

Security forces in a modern state

Summary Report | 9th FSS Security Talk on 27 October 2021, Hotel Bellevue Palace, Bern

How do social changes and other influencing factors affect the work of security forces? What are the greatest threats to public and private security? What opportunities and risks do new technologies and data analyses bring to policing? How should competences in the security sector be organised between state and private actors and between the different levels of government, and how does their cooperation work?

These and other questions were addressed by renowned experts such as **Thomas Würgler** (former Commander of the Zurich Cantonal Police, now a partner at Umbricht Attorneys at Law), **Dr. Matthias Leese** (Senior Researcher at the Center for Security Studies, ETH), **Moritz Oberli** (Managing Partner, at EY Switzerland), **Eva Hürlimann** (owner of Institut Vivacitas) and **Armin Berchtold** (President of the Swiss Security Services Association, VSSU) at the 9th FSS Security Talk. They discussed the current and future challenges for security forces. Current topics such as cybercrime, the distribution of competences between private and public security forces, but also Switzerland as a highly secure country compared to other European countries were discussed. Dr. Matthias Leese summed up the situation in Switzerland very well, stating: "Switzerland, with its federalist system, has a very high need for coordination. However, one can also see that a lot of coordination is happening in Switzerland to meet these high needs. "Overall, the participants agreed that Switzerland is in a good position, but that it still has a lot to do in the areas of cybercrime and white-collar crime.

The two input presentations and the lively panel discussion afterwards offered the 90 participants highly interesting insights into the current and future challenges of Switzerland's internal security. With a successful discussion and subsequent aperitif, the highly exciting 9th FSS Security Talk ended with 90 interested guests.

Security Forces in a Modern State - Need for Regulation?

The round of two keynote speeches was opened by **Dr. Matthias Leese**, Senior Researcher at the Center for Security Studies at ETH Zurich. Right at the beginning, he emphasized that the topic was both very important and complex. He structured his presentation in line with the title of the event. He argued that there is a **strong need for regulation** in today's Switzerland with regard to the **division of labour between state and private security forces**.

To illustrate this, Dr. Leese began with a look at the past. When asked who is responsible for security, most would intuitively **name the state, represented by its security agencies**. Externally, security means averting danger and maintaining territorial integrity, tasks performed by the military, border guards and intelligence agencies. Internally, security means **maintaining domestic order** and **enforcing the rule of law**, roughly speaking the remit of the police and the judiciary.

Locke and Hobbes - masterminds and founders of internal security

In the history of ideas, it is precisely these tasks that were central to the **justification of the legitimacy of the state**. **Thomas Hobbes** justified the necessity of the state in the 17th century with the fact that man alone is not capable of living in peace with his environment and must therefore be kept in **check** by a **far-reaching, state power**. Using the example of the Hobbesian leviathan, Dr. Matthias Leese showed that in this concept the state **combined absolute spiritual and temporal power**. The people submitted to this power for the **protection of their own lives**. Slightly expanded, this rationale can be found a few decades later in **John Locke**, who argues in his Two Treatises of Government that the task

of the state is not only to secure life and **limb**, but also to **secure liberty and property**. In principle, these basic pillars of state theory from the 17th century have not changed much to this day.

Dr. Leese emphasized that even today the state has the task of **protecting our lives, safeguarding our freedom and protecting our property**. Citizens are therefore entitled to far-reaching rights from the state, above all the rights to preserve and enforce our physical integrity, our freedom and our property. However, these encroachments must be carefully justified, and it is up **to state institutions to define** them. There is thus a **state monopoly on the use of force**, although the state must have the necessary tact to carry out interventions only in justified cases. Likewise, state institutions are obliged to be **transparent and accountable to the public**.

