dangerous materials being traded. The same applies to border controls, to prevent illegal immigrants, traffickers of human beings, drug traffickers and terrorists taking advantage of the fact that internal border controls have been lifted within the Schengen area¹⁵. Innovative and sophisticated solutions and systems will help avoid fraud on identity documents, inter alia through biometrics in visas, passports, residence permits and other documents.

Nowadays, the most visible players in the EU security market are private security. The private security sector also has an important role to play: developing appropriate security capabilities requires a strong and competitive industrial base, which itself depends on pinpointing the needs of customers for whom new products, systems and services are created. There are a number of cross-cutting policy issues that need to be addressed with a view to developing such a competitive industrial base and meeting the security needs of the public sector and of citizens. This includes improving the way systems operate together and inter-connect, mainly by developing common training standards, exchanging best practice and contributing to the reflection on improving procurement processes¹⁶. On the other hand, the fast growth of private security market may cause not only challenges, but also lead to the threats.

2.1. The Growth and Development of the Private Security Market

Over the years, private security has become a major contributor to overall security policy. Long scorned by public stakeholders, private security is now seen as a key driver for addressing specific issues. Once considered little better than undemocratic vigilantes, private security agents are now recognised as highly professional and entrusted with the security of others. However, the private security industry is neither homogenous nor

¹⁴ Crime and Criminal Justice: Eurostat: Statistics in focus on 2009// http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_OFFPUB/KS-SF-09-036/EN/KS-SF-09-036-EN.PDF

¹⁵ The Schengen Acquis - Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement of 14 June 1985 between the Governments of the States of the Benelux Economic Union, the Federal Republic of Germany and the French Republic on the gradual abolition of checks at their common borders, adopted by Council of The European Union decision No. 1999/435/EC of 20 May 1999 // <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/SCH.ACQUIS-EN.pdf>

¹⁶ Kalesnykas R., Dieninis L. The legal regulation of professional requirements for private security personnel: the experience of Lithuania and some European Union countries// Current Issues of Business and Law. – Vilnius: International Scholl of law and Business, 2010. Vol. 5, p. 223 – 241.

clearly defined but rather comprises a huge range of large and small industries. Private security sector comprises a large range of activities, including surveillance of personal assets and property, cash-in-transit, personal protection, access control and designing, installing and alarm systems management¹⁷.

Private agents now play a significant role in EU security. While this was underplayed for many years and the rise of private security blocked in certain countries, there has been increasing social and political recognition of the phenomenon in recent years. However, EU countries take a varied approach to this issue. There is no quantitative development model available, given the wide range of statutory provisions adopted. Since 2000, private security forces have attained a quantitative level of visibility. They are now widely acknowledged as security service providers and their development has been supported by profound socio-political changes, due to both changing lifestyles and consumer habits and to the role of the state in meeting social demand in EU.

It is difficult to calculate the number of employees involved in security. According to Eurostat, there were 1 153 000 agents for the 27 EU Member States in 2008, which rose almost 4% to 1 197 300 in 2009. While the EU is 237 private agents per 100 000 inhabitants, there are a number of major deviations both above and below this average. The country with the highest ratio is Hungary: the number of private security agents in proportion to the population is three times higher than the European average (791 private agents per 100 000 inhabitants). It is the only country with such a high deviation. Three countries have a ratio twice as high as the EU average, namely Poland (524 private agents per 100 000 inhabitants), Ireland (497 private agents per 100 000 inhabitants) and Luxembourg (484 private agents per 100 000 inhabitants). The country with the lowest ratio is Austria (83 private agents per 100 000 inhabitants). Four EU countries have ratios twice as low as the EU average, namely Finland (115 private agents per 100 000 inhabitants), Sweden (111 private agents per 100 000 inhabitants), Denmark (97 private agents per 100 000 inhabitants) and Italy (95 private agents per 100 000 inhabitants). Thus, the EU average is actually only significant for 14 countries, which have ratios of between 175 and 290 private agents per 100,000 inhabitants.

