



SFB 1199

Processes of Spatialization
under the Global Condition

Laura Di Fabio

**Counterterrorism Cooperation
Policy between the Federal
Republic of Germany and Italy
in the 1970s**

Working paper series
des SFB 1199
an der Universität Leipzig
Nr. 9

Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 1199
Processes of Spatialisation under the Global Condition
at the University of Leipzig

Funded by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft



Laura Di Fabio

Counterterrorism Cooperation Policy between the Federal Republic
of Germany and Italy in the 1970s
(= Working paper series des SFB 1199 an der Universität Leipzig, Nr. 9)

© SFB 1199
11/2017

Vertrieb:
Leipziger Universitätsverlag GmbH, Oststrasse 41, 04317 Leipzig,
info@univerlag-leipzig.de

ISBN: 978-3-96023-088-5
ISSN: 2510-4845

Content

1	Introduction	4
2	Historiographical Overview and Preliminary Considerations	5
3	Case Study: Italian-West German Cooperation against Political Terrorism (1967–1982)	8
3.1	The FRG Case	8
3.2	The Italian Case	10
3.3	The Italian-German Transnational Space of Police Surveillance	11
4	Conclusions	13

About the author

Laura Di Fabio

is studying for a PhD in History. Her doctoral research “Two democracies, a common enemy: Italy and the Federal Republic of Germany against terrorism”, (awaiting publication in 2017, Mondadori Education) was discussed in June 2015 at the University Tor Vergata in Rome, in collaboration with Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität in Münster. The study is the result of in-depth analysis of the documentation produced by the ministries of the interior and the security forces of Italy and the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) as part of the nations’ effort to safeguard democracy between 1967 and 1982: the crucial decade in which political terrorism, carried out by actors of both the extreme left and the extreme right, reached its peak in both countries. The present paper expands on a section of the doctoral research mentioned above, which has been integrated with the archival sources collected during the author’s time as a visiting scholar with a Short-term Research Grant from the German Academic Exchange Service (Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst, DAAD) at the University of Trier and as a visiting scholar at the Collaborative Research Centre (SFB) 1199: “Processes of Spazialization under the Global Condition” at the University of Leipzig (2016–2017).

1 Introduction

In his pioneering essay “Consigning the Twentieth Century to History: Alternative Narratives for the Modern Era”, Charles S. Maier argues the need for a reconceptualization of twentieth-century studies, observing how: “The urge to focus on the ‘twentieth century’ as such obscures one of the most encompassing or fundamental sociopolitical trends of modern world development, namely the emergence, ascendancy, and subsequent crisis of what is best labelled ‘territoriality’ [...] Territoriality means simply the properties, including power, provided by the control of bordered political space, which until recently at least created the framework for national and often ethnic identity.”¹

In the 1970s, the concept of security was still strongly connected to territoriality and to a locally-based perception of emergency. The national-international nexus, shaped by the bipolarity of the Cold War, inevitably affected the perception of security in terms of what was recognized as existing inside and outside of the national sovereignty sphere.² Over this decade, the definition of political opponents, state borders, territory and national sovereignty in Europe underwent a new attribution of meaning. Political armed violence made its first appearance, for example, as Europe had known only street riots and sporadic social conflicts until then. The international dimension taken on by armed political violence by the end of the 1960s challenged governments and security apparatuses to rethink their theoretical and logistical approaches to terrorist emergency on foreign soil.

Especially after the 1972 attacks on the Munich Olympic Games and the 1973 Rome airport attacks and hijacking, which saw the start of a series of aircraft hijackings by non-European revolutionary movements, political armed violence acquired a truly transnational dimension.³ On a national and transnational scale, the strengthening of contact between armed revolutionary groups from different parts of the world sharing a common ideology (anti-imperialism, anti-capitalism, and so on)⁴ created the means for an exchange of skills, information and know-how, as well as effective logistical cooperation.⁵ As a result, law enforcement⁶ and intelligence apparatuses also began exchanging scientific and practical knowledge in order to extend the territorial control of the state.⁷ The new strategies developed to control terrorism replaced certain well-established practices, transforming standard approaches both towards political crime and towards the training of the police.

As observed by Didier Bigo in his study dedicated to European cooperation in matters of public security, among the police forces “a new representation of the world of security emerges with the new regime of truth and new knowledge that is formed [...] [p]revention becomes absolute for total security.”⁸ The term “surveillance”, however, is not intended here as a form of absolute control over individuals, but rather as the exercise of precautionary and pre-emptive force by those trusted to guarantee order and social security, where both precautionary and pre-emptive force “emphasized the utopian promise of reflective modernity.”⁹ For this reason, it is important to analyse such control and disciplining activities in light of their techno-po-

1 C.S. Maier, “Consigning the Twentieth Century to History. Alternative Narratives for the Modern Era”, *The American Historical Review* 105 (2000) 3, pp. 807–808.

2 Cf. E. Conze, *Die Suche nach Sicherheit. Eine Geschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland von 1949 bis in die Gegenwart*, Munich: Siedler Verlag, 2009.