Division of labour in the field of security over time

Dr. Leese then explained that, **historically speaking, security has never** been the **exclusive preserve of the state**. On the contrary: private service providers for the protection of physical integrity, property and the enforcement of law and order existed even earlier. In ancient Rome, for example, it was common for businesses to be protected by private individuals. In France and England, too, there were already so-called "**thief takers**" in the 16th century, who acted as a kind of private police force. Dr. Matthias Leese also recalled the private detective and security agency **Pinkerton Detective Agency** and also the **bounty hunters of the Wild West**. He noted that, historically, private security forces have always played a prominent role when state bodies were **unable or unwilling to perform their security task**, for example because of a lack of resources or when there was a great imbalance between the security needs of the population and the state's security offering. Such constellations can be observed historically in crisis situations or in sparsely populated areas.

Over time, the **private security services industry** has become increasingly **professionalized and specialized**, Dr. Leese continued, with an initial push in the Anglo-Saxon world after World War II.



Towards the end of the 20th century, this development was further encouraged by the wave of liberalisation in Europe, which was driven by the assumption that market mechanisms could make services more efficient and cost-effective. This resulted in the privatisation of state infrastructures and tasks in many areas. Dr. Matthias Leese used the example of passenger screening at airports, which he had personally studied in the past in terms of new technologies, new legislation and the increasing delegation to private actors. In doing so, he recognized that **many tasks that used to be sovereign tasks are increasingly being transferred to private service providers**.

This would result in **new, interesting constellations in the landscape of actors**, in that state competences would be transferred to private actors and these would be allowed to carry out actions that, for example, encroach on the privacy or intimate sphere of passengers. Therefore, in practice, there are always armed federal police officers present behind the screening line at the airport who can exercise the state monopoly. As a rule, however, they only supervise the work of private service providers.

Rowing and Steering

In the academic literature, this relationship and interplay between private and state security actors is illustrated with the image of rowing and steering. The **state** retains **responsibility**, while **simple and labour-intensive activities** can be **delegated**. Complex relationships can arise, as in the case of the **question of the distinction between public space and private space**. In principle, the state is responsible for securing public space, while the owners of private space are responsible for securing it. However, today there are numerous **hybrid spaces** that are, for example, privately owned but at the same time open to the public. Railway stations, airports and shopping and sports centres are classic examples of hybrid spaces. This raises the question of who - and how - is responsible for their security, which is further complicated by the state's legitimate interest in functioning infrastructures. In addition, it must be clarified which **tasks may be delegated to private security service providers at all**.

According to Dr. Matthias Leese, **internal security** can basically be divided into **prevention and law enforcement**, with the main focus here being on prevention and less on protecting physical integrity and more on maintaining public order and protecting property. He elaborated on these considerations with reference to a past visit to the **Securitas operations centre** in Bern, stressing that many tasks of modern, private security service providers are now performed remotely with the help of cameras and other sensors. The fact that the police have to be called in in the event of a registered burglary again shows that a **wide range of tasks** can be **delegated to private actors**, with the **state's monopoly on the use of force** generally remaining **intact**.

Tipping point in the security industry

Next, Dr. Matthias Leese asked what the situation in Switzerland was like today. He said that the **private security sector** has been a **growth sector** for years, whereby this is due, among other things, to the internationally - comparatively - low level of policing in Switzerland. There are currently around **900 registered private security companies** with around **22,000 employees**, whereby the "**tipping point**" was reached in **2015**, i.e. the majority of security forces consist of private providers. The clients of private security forces are mainly **private individuals and companies**, but increasingly also cantons, municipalities and the federal government. The tasks of private security actors **primarily** include **prevention**, i.e. patrolling and marking presence, but also, for example, guarding prisoner transports or issuing traffic buses.

The security researcher stressed that these developments were very exciting for science. The relationship between security forces in a modern state is so exciting precisely because it concerns very fundamental questions, including the question of the **legitimacy of state security action**, the **relationship between the population and the state**, and so on. That is why these questions are always the subject of public debate. From the point of view of the population, for example, it is not easy to distinguish between private and other security caterers. In addition, the question remains, what is a private employee allowed to do? Unfortunately, there are still **grey areas** in this respect from a legal point of view. To make matters worse, **competencies** depend largely on whether the interaction takes place in a **private or public space**. On private property, private providers may even be allowed to carry weapons under certain circumstances. In addition, domiciliary rights apply. Furthermore, it should be

considered whether, in the context of a commercial event, one has tacitly given one's consent to be controlled or turned away by private service providers. If these points already **raise questions from a legal perspective**, they are **almost impossible for citizens to answer**.