In Lithuania, the ratio of private security agents are slightly higher than the EU average, namely 290 private agents per 100 000 inhabitants. The emergence and development of private security market in Lithuania started by the end of the 20th and now continued with *three legal acts*. *The Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania* (it was enacted in 25 October 1992), enshrining the fundamental principles of protection of human rights and freedoms, the Government order No. 160 *On protection of persons and property* (it was enacted in 12 March 1993), which granted citizens the right to arrange protection of persons and property, and the *Law of the Republic of Lithuania on persons and property protection (No. IX -232, it was enacted in 8 July 2004)*, which coming into force on the 1st of January of 2005¹⁸. In fact private security market started prevailing as late as 1994. At that time the institutions of internal affairs created the system for the control of private security services and published first methodical recommendations for persons who wanted to deal in protection of persons and property. The data disposed on 1 January 2010 shows that there were 94 private security services and 45 security sub-divisions of companies

¹⁷ Prenzler T. The privatization of policing. In R Sarre & J Tomaino (eds) *Considering crime and justice: realities and responses*. Adelaide: Crawford House Publishing, 2000.

¹⁸ Law of the Republic of Lithuania on persons and property protection, enacted by the Parliament of the Republic of Lithuania in 8 July 2004, No. IX-2327.

which have licence in-arm security and 18 un-armed private security services, also there were 8911 private security officers with comparison to police officers were 12 576.

Today's surveys of private security market in Lithuania allow forecasting that the number of private security companies and security sub-divisions of companies will go down as the result of high staff training costs, procurement of firearms and special equipment, licences etc, therefore only a limited number of private security companies may survive in competitive business environment. M.Button and B.George¹⁹, L.Johnston²⁰ and other researchers argue that the success of every private security company depends on the sphere of activity, the number of customers and financial resources. We could identify the factors, which facilitate development of private security market in the context of today's Lithuania. *First*, the increase of crime rate and fear of crime, in particular in relation to person and property protection, and public safety, *second*, the mass of private property, *third*, financial and human resources crisis in police services, *fourth*, information and technological changes in the society, *fifth*, favourable legal grounds of states for private security services.

Private security seeks to protect rights and rightful interests of its customers; in doing so it ensures safety and maintains order. Seeing to attain this objective private security companies formulate major directions of activity, which are later on enshrined in legislation. Legal acts in Lithuania only superficially set tasks for private security institutions; therefore we face the problem of prioritisation of activities. For example, The Law of the Republic of Lithuania on persons and property protection (2005) sets forth three tasks. *First*, protection of life, health and property from criminal acts, *second*, protection of movable and immovable property, commercial and industrial secrets of companies, institution or organisation, *third*, collection activities. Obviously, the tasks are narrow and so do not respond to the current needs, because rapid development of private security market provides for a much wider range of activities.

2.2. Public – Private Partnership in EU Security Field

In 2007, the Commission of European Communities passes the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on Public - Private Dialogue in security research and innovation²¹. The aim of this Communication is to underline the principles of an EU security research agenda and highlight the importance of a solid Public - Private Dialogue in the field of EU security research and innovation. In this context, the Commission of European Communities set up the specific policy objectives of the Private - Public Dialogue in Security, which are:

- to bring together all the relevant stakeholders in order to discuss issues of cross-cutting, common concern, facilitate the assessment of their differentiated strengths and resources, identify areas for potential synergies; or joint programming;

¹⁹ Button, M. and George, B. Why some organisations prefer contract to in-house security staff. In M.Gill (ed.). Crime at Work: Increasing the Risk for Offenders. Leicester: Perpetuity Press, 1998.

²⁰ Johnston, L. Policing Britain - Risk, Security and Governance. London: Longman. 2000.

²¹ Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on Public - Private Dialogue in security research and innovation, approved by the Commission of the European Communities on 11 September 2007, No. COM(2007)511//
http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/security/files/study_public_private_dialogue_security_research_and_innovation_en

- to identify proposals for forming a strategic security research and innovation agenda, involving national and European stakeholders, laying out a shared and clear view of EU security research needs and priorities;
- to share ideas, views and best practices in order to make better use of existing capabilities and to enhance the use of technology in security-related domains.

The Commission expected that the creation of a European Security Research and Innovation Forum (ESRIF²²) for the development of a Public - Private Dialogue in the area of EU security research and innovation will be the key instrument for achieving these objectives.