3 Cf. W. Laqueur, *The age of terrorism*, Boston: Little Brown, 1987; B. Blumenau, *The United Nations and Terrorism. Germany, Multilateralism, and Antiterrorism Efforts in the 1970s*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014; R. Priore and G. Paradisi, *La strage dimenticata. Fiumicino 17 dicembre 1973*, Reggio Emilia: Imprimatur, 2015.

4 Cf. S. Reichardt, “Nuove prospettive sul terrorismo europeo degli anni Settanta e Ottanta”, *Ricerche di Storia Politica* 3 (2010).

5 P. Terhoeven, *Deutscher Herbst in Europa. Der Linksterrorismus der siebziger Jahre als transnationale Phänomene*, München: De Gruyter, 2014.

6 The author of this research prefers to adopt the plural form “police forces” rather than the singular “police”. When discussing the Italian case, the police activity of the national public security organs (today the State Police) and the Arma dei Carabinieri is described. For the German case, the research will consider the investigative methods of the Federal Criminal Office (Bundeskriminalamt, BKA) in Wiesbaden.

7 K. Weinbauer, “Controlling Control Institutions: policing of Collective Protests in 1960s West Germany”, in: W. Heitmeyer et al. (eds.), *Control of Violence. Historical and international perspectives on violence in modern societies*, New York: Springer, 2011.

8 D. Bigo, *Polices en réseaux: l'expérience européenne*, Paris: Les Presses de Sciences Po, 1996, p. 334.

9 L. Frohman, “Datenschutz, the Defense of Law, and the Debate over Precautionary Surveillance. The Reform of Police Law and the Changing Parameters of State Action in West Germany”, *German Studies Review* 38 (2015) 2, p. 310.; R. Bergien, “Big Data als Vision. Computereinführung und Organisationswandel in BKA und Staatssicherheit (1967–1989)”, *Studies in Contemporary History* 14 (2017) 2, pp. 258–285.

litical character, especially in this crucial transition from traditional surveillance approaches to post-modern, computerized approaches, which can be defined as “techno-surveillance”.

The present research will therefore look at how the actions of Italian and West German police agencies changed in the 1970s and 1980s and assess whether and to what extent their increased technological potential marked the beginning of a new approach to the surveillance of space. To address such questions, the interconnection between space, technology and police surveillance will be evaluated, in order to illustrate how such a relation has transformed the practices of institutions and local actors – in this case the police forces – and given rise to a culture of security in Italy and in the Federal Republic of Germany throughout the complex turning point represented by the 1970s and 1980s in Europe.

2 Historiographical Overview and Preliminary Considerations

If the fight against terrorism has often been the focus of innovative historiographical studies, the role of spatiality in respect to surveillance is still relatively neglected. Renewed historiographical interest has emerged as a consequence of the terrorist attacks suffered by the United States on 11 September 2001 and the climate of counterterrorist emergency of the following decade, the latter of which still affects the world of international relations today.¹⁰ The wide availability of newly released documents in European and American archives has contributed to a surge of research interest in the dialectic between the nation state and violent armed conflict. The most recent historiography also focused on the intrinsically dichotomic conflict that each democratic state faces in its effort to maintain a balance between security and the individual freedoms enjoyed by its people.¹¹ Despite its relevance, literature examining counterterrorist effort from a comparative, transnational, and global perspective is still minimal in Italy: the present research seeks to address this neglected aspect.¹² In addition to the aforementioned research areas, it is important to acknowledge the many contributions to the field known as Surveillance Studies, which adopts a long-term, focused methodology in an attempt to examine the effects of disciplining and social control in various historical contexts.¹³