Following these remarks, Dr. Matthias Leese turned to another problem from the perspective of the state: **security tasks** are usually **sensitive activities** that must be well justified and require **well-trained specialists**. Employees of private providers, on the other hand, undergo **comparatively limited training**, and there are no uniform **training and quality standards**. The strong competitive pressure among providers leads to comparatively poor wages and working hours, which in turn leads to **high staff turnover**.

All in all, these factors increase the risk that private security forces knowingly or unknowingly exceed their competencies or do not have the necessary tact. He stressed, however, that one cannot lump everyone together and of course not all private providers do a bad job, quite the contrary. Most behave in an exemplary and responsible manner and train their staff well. Overall, however, the research on this is clear, with the same problems occurring everywhere, even internationally.

"Harmonisation would benefit everyone".

For the reasons outlined above, Dr. Leese advocated the **harmonisation of licensing criteria** for private security companies **throughout Switzerland** and a **uniformly defined set of tasks and duties**. In his opinion, this would help to make the sometimes complex situations easier to understand for the population and ensure clarity for cantonal and municipal authorities. This would also close a gap that currently exists due to the Internal Market Act, in that licensed providers are entitled to accept and carry out contracts throughout Switzerland.

The idea of the need for regulation did not come from him, he explained. Rather, the need for regulation was already identified in 2004 as part of the project "**Review of the Swiss Internal Security System**" (USIS), whereby most stakeholders in Switzerland, from the Conference of Cantonal Justice and Police Directors (KKJPD) to the Association of Swiss Police Officers (VSPB) and industry associations, basically agree that this need exists.

Nevertheless, all **previous attempts at regulation** have **failed**. At cantonal level, a **concordat on private security services** was launched in **2010 on the** model of Western Switzerland, although not all cantons were behind this concordat (Bern and Zurich), which in turn led to the concordat being **suspended again in 2017**. At the federal level, a new attempt was launched in **2019**, when the **Security Policy Committee of the Council of States** introduced a **bill** to this effect. However, this did not make it through the **consultation process in parliament**. The reasons for this, however, were not known to Dr. Matthias Leese. From an external perspective, however, it is somewhat surprising that no political compromise was reached despite a clear situation and the agreement of important political players.

Dr. Matthias Leese concluded his insightful presentation with the following conclusion: "**Private security** has always played an **important role** in society, historically until today. However, the growth of the last ten years suggests that private security will play an even more important role in the future. All the more reason why **harmonization** would **benefit everyone** and clarify the question of the **relationship between the state and the security forces**. "

Challenges and trends for modern security forces

The second speaker was **Thomas Würgler**, former commander of the Zurich Cantonal Police and now a partner at Umbricht Attorneys at Law. He began his presentation on the **perspective of the police with a** reference to the viral sensation of the Zurich Cantonal Police, the Tetris Challenge, in which the

contents of a police car were illustrated. He stressed that he did not want to, and could not, make a survey of the Swiss police landscape in the short time available for this presentation, but rather limited himself to what he considered to be the most important challenges and presented his personal views with regard to further development.

Thomas Würgler agreed with the previous speaker on many points. The **topic of security** moves the **population** and is important for the prosperity of **Swiss society**, the **business location** and the very **personal security of the people** in Switzerland. Various players play important roles in this, including the private security forces. The former commander explained that the police in Switzerland have over **25,000 employees**, not all of whom are trained police officers. He also stressed that the **police density in Switzerland is not as dramatic as is often said**. There are big differences between the cantons in Switzerland, but basically we are not far from the EU, which also has big differences from country to country. If you want to compare Switzerland with other



countries, you have to take into account various factors, especially the **indicators for objective and subjective security, where** Switzerland is at the top. In general, Switzerland is in a good position. The crime rate has fallen sharply in the last ten years and the population has a high sense of security, said Thomas Würgler. The special feature of Switzerland is the **relatively complex security landscape**, which consists of all **federal levels** and **various institutions**. One can therefore conclude that when something so complicated works and leads to a high level of security, the system also works. Nevertheless, one can see that there is a very **high need for coordination in** the area of security in Switzerland. Thomas Würgler does not see any **major demarcation problems in the area of competences**, but in practice he contests a very high need for coordination across all borders, be it cantons, federal government, cities, but also private individuals, and thus an **intensive security work**.