Private security companies, as opposed to national, regional or municipal public security forces, are bound by agreement in a specific area. Private security companies operate on the margins of public authority activities, whether this relates to carrying out a delegated public service mission (surveillance of airports, metros, official buildings, etc.) or security provision for private spaces (shopping centres, companies, etc.). Interactions between public and private domains are particularly frequent and varied. In 1998 after carrying out a survey on an area of London, British researchers²³ came up with a description of typical relationships between public and private bodies in terms of policing. This classification is based on three categories: cooperation, competition and coexistence. These concepts should not be taken to describe a distinct model for any EU country (or any general trend within a state). They should only be used as a means of interpreting the data to improve understanding of the relationships between the public and private sectors.

Ever since the 2001 terror attacks in the United States, both public and private forces have been present on airport platforms, each with distinct roles. This model appears to be pervasive throughout Europe. Private security agents are concentrated in inspection and filtering areas separating public areas from airport reserved zones, whereas state forces patrol the entire territory, carrying out identity checks and securing runways. Joint meetings are held between the two partners at which any problems to do with security provision or site operation is discussed. For example, in France, private security agency managers and public partners of Orly airport meet every two weeks to exchange operational information and coordinate their activities, which are often intertwined²⁴. Apart from this sharing of responsibilities that is generally common to all European airport platforms, public and private cooperation varies from state to state.

In Spain, the cooperation principle of private and public security forces is clearly defined by the law. Private security agents are invited to participate alongside public security forces in combating crime and terrorism, particularly by providing information on activity by criminals. However, this operational collaboration requires two basic elements²⁵: a free-flow of information and reciprocity in terms of information sharing. Therefore, public and private security forces have signed a protocol to organise collaboration between the two sectors, to determine areas for joint action and finally to establish confidence. In addition, all private security agents are provided with a booklet by the police who set out what to do in particular situations and containing a contact list.

²² The European Security Research and Innovation Forum (ESRIF) - Public-Private Dialogue in Security Research was established in 11 September 2007, based on a joint initiative of the European Commission and the 27 EU Member States. // www.esrif.eu

²³ Jones T. And Newburn T. Private security and public policing, - Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

²⁴ Private Security and its role in European Security. – CoESS, INHES, 2008, p. 54.

²⁵ Ibid, p. 54.

Secondly, private security agents are provided with a dedicated free telephone and fax line to enable them to rapidly forward any information that is likely to be of interest to the public security forces. In parallel, this privileged communication channel allows them to ask for the intervention of state forces in the event of an emergency or to obtain information from the authorities, such as owner identity or to find out whether a suspect vehicle is stolen.

In Sweden, security is based on a policy of consultation between private security providers and the government²⁶. The authorities thus acknowledge that private security provides additional protection, in particular against vandalism, trespassing and fires. In fact, the private security sector have limited police powers specific to their missions and area of activity, such as protecting accident and emergency hospital departments, metro surveillance or settling neighbourhood disputes. The rapid extension of their field of competence has led to private security agents working more and more closely with the state police forces. This means that the public forces have had to invest in training and monitoring private security guards. In general, there is ongoing dialogue between both forces and relations are considered excellent.

In the United Kingdom, the Home Office recently acknowledged that public/private partnership was a fundamental part of crime prevention policy²⁷. Although the private security industry is first and foremost a business, the authorities have acknowledged that this sector provides significant assistance to the police in both preventing and combating crime and in public order disturbances. Without private security agents, the opportunity to commit crime and antisocial behaviour would be much more common, according to the Home Office. Thus, the police willingly entrusts particular duties to trained private agents on the public thoroughfares. For example, they help with road traffic duties wearing jackets lent to them by the police. However, this form of cooperation between the two forces remains occasional. It mainly occurs during once-off events such as international summits or sporting events or at times of crisis, such as terrorist attacks. Some believe that this form of cooperation should be stepped up, particularly for the Olympic Games which are to be held in London in 2012.

In Romania²⁸ there is a collaboration agreement for dealing with minor offences. For example, the police provide a list of stolen vehicles to private security agents, who then inform the police if they locate them or the offenders. Similarly, agents play a key role in providing security for shopping centres. These places are a favoured target of shoplifters for small items (cosmetics, alcohol, electronic equipment and food). This type of offence constitutes a large part of crime in Romania and collaboration with private security is seen here as particularly effective. In Slovakia, the contribution of private security companies in combating criminality is also effective. The law allows them to monitor and question offenders, check their identity and refer the matter to the military or general police so that criminal proceedings can be instigated.

Finally, in many EU countries supposed, that the trend for public and private partnership of security forces was set to increase in the future, because private security is now an important force in many areas previously considered the responsibility of the state. This produces a ratchet effect. After yielding ground to the private sector, the public

²⁶ Private Security in Europe - CoESS Facts and Figures 2008. Belgium: Confederation of European Security Services, 2008.

²⁷ Private Security and its role in European Security. – CoESS, INHES, 2008, p. 56.

²⁸ The Security Services and Equipment Market in Romania. – Bucharest: FRD Center Market Entry Services of Romania, 2010

authorities seem incapable of going backwards, often for financial reasons. Compatibility of activities of the public and private security forces deals with organizational - functional and legal presumptions. The author makes an assumption that better EU security is to be expected out of compatibility of activities of the public and private security forces.

2.3. Privatization of security services

The system of subjects in charge of security is being changed by substantial changes in the society, political and economic instability, emergence of new forms of property, a wide range of market players and a rapid development of private business. It could be maintained that tendencies of privatisation of security services is a new social phenomenon, which influences EU security strategy and gives rise to academic and practical debate²⁹. Before the various organization engaged in the maintaining of state security are considered, however, it is important to identify what is meant the term *privatization of security services*.

In recent years there has been an academics discussion to distinguish public policing from private policing³⁰. We suppose that public policing and private policing are distinguished by the sector to which they belong. If they are part of the government and funded out of taxation, they are public. If they are provided by companies through fees they are private. This grey area has become more complex in recent years as the privatization of security services. In Member States still exists an opinion that the public security sector still remain the most important police related organization in the multiplicity of agencies involved in the field of state security. In many EU countries exists the opinion, that police are public organization, funded totally from public taxation, that provides almost its services to the public free of charge and that possesses full constabulary powers³¹. Despite this high degree of “*publicness*”, there are areas where increasing degrees of “*privateness*” have emerged. Contrary to popular belief, due to limited financial resources today sees the incapacity of the state to guarantee proper level of security and public safety, which is in particular true in relation to the protection of business entities. In the face of criminal danger large numbers of companies turn to alternatives either by taking care of their own security or by purchasing security services.

Definition of *the privatization of security services* range from a general shrinking of the state to the more precise replacement of public security sector with private sector. The underlying theme of all definitions is a reduction in the role of the state and a prior belief that the private security sector is more efficient and effective at providing security goods and services. Private policing with private security leading the privatization process is spontaneously developing alongside with community policing. The message here is that private resources may be employed in maintaining the state security, whereas the efficiency largely depends on the competitive market of security services as a whole. Security is not only the business of public security sector (the police) but also of non-state institutions named as private security.

Privatization of security services occurs typically on both the revenue-raising side and on the spending-and-production side, without any government involvement³².

²⁹ Kalesnykas R. (2005). The threat as a dimension for security industry development// Jurisprudence: academic journal of Mykolas Romeris University. T. 76 (68). P. 102 – 112.

³⁰ Forst B, Maning P.K. (1999). The privatization of policing: Two views. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

³¹ Forst B. (2000). The Privatization and Civilization of Policing. Criminal Justice. Vol. 2. P. 19-79.

³² Kalesnykas, R. (2003). The Place and Role of Private Security in Policing: a State in Transition// Science, Security, Police. – Belgrade: Police Academy of Belgrade. Vol. IX. No. 2. P. 21 – 37.

However, it can exist on the production side alone, as frequently occurs when public funds are used to purchase the services of private agents. When it occurs on both sides, citizens or private institutions raise the funds for security services that might otherwise be provided publicly and determine how they will be allocated. This includes a myriad of self-help approaches to protecting private property and personal safety, including the following: hiring of security guards and private investigators; installation of surveillance, lighting, and alarm systems; use of citizen foot patrols and block watches as well as escort services and etc. When *privatization of security services* occurs on the production side alone, state may contract with private sources for such specific services as court security, prisoner custody, computer and communications system maintenance, video surveillance, traffic and parking control and etc.