Challenges from digitalisation to crisis management

With regard to the challenges in the Swiss security landscape, Thomas Würgler explained that two years ago he would probably have mentioned the **terrorist threat**. Today, he thinks that this very difficult situation in Switzerland has been well managed with **combined forces** and a **great effort in the areas of material, training, information sharing** and, above all, in the **preventive area**. Terrorism is a phenomenon that can never be completely kept away from modern society, but at the moment it is **no longer one of the top challenges**.

Rather, Thomas Würgler sees **digitalization as the top challenge**. This social trend offers many opportunities, also for the police, but of course also dangers. Digitalization and the new technologies that have emerged from it have **changed crime**. Today, one cannot distinguish between virtual and

physical crime, rather one has a **modern crime**, which, however, is essentially characterized by what is **going on virtually**.

This dynamic was linked to the second challenge identified, in particular **cross-border crime**. Cross-border crime, together with money laundering, represents one of the major challenges for Switzerland as a business location, which must be taken very seriously. This is an issue where not only the state is called upon, but also the **private sector**.

In addition, he classified **violence against women and minorities** as a danger that concerns everyone in Switzerland. "If we don't find an answer here, it's not just a challenge, it becomes a **problem**," Thomas Würgler noted. It should be noted that this is not just an issue for the police, but rather an **issue for society as a whole**. Moreover, it is not always possible to distinguish whether it is a police issue or whether the topic has a different origin. Ultimately, everything depends on the **attitude of society**, in which the police is ultimately only one element in the whole (value) system of Switzerland.

As a further challenge, Thomas Würgler mentioned crisis situations, **surprising and upsetting crises in general**, including the **Covid pandemic**. In this context, he also mentioned the **polarization of opinions** as a challenge, which is particularly demanding from the perspective of the police, since it is the task of the police to make contact with the entire population. In this context, **existing filter bubbles**, or "**parts of society that shut themselves off and only know their own truths**", could be dangerous for society, as examples from abroad also showed.

At the end of the challenges that he derived from modern, social trends, Thomas Würgler came to talk about what he considered to be the most important point: "**The prevailing claim to comprehensive security that shapes social thinking today**". In this context, he referred to the case of the child murderer in Flaach, ZH, in which even the child and adult protection authority (KESB) was accused of not having intervened in time. "**Today, people have the impression that the state can avert all harm**." In this context, the former commander spoke of a "risk-averse society" which, if the concept is taken further in an absolute way, becomes a challenge.

Dilemmas of Swiss policing

Thomas Würgler then addressed the dilemmas of policing that the Swiss police face. He began by stating that **police work is always local**. At the same time, we live in an **information society** nowadays, which means that without getting the necessary information in time, the police **cannot intervene**. But with **26 cantonal police forces** and over **100 independent corps**, the **timely flow of information** is effectively a major problem in the future, which the police must discuss and solve together with politicians.

Thomas Würgler also mentioned the dilemma between **crisis management and federalism**. He had experienced this himself as head of the crisis organisation in the canton of Zurich during the extraordinary situation in the context of the pandemic. At that time, the crisis teams basically worked well, but coordination between the federal government and the cantons and between the cantons was challenging. In particular, crisis management in the Confederation was a problem and it was remarkable that the lessons learned from the security exercise, the SVU 19 - the exercise leader aRR Hj. Käser was here and could certainly confirm this - had not been implemented".

As a third and final dilemma, Thomas Würgler **highlighted** the inherent **tension between the police as a service provider and the prevention of danger**. Today, the police operate in the **service environment** expected by the population. Nevertheless, they must always be on **stand-by** and expect **any escalation**, which in turn has a major impact on the training and composition of the police.