Some academics separate types of *the privatization of security services*, which are allow to choose one of accepted for EU country. For example, Butler has identified a range of security privatization policies³³: (a) the sale of state assets to the private sector; (b) deregulation, where the regulatory burden on industries is reduced or removed and which may lead to greater private sector involvement; (c) public authorities contract out to the private sector functions they previously provided themselves; (d) the government gives recipients of their services vouchers (they can shop around for the best services). Johnston classifies *the privatization of security services* in three ways³⁴: (a) direct and in-direct “load shedding”, where the police relinquish roles directly to the private security sector or where the private security sector usurps the police because they are unable to provide the service the public want; (b) “contracting out”, where the government or police contract with a private organization to undertake a function for which they will remain in ultimate control; (c) “charging fees and selling services”, where the public police have increasingly begun to act in a commercial way by charging fees and selling their services. These classifications the privatisation of security services shows that the broad range of private security sector strategies increasingly used by the public police could similarly be included. When *privatization of security services* has not been possible, attempts have been made to introduce private security sector practices into the public security sector.

To summarize all proposition, we could define that *privatisation of security services* is treated as a process of transference of certain obligations of public safety enforcement, policing as well as responsibility from the public security services to the private security services. Nowadays, in many EU countries private security market was developing under different international, political, economic, social, legal and other conditions, which affected the nature, development and qualities of private security forces, which makes them distinct from public security forces.

3. THE NEW-VISION AND EU SECURITY STRATEGY

The European Council is convinced that the enhancement of actions at European level, combined with better coordination with actions at regional and national level, are essential to protection from trans-national threats. The main crime-related risks and threats facing Europe today, such as terrorism, serious and organised crime, drug trafficking, cyber-crime, trafficking in human beings, sexual exploitation of minors and child pornography, economic crime and corruption, smuggling of persons and trafficking in arms inter alia, continues to challenge the EU security. Cross-border wide-spread crime

³³ Butler, S. (1991). Privatization for purposes. In W.T. Gormley (ed.) Privatization and its Alternatives. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

³⁴ Johnston, L (1999). Private policing: uniformity and diversity. In: Mawby, R.I. (ed.) Policing across the world: issues for the twenty-first century. London. P. 167-186.

has become an urgent challenge which requires a clear and comprehensive response. Whilst in itself not aimed at creating any new competences, but at integrating existing strategies and conceptual approaches, and acknowledging the framework of the Stockholm Programme, Council of the European Union adopted a Internal Security Strategy for the European Union: ‘Towards a European Security Model’ (2010) (hereinafter – European Security Model)³⁵, which is responsive to this. It demonstrates a firm commitment to continuing to make progress in the area of justice, freedom and security through a European Security Model which faces the following challenges: protecting rights and freedoms; improving cooperation and solidarity between Member States; addressing the causes of insecurity and not just the effects; prioritising prevention and anticipation; involving all sectors with a role to play in public protection (political, economic, social, etc.); communicating security policies to the citizens; and, finally, recognising the interdependence between internal and external security in establishing a "global security" approach with third countries.

The Lisbon Treaty³⁶ and the Stockholm Programme³⁷ enable the EU to take ambitious and concerted steps in developing Europe as an area of justice, freedom and security. Against that background, the Strategy of European Security Model:

- sets out the common threats and challenges, which are important for EU Member States to work together in order to tackle new challenges which go beyond our national, bilateral or regional capability;
- sets out the EU's common internal security policy and the principles underpinning it;
- defines a European Security Model, consisting of common tools and a commitment to: a mutually reinforced relationship between security, freedom and privacy; cooperation and solidarity between Member States; involvement of all the EU's institutions; addressing the causes of insecurity, not just the effects; enhancing prevention and anticipation; involvement of all sectors which have a role to play in protection – political, economic and social.

We could infer, that the measures settled in the Strategy of European Security Model will help to resolve the main challenges for the security of the EU. Crime takes advantage of the opportunities offered by a globalised society such as high-speed communications, high mobility and instant financial transactions. There are dominated a number of significant common threats which can be identified:

- Terrorism. Its global reach, its devastating consequences, its ability to recruit through radicalisation and dissemination of propaganda over the Internet and the different means by which it is financed make terrorism a significant and ever-evolving threat to our security.
- Serious and organised crime. Drug trafficking, economic crime, human trafficking, smuggling of persons, arms trafficking, sexual exploitation of minors and child pornography, violent crimes, money-laundering and document fraud are only some of the ways in which organised and serious crime manifests itself in the EU.