"The population expects a performance network"

After the challenges and dilemmas of police work mentioned above, Thomas Würgler formulated some developing theses. The first thesis is based on the fact - which the majority of Switzerland fails to realize - that we are in a **crime area Switzerland**. It is a losing battle if the cantons **do not coordinate in the fight against crime**. In this sense, the fight against crime, and perhaps even in the area of prevention, should be coordinated. This means that the population expects a certain performance and corresponding effect from the police in the sense of more security and that it is ultimately irrelevant who provides this.

In addition, according to Thomas Würgler, **new technologies** should be (increasingly) used. While corresponding large-scale projects already exist, one often has to struggle with the financial sovereignty of the cantons, but also with the problem of how politics can use the good results in the cantons for the whole of Switzerland. For him, it is clear that "**a big step forward** must be made here".

Furthermore, in the area of **protection against violence**, the path already taken in many cantons towards threat management must be consistently continued. This means that prevention must be seen as the prevention of violence, so that the focus is placed on ensuring that the danger does not materialise or that an act can be prevented. In this sense, he did not like to speak of prevention, but of "**preventive intervention**".

In the area of **crisis management**, Thomas Würgler called on the **leadership of the Confederation and the cantons to** strengthen and **coordinate this more intensively**. To this end, he said, there were models for forming committees to make rapid decisions in crisis situations. In this respect, the former commander sees the entire political arena under pressure to act and also identifies a need for action in the police, although great progress has been made in the police - starting with the WEF and also within the framework of the 2014 and 2019 security exercises. He concluded his remarks with the demand: "**Important steps have been taken, but these steps must be consistently continued. Here, too, the population ultimately expects a performance network**".



From left to right: Dr. Matthias Leese (CSS), Moritz Oberli (EY), Fredy Müller (FSS), Thomas Würgler (Umbricht Attorneys at Law),
Eva Hürlimann (Vivacitas), Armin Berchtold (VSSU)

When do we feel safe?

Fredy Müller (Managing Director FSS) opened the panel discussion with the question of how and why one feels safe, or not safe. **Moritz Oberli** (EY) said that safety is always a subjective feeling. For example, if you can go home in the evening without any problems, even on foot, without feeling in danger. **Armin Berchtold** (President VSSU) agreed. He himself had lived in Paris for three years and had spoken to American colleagues there, telling them that children in Switzerland walk to school alone, which was unimaginable in the USA. "**We live in an incredibly safe country**, especially compared to other countries around the whole world."

He then briefly touched on the numbers that Dr. Matthias Leese had mentioned at the beginning.¹ **Eva Hürlimann** (Vivacitas) explained that many people and companies only book a "security seminar" with her institute when something has already happened. Then the motivation is particularly high to seriously deal with the topic of safety/prevention. Fredy Müller then wanted to know what the difference is between objective and subjective security. **Thomas Würgler** made it clear that **objective and subjective security do not always have to coincide**. Often, **media coverage** draws **attention to phenomena** and dangers that are disproportionately reported, which in turn can create additional **insecurity**.

Fredy Müller therefore wanted to know from Dr. **Matthias Leese** (CSS) to what extent **citizens** themselves can do something for security and how this is taken into account in research. Matthias Leese stressed that **security is difficult to measure**, especially with regard to certain criminal offences. For example, a few years ago there were more residential burglaries. As a result, he said, prevention was stepped up and the numbers went down, and objective security went up. Scientifically, however, it is unclear whether this was really due to the prevention measures or whether other effects were not responsible for the decline. However, the participation of the population is important. Especially **in prevention work** by the police, **the citizen is strongly involved**. There are often information campaigns on how citizens can protect themselves against burglary, for example by closing windows that are tilted. Such factors play a role and are **also taken into account in research**.

Moritz Oberli agreed with the previous speaker. He had lived in the USA for a long time. There are neighborhoods there that you should not visit in the evening. You automatically become more attentive and try to protect yourself better as a person. A critical risk assessment in our everyday lives should be a duty for everyone, **the panel** agreed, especially in view of the changes in social and technical developments.