³⁵ Draft Internal Security Strategy for the European Union: ‘Towards a European Security Model’, adopted by Council of the European Union on 23 February 2010, No. 5842/2/10 REV 2 JAI 90//

³⁶ Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community, signed at Lisbon, 13 December 2007, No. (2007/C 306/01)// <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:C:2007:306:SOM:EN:HTML>

³⁷ The Stockholm Programme — an open and secure Europe serving and protecting citizens, approved by Council of the European Union on 2nd December 2009, No. 16484/1/09 REV 1 JAI 866 + ADD// http://www.se2009.eu/polopoly_fs/1.26419!menu/standard/file/Klar_Stockholmsprogram.pdf

- Cyber-crime. It represents a global, technical, cross-border, anonymous threat to our information; it poses many additional challenges for law-enforcement agencies.
- Cross-border crime. Such as petty or property crime often carried out by gangs, when it has a significant impact on the daily lives of people in Europe.
- Violence. Such as youth violence or hooligan violence at sports events, increases the damage already caused by crimes and can significantly harm our society.
- Natural and man-made disasters. Such as forest fires, earthquakes, floods and storms, droughts, energy shortages and major ICT breakdowns, pose safety and security challenges.

The main aim of the Strategy of European Security is to harness and develop common tools and policies to tackle common threats and risks using a more integrated approach. To achieve that aim, each Member State must provide the following guidelines for action:

1. *A wide and comprehensive approach to EU security.* To reach an adequate level of EU security in a complex global environment requires the involvement of law-enforcement and border-management authorities, with the support of judicial cooperation, civil protection agencies and also of the political, economic, financial, social and private sectors, including non-governmental organisations.

2. *Ensuring the effective democratic and judicial supervision of security activities.* National parliaments have a greater role to play in the work of the EU through their ability to monitor application of the subsidiarity principle and through their participation in evaluation of the implementation of justice, freedom and security policies.

3. *Prevention and anticipation: a proactive, intelligence-led approach.* Security policies, especially those of prevention, must take a broad approach, involving not only law-enforcement agencies, but also institutions and professionals at both national and local levels. Cooperation should therefore be sought with other sectors like schools, universities and other educational institutions, in order to prevent young people from turning to crime. The private sector, especially when it is involved in financial activities, can contribute to the development and effective implementation of mechanisms to prevent fraudulent activities or money laundering.

4. *Development of a comprehensive model for information exchange.* This model will include all the different EU databases relevant for ensuring security in the EU so that there can be interaction between them, as far as it is needed and permitted, for the purpose of providing effective information exchange across the whole of the EU and maximising the opportunities presented by biometric and other technologies for improving our citizens' security within a clear framework that also protects their privacy.

5. *Operational cooperation.* The Lisbon Treaty (2007) has created the Standing Committee on Operational Cooperation on Internal Security (COSI)³⁸ to ensure effective coordination and cooperation between law-enforcement and border-management authorities, including the control and protection of external borders, and when appropriate judicial cooperation in criminal matters relevant to operational cooperation. The work of this Committee will be based on national and EU threat assessments and priorities.

³⁸ Council of the European Union decision of 25 February 2010 on setting up the Standing Committee on operational cooperation on internal security – COSI (2010/131/EU)// <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:052:0050:0050:EN:PDF>

6. *Judicial cooperation in criminal matters.* At EU level, successful criminal operations and investigations must enable to realise the potential synergies between law-enforcement and border agencies and judicial authorities in preventing cross-border crime.

7. *Integrated border management.* New technologies play a key role in border management. They improve security by allowing for the necessary controls to be put in place so that borders are not crossed by people or goods which pose a risk to the EU. The law-enforcement authorities should facilitate provision of the information necessary for the implementation of security measures at borders.

8. *A commitment to innovation and training.* A strategic approach to professional training in Europe: this objective is essential in establishing law-enforcement, judicial and border-management authorities that have advanced technology and are at the forefront of their specialisation, and in enabling European law-enforcement training to take a major step forward and become a powerful vehicle for promoting a shared culture amongst European law-enforcement bodies and facilitating transnational cooperation.

9. *External dimension of internal security/cooperation with third countries.* In terms of external security, the EU must not restrict itself just to cooperation between the law-enforcement agencies of Member States and other countries, especially EU neighbours. It is necessary to build relationships with other countries through a global approach to security, working closely with them and supporting their institutional, economic and social development. The efforts to combat transnational crime outside the EU as well and to build up respect for the rule of law are of crucial importance. Special attention will have to be paid to "weak and failed States" so that they do not become hubs of organised crime or terrorism.

10. *Flexibility to adapt to future challenges.* A broad, pragmatic, flexible and realistic approach, continually adapting to reality, taking into account risks and threats which could impact on citizens in a wider perspective, not focusing only on criminal aspects but taking into account risks of any kind which might create a security problem in the broader sense.

In resume, it can be assumed that EU must consolidate a European Security Model, based on the principles and values of the EU: respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, the rule of law, democracy, dialogue, tolerance, transparency and solidarity. The quality of our democracy and public confidence in the EU will depend to a large extent on our ability to guarantee security and stability in Europe and to work with our neighbours and partners to address the root causes of the security problems faced by the EU.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The demand and need of new- type security services, the development of security business and the creation of European Security Model promote the processes of globalization within changing global society. This leads for the new challenges in each Member State to manage and fight with new threats: terrorism, serious and organised crime, drug trafficking, cyber-crime, trafficking in human beings, sexual exploitation of minors and child pornography, economic crime and corruption, smuggling of persons and trafficking in arms and etc. Furthermore, the rapid penetration of globalization process into security market poses new risks and threats to EU citizen's safety and EU security policy.

2. The author observed that some challenges in certain EU countries may be regarded as a threat for the security: the mass growth and development of private security sector, public – private partnership for providing security services, the privatization of security services and the re-birth of private police. The author raises the question: what European Security Model should be to make the situation in the EU security field not as

bad as it is now, moreover, what should be done to improve it? In solving the problem the author explain what should be the European Security Model capable of implementing private and public safety and maintaining public order in every Member State.

3. The public – private partnership model of relations between the public and private security services is based on a possible position of Member States regarding the European Security Model, which would define possibilities and boundaries of interaction between the two. The author distinguished two types of reasons: *first*, the ones which hinder start-up and maintenance of close relations between the public and private security services in carrying out common functions of maintaining security, i.e. competition, which is one of the negative presumptions to carry out common activities, and *second*, reasons which stimulate cooperation between the public and private security forces, i.e. fixing of legal, contractual and administrative relations which take shape in maintenance of common functions of ensuring of protection of personal, public, property safety and order. This is aimed at proving that private security sector may be as partner of the public security sector police in the EU security field.

4. The author holds the provision that security services in globalized world may exist as a business, whereas the efficiency of the security services depends on competition between various security service providers. Thus, it could be maintained that tendencies of the privatization of security services is a new social phenomenon, which influences EU security policy and gives rise to academic and practical debate. The issue of the privatization of security services is treated as a process of transference of certain obligations of EU security enforcement as well as responsibility from public security services to private security services.

5. The Treaty of Lisbon, the Stockholm Program and the Security Strategy for the European Union has identified the fundamental principles and guidelines for actions in the development of European Security Model. Every Member State must prepare their homework well in order to implement the European Security Model and the same time strengthening the area of freedom, security and justice. We should not forget, that every new strategy challenged adequate changes. In order to avoid all that, it is necessary to establish the standards and the criteria of effectiveness evaluation of the Stockholm Program and the Security Strategy for the European Union, to prepare national programs on public security and safety area and to assign suitable amount of allocations to the implementation of the measures stipulated in such programs.

References

1. Butler S. Privatization for purposes. In W.T. Gormley (ed.) Privatization and its Alternatives. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991.
2. Button M. and George B. Why some organisations prefer contract to in-house security staff. In M.Gill (ed.). Crime at Work: Increasing the Risk for Offenders. Leicester: Perpetuity Press, 1998.
3. Cha V.D. Globalization and the Study of International Security// Journal of Peace Research, 2000. Vol. 37, No. 3, p. 391-403.
4. Clark I. Globalization and Fragmentation: International Relations in the 20th Century. - Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
5. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on Public - Private Dialogue in security research and innovation, approved by the Commission of the European Communities on 11 September 2007, No. COM(2007)511// http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/security/files/study_public_private_dialogue_security_research_and_innovation_en
6. Council of the European Union decision of 25 February 2010 on setting up the Standing Committee on operational cooperation on internal security – COSI (2010/131/EU)// <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:052:0050:0050:EN:PDF>