Several studies in Switzerland conclude that people feel very safe in our country. Nevertheless, there are major challenges. Thomas Würgler mentioned that police work is first and foremost about what crime is detected. **Crime has changed over the last few years**. The drivers are mostly external and come from society or technological development. All security forces have to deal with this. It is not just a matter of collecting and analysing statistics, but also of identifying **trends and developments** and adapting resources accordingly. This is one of the major tasks of the police.

The same applies to private security forces, said Armin Berchtold: "The whole of society is changing and there is unfortunately **more violence** today." Security forces are confronted with these challenges on a daily basis. For this reason, more and more technology is being used in everyday life. Private

¹ The President of the Swiss Security Companies stressed that the private security industry comprises about 820 companies in Switzerland, with about 14,000 full-time jobs. The VSSU represents about 100 of these companies and thus 85% of the employees in the private security services sector. The VSSU also represents the largest companies in the industry and is a real mouthpiece.

security forces would no longer be equipped with notepads, but with tablets. **Technological developments** are also changing the demands on security forces, which have to become more and more flexible.

Eva Hürlimann was also pleased about the change that **more and more companies** are daring to **invest** in the **area of security**. Many of them are now making this public. Today, it is permissible to communicate that a company or organization is **investing in prevention and communication**. In the past, this was taboo because the impression prevailed that one had a problem. Eva Hürlimann emphasized that the first step towards a solution is always the admission that one has a problem or recognizes dangers. Only then could one work on it.

Violence as a social problem

The next topic revolved around the phenomenon of multiculturalism and the question of whether this leads to more violence. Dr. Matthias Leese explained that **security is a task for society as a whole**. In the creation of security one has several tools at one's disposal. One can act repressively, preventively or cause-oriented. This means either punishing as harshly as possible, trying to prevent crimes or fighting the reasons why people commit crimes. Research here clearly shows that offending in **certain offence areas is strongly related to the level of education**. Some people have the chance to get a good job and thus a certain social status. However, many people do not manage to do so. One could also try to draw a causal connection to migration. This is because many refugees do not bring with them the "tools" to successfully contribute to society. Thus, there is an increased chance of going off the rails, which is also confirmed by scientific studies. However, this causal relationship does not seem very likely to him. In the end, the right **mix is** decisive, and this is the task of society as a whole and not the task of an individual authority.

Moritz Oberli confirmed what the previous speaker had said and explained that the **cooperation of various actors**, such as authorities, teachers, social workers, security forces, etc., was a proven solution. This works very well in Switzerland and helps to tackle this problem in a timely and successful manner. Thomas Würgler added that the keywords crime and migration do not belong together. The causes of crime are, as mentioned, rather **educational and social issues**. The police have the task to get in contact with all parts of society and to meet them on an equal footing. Switzerland has a proportion of foreigners of almost 25% and even more citizens with a migration background. We have to work with this reality and, as the statistics show, it works well.

Fredy Müller then addressed the topic of **internal security**. He asked the panel participants how far the state should be allowed to go to enforce law and order. Thomas Würgler said that internal security is very complex because many players are involved. There are many interfaces between the Confederation and the cantons, and these have been solved well. Cooperation works well, but ultimately the question of **internal security is a question for the cantons**. But that alone is not enough, because there is a **lot of cooperation**. Armin Berchtold agreed and explained that the coordination **and cooperation between the private sector and the police worked extremely well**. There are only exceptions where there are problems. Without private individuals, for example, the Biden-Putin summit in Geneva would not have been possible. The impeccable cooperation between the army, police and private security forces is essential at such major events, the president of the VSSU noted: "During the three days of the Biden-Putin summit, the private security forces worked a total of 10,000 hours. Most of these hours were even performed on behalf of the police". This experience shows that it works well. The only problem his industry has is that the **smaller companies in the sector often fall through the cracks**.

Next came the question of the extent to which **linguistic competence** is also important for **security forces**. In Switzerland in particular, languages such as Albanian, English or Portuguese are important in addition to the four national languages. Moritz Oberli noted that although they had not directly asked about language competence when preparing the study "Security in a networked world" (2019), this was of course an **important skill**, especially at key moments when security forces are deployed. Thomas Würgler added that language skills were particularly required in a canton like Zurich with an international airport. Languages such as English, French or Italian are an important skill and are increasingly becoming a requirement. Most police officers start their profession at the age of about 25. They have to be able to cope with a lot and they **need constant further training, be it in the linguistic or in the technological field**. He also noted that the cooperation between the various players was essentially working well.