7. Crime and Criminal Justice: Eurostat: Statistics in focus on 2009// http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_OFFPUB/KS-SF-09-036/EN/KS-SF-09-036-EN.PDF
8. De Ward J.J. The Private Security Industry in International Perspective// European Journal of Criminal Policy and Research, 1999. Vol. 7 (1), p.143 – 174.
9. Draft Internal Security Strategy for the European Union: ‘Towards a European Security Model’, adopted by Council of the European Union on 23 February 2010, No. 5842/2/10 REV 2 JAI 90//
10. Forst B, Maning P.K. The privatization of policing: Two views. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1999.
11. Forst B. The Privatization and Civilization of Policing. Criminal Justice. Vol. 2. P. 19-79.
12. Held D., McGrew A. The End of the Old Order?// Review of International Studies, 1998. No. 24, p. 219-243.
13. Hughes C.W. Reflections on Globalization, Security and 9/11// Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 2002. Vol. 15, No. 3, p. 421-433.
14. Johnston L. Policing Britain - Risk, Security and Governance. London: Longman. 2000.
15. Jones T. And Newburn T. Private security and public policing, - Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
16. Kalesnykas R. Possibilities to Integrate the Private Security in the System of Law and Order// Jurisprudence: academic journal of Mykolas Romeris University, 2002. T. 26 (18), p. 71 – 82.
17. Kalesnykas R. Privatization Processes of Policing in Lithuania// SIAK Journal: Zeitschrift für Polizeiwissenschaft und Polizeiliche Praxis. – Wien: Bundesministerium für Inneres, 2007. Vol. 3/2007. P. 14 – 24.
18. Kalesnykas R. The threat as a dimension for security industry development// Jurisprudence: academic journal of Mykolas Romeris University, 2005. Vol. 76 (68), p. 102 – 112.
19. Kalesnykas R., Dieninis L. The legal regulation of professional requirements for private security personnel: the experience of Lithuania and some European Union countries// Current Issues of Business and Law. – Vilnius: International Scholl of law and Business, 2010. Vol. 5, p. 223 – 241.
20. Kalesnykas, R. The Place and Role of Private Security in Policing: a State in Transition// Science, Security, Police. – Belgrade: Police Academy of Belgrade, 2003. Vol. IX, No. 2, p. 21 – 37.
21. Karacasulu N. Security and Globalization in the Context of International Terrorism// Review of International Law and Politics, 2006. Vol. 2, No. 5, p. 1-17.
22. Kay S. Globalization, Power and Security// Security Dialogue, 2004. Vol. 35, No.1, p. 10.
23. Law of the Republic of Lithuania on persons and property protection, enacted by the Parliament of the Republic of Lithuania in 8 July 2004, No. IX-2327.
24. Prenzler T. The privatization of policing. In R Sarre & J Tomaino (eds). Considering crime and justice: realities and responses. Adelaide: Crawford House Publishing, 2000.
25. Private Security and its role in European Security. – CoESS, INHES, 2008.
26. Private Security in Europe - CoESS Facts and Figures 2008. Belgium: Confederation of European Security Services, 2008.
27. The European Security Research and Innovation Forum (ESRIF) - Public-Private Dialogue in Security Research was established in 11 September 2007, based on a joint initiative of the European Commission and the 27 EU Member States. // www.esrif.eu
28. The Schengen Acquis - Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement of 14 June 1985 between the Governments of the States of the Benelux Economic Union, the Federal Republic of Germany and the French Republic on the gradual abolition of checks at their common borders, adopted by Council of The European Union decision No. 1999/435/EC of 20 May 1999 // <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/SCH.ACQUIS-EN.pdf>
29. The Security Services and Equipment Market in Romania. – Bucharest: FRD Center Market Entry Services of Romania, 2010
30. The Stockholm Programme — an open and secure Europe serving and protecting citizens, approved by Council of the European Union on 2nd December 2009, No. 16484/1/09 REV 1 JAI 866 + ADD// http://www.se2009.eu/polopoly_fs/1.26419!menu/standard/file/Klar_Stockholmsprogram.pdf
31. Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community, signed at Lisbon, 13 December 2007, No. (2007/C 306/01)// <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:C:2007:306:SOM:EN:HTML>