Switzerland as a model pupil

Dr. Matthias Leese was then asked to what extent Switzerland is a role model for other countries in the area of decentralized organization. He pointed out that Switzerland deals **excellently** with its **geographical and political challenges**. Switzerland, with **its federalist system, has a very high need for coordination at all levels**. In other forms of political organization, such as in centralized France, essential areas can be regulated more easily. However, it is clear that a great deal of coordination takes place in Switzerland in order to meet the constant and high need for coordination. For the last few years, he has been working on a programme that tries to predict criminal acts using algorithms in order to test new forms of prevention. He found that the **data often stopped at the cantonal border** because not all cantons used the same software. The cantons should therefore coordinate even better, for example by using the same technology and exchanging data more regularly. Nevertheless, Switzerland is a model country in this area compared to other countries.

Moritz Oberli agreed with Matthias Leese that data exchange should not stop at cantonal borders. There is **a lot of catching up to do**, especially **in the digital area**: "At the time we did the study, many cantons had no cyber forces at all, for example. Moritz Oberli, on the other hand, praised Switzerland for being an **international frontrunner**, particularly **in the area of community policing**. This means that the police are very "close to the citizens". As a prime example, he cited the municipality of Entlebuch, where there is a police station in every larger village and the local police officers have the advantage that they know their population. "This is an invaluable advantage in today's world," concluded the co-author of the security study.

Thomas Würgler agreed with the previous speaker but pointed out that community policing was a technical term from training that did not describe police work in practice and that he did not consider it helpful, just like the term dialogue policing. "As a commander, I have always had the aspiration that a police officer can engage in dialogue. **Community policing or the proximity of the police to the citizen was a matter of course for my corps**." Dr. Matthias Leese added that this debate often caused confusion in German-speaking countries. The term originates from the USA and describes the access to specific, for example black neighborhoods in large cities, which have to deal with very specific problems. Such spatial and social segregation does not exist in Switzerland, which is why such theoretical models can only be transferred to a limited extent. **Swiss police officers traditionally always approach citizens** and try to act at eye level. Armin Berchtold added that private police forces in particular are often micro-enterprises and therefore always act at eye level with citizens. Community policing is a living reality, especially among the private security forces.

Competences of private security forces

The question then arose of the **distribution of competences between private and public security forces** and the different training standards. Thomas Würgler said that it was not up to him to comment on the training of private individuals. Overall, **however**, he did **not** see **the different training standards as a major problem**. For example, he sees the situation less critically than Matthias Leese presented it in his presentation. For him, the **competencies are clear and do not overlap**. Aviation security, for example, is regulated by the Aviation Act in the private sector, as can be seen at Swiss airports. Sovereign acts, on the other hand, require the deployment of the police. Armin Berchtold agreed with Thomas Würgler. He also stressed that **private individuals did not need the same training, as many private security forces were only deployed for very specific purposes**. In addition, the VSSU offers several further training and certification opportunities. However, he noted that private security forces also need sufficient training. On the whole, private security forces are less trained than the police, but in most areas this is still perfectly justifiable. Thomas Würgler said that the **security forces needed the training that they needed in their daily work**. The problems are rather within the police corps itself. Here, it must be clearly regulated who is responsible for which tasks. There is also the problem that in **certain areas of activity, police assistants are relied on who have been trained for less time and are therefore cheaper. This was problematic in the long term, as it was at the expense of the increase in the number of actual police officers that was actually necessary**.

Moritz Oberli also raised the question of where exactly the **interface between the private and public sectors** lies. Especially in the **cyber area**, he still sees some **problems**. Another topic was trust in private security forces, which according to studies is high. It is also seen time and again that private security services often carry heavier equipment. Armin Berchtold made it clear: "The equipment clearly depends on the mission. Security guards who are on duty at a football match wear different equipment and have had different training than someone who goes on a night-time tour. He added that the **media** often suggests that **private security guards are always in full gear**, which gives a **false impression**. Private security forces only wear full gear when the mission requires it. Most situations cannot be handled with force, but the **security forces have to act in a de-escalating manner**. Such situations are very stressful, and it **usually takes brains, not brawn**. This aspect must also be taken into account in training.

Possibilities for action by the citizen

Eva Hürlimann agreed with the previous speakers that the police and security forces were doing a great job, always trying to act as equals, but that crimes and offences were still happening. "Of course, it is never possible to achieve one **hundred percent security**," Eva Hürlimann stressed, "and it is **unrealistic that the police can be everywhere and always on the spot**." We do live in a very safe country, but nevertheless the personal responsibility of the citizens must be perceived even more.

Eva Hürlimann then explained what interested course participants can learn in her seminars. In order to prevent assaults, one must first become aware of what exactly is going on in such a case and how one can behave correctly. It is important to know how to **stand**, how to **communicate** and how to **use language**. Finally, it is also important to replay and practice situations one-to-one in order to be able to defend oneself in the best possible way in an emergency. Eva Hürlimann then explained: "Every **conflict can be** divided into **five phases** and every dangerous situation proceeds in a similar way. It begins with the **taking of the look**, the looking at each other. This is followed by **addressing** and **approaching**. Just before escalation comes the **touching**, where the offender tries out whether he can go any further." It is important to be **able to get out during the first four steps before violence occurs**. With self-defence, on the other hand, the attack has already happened. The person concerned has already missed four phases during which one could have acted in a de-escalating manner. In addition,

it always helps to be an attentive person and to be aware of one's surroundings. The point is that anyone can manage a potential attack or even deal with it without it coming to violence, Eva Hürlimann emphasized. Thomas Würigler added that this **de-escalating approach was also the be-all and end-all of police work**. In addition, he said, the **psychological aspect has made up a considerable part of training and further education over the last 20 years**. Without this knowledge, successful police work would not be possible.

Cybercrime as a new challenge

Finally, the topics of **cyber, data and technology were** discussed. Moritz Oberli said that the statistics showed that the number of crimes was decreasing, **but the number of complex crimes was increasing**. One could not separate the cyber issue from normal crime. With modern technologies, **crimes can happen much faster and more vehemently**. Accordingly, cyber increases the attack. Matthias Leese is also convinced that digital space is one of the issues of the future. The well-known **image of a secure Switzerland** is very nice, but it **cannot be projected onto the digital space**, because suddenly you are facing the whole world. This danger applies to everyone, companies, federal authorities, institutions, but also private individuals. Suddenly, the perpetrator could also be located in Russia, China or Iran. Every citizen must take precautions to protect their identity in the digital world. These are issues that still lack sensitivity among large parts of the population. It is often the case that companies **only think about cyber security after they have been the victim of a cyber-attack**. Particularly with regard to small and medium-sized businesses, there is still a lot of educational work to be done. Thomas Würigler pointed out that the Canton of Zurich was the first canton to introduce a cyber unit. It was recognised years ago that crime was changing. However, there is always a **trigger in the "real world"**. Modern crime is therefore much more multi-layered and complex today than it used to be.

One often hears the call for the federal government to take a leading role against cybercrime. Thomas Würigler believes this is wrong in this absolute form. The fight against cybercrime is part of the general fight against crime and that is the responsibility of the cantons. Moreover, it is not enough to **rely only on specialists**. The specialists are the tip of the spear, but the task is much bigger than can be done by just a few specialists. All investigators, and even all frontline police officers, need to be trained accordingly. Even frontline **police officers today need to be trained much more broadly**. For example, if a mobile phone is confiscated, police officers need to know how to handle and secure it properly. You can't use a specialist for everything. Police officers are trained differently today than they were 5 years ago. Armin Berchtold concluded with the statement that **every company can become a potential victim of cybercrime**. In the future, there will also be more **large companies in the cyber sector in the private security industry** that can support companies and the public sector in cyber security. However, new people and new skills are needed in training.