-
- 10 G. M. Ceci, “A Historical Turn in Terrorism Studies?”, *Journal of contemporary history* 51 (2016) 4; R. Gerwarth and H.G. Haupt, “Internationalising Historical Research on Terrorist Movements in Twentieth-century Europe”, *European Review of History* 14 (2007) 3, p. 275; L. Di Fabio and L. Bald, “Perché indagare la lotta al terrorismo italiano in chiave transnazionale. Nuove ipotesi e percorsi di ricerca” *Diacronie*, 2, July, 2017. For an Italian-German comparative perspective see: H. Reiter and K. Weinbauer, “Police and Political Violence in the 1960s and 1970s: Germany and Italy in a Comparative Perspective”, *European Review of History* 14 (2007) 3. For a perspective on enduring features within control and disciplining practices, see: Heitmeyer et al., *Control of Violence*; E. Oberloskamp, *Codename TREV. Terrorismusbekämpfung und die Anfänge einer europäischen Innenpolitik in den 1970er Jahren*, Munich: De Gruyter, 2017.
- 11 Among the many existing sources, see: K. Weinbauer, J. Requate, and H.G. Haupt (eds.), *Terrorismus in der Bundesrepublik. Medien, Staat und Subkulturen in den 1970er Jahren*, Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2006; B. De Graaf, *Evaluating Counterterrorism Performance. A Comparative Study*, London: Routledge, 2011; T. Hof, *Staat und Terrorismus in Italien. 1969–1982*, Munich: De Gruyter, 2011; K. Weinbauer and J. Requate (a cura di), *Gewalt ohne Ausweg? Terrorismus als Kommunikationsprozess in Europa seit dem 19. Jahrhundert*, Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2012; G. Diewald-Kerkmann and I. Holtey, *Zwischen den Fronten. Verteidiger, Richter und Bundesanwälte im Spannungsfeld von Justiz, Politik, APO und RAF. Gespräche*, Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2013; J. Hürter, *Terrorismusbekämpfung in Westeuropa. Demokratie und Sicherheit in den 1970er und 1980er Jahren*, Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014. And also, a recent Italian publication: M.A. Matard-Bonucci and P. Dogliani (eds.), *Democrazia insicura. Violenze, repressioni e stato di diritto nella storia della Repubblica (1945–1995)*, Rome: Donzelli, 2017.
- 12 Cf. the Italian, German and Italian-German literature: J. Hürter and G.E. Rusconi, *Die bleiernen Jahre. Staat und Terrorismus in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und Italien 1969–1982*, 9, Munich: De Gruyter, 2010; A. Baravelli, *Istituzioni e terrorismo negli anni Settanta*, Roma: Viella, 2016; L. Di Fabio, “Due democrazie, un nemico comune. Italia e Repubblica Federale Tedesca contro il terrorismo (1972–1982). Zwei Demokratien, ein gemeinsamer Feind. Italien und die Bundesrepublik Deutschland gegen den Terrorismus (1972–1982)”, PhD thesis, University of Rome Tor Vergata and Westfälische Wilhelms Universität Münster, 2015; L. Bald, “‘Pubblica Sicurezza’ in the European context. Italy and the internationalisation of counterterrorism policy (1972–1982)”, PhD thesis, IMT School for Advanced Studies Lucca, 2017; L. Stortoni, “La repressione del terrorismo in Italia: l’intervento delle forze dell’ordine fino all’inizio degli anni Ottanta”, PhD thesis, European University Institute, Fiesole, 1992. For an overview of existing British, American and Italian literature on Italian terrorism, see: G.M. Ceci, *Il terrorismo italiano. Storia di un dibattito*, Rome: Carocci, 2014.
- 13 A historiographical and methodological overview in C. Conrad and S. Reichardt (eds.), “Geschichte und Gesellschaft”, *Surveillance Studies* 42 (2016) 1; Heitmeyer, Haupt, and Malthaner, *Control of Violence*; K. Boersma et al., *Histories of State Surveillance in*

Such a perspective is especially useful when applied to the analysis of the Italian-West German case. The present research seeks to address Italy's neglected role within international counterterrorist cooperation. By examining primary sources, its aim is to provide answers to the key questions presented by the existing literature regarding information exchange and law enforcement cooperation.¹⁴ What is more, the role of territoriality in relation to public security is a yet insufficiently explored theme in Italy's recent history.¹⁵ Taking the existing literature as a basis, a few preliminary considerations are required in order to clarify the methodology adopted. As a starting point, it is important to establish what relevance an analysis of surveillance can have when exploring the transformations of state apparatuses, such as the police, throughout the 1970s and 1980s.

This study will consider police responses towards local and transnational terrorism. "Transnational terrorism" refers to the network of exchanges and cooperation between armed groups in different parts of the world who share a common political orientation (anti-imperialism, anti-capitalism, etc.)¹⁶, and those who do not share a common political orientation but still exchange resources and logistical assistance regardless of ideological affiliation.¹⁷ The police forces and intelligence agencies of the 1970s and 1980s began to exchange scientific and practical counter-terrorism knowledge and strategies, with the aim of extending the control exercised by the state beyond its borders. Such practices did not fail to generate controversy and raised questions about what constituted legitimate action, such as "where", "how", and "to what extent".

The 1970s can be seen as a decade of transition from an "old regime" style of police surveillance, in which an authority held power over a circumscribed territory at a particular time, to a new concept of control, which was faced with the task of containing transnational armed opposition and challenged by a deep crisis of authority and the transformation of what is usually referred to as the nation state.

Firstly, for our purposes it is useful to define what we mean by a "geography of violence". Simon Springer and Philippe Le Billon expand on the complexity of the word "violence", which is an umbrella term for a vast array of activities operating in many different social contexts: there exists, for example, violent forms of imperialism, colonialism, and migration, violence at borders, and certain intersections between violence and capitalism.¹⁸ In our case, applying their analysis to the concept of state, violence can take the shape of a response to political armed struggle and terrorist attacks in the broader sense (bombing attacks, kidnapping, aircraft hijackings, etc.) and also to the processes of territoriality and deterritorialization related to police strategies of surveillance.

On this topic, Nicholas R. Fyfe identifies a crucial element of the social control exercised by law enforcement bodies, as he observes that "unlike terrorists, the police are given the legal right to use coercive force by the state, which thus confers legitimacy on the use of force by the police. [...] [T]he use of coercive force by the police is territorially distinct from its use by other social groups".¹⁹ This is a fundamental distinction.

From this perspective, it is useful to recollect the four principles of territoriality summarized by Hartmut Behr: "the concepts of sovereignty, (national) integration, the function of borders, and national security". As Behr correctly observes, "[t]hese concepts not only constitute the (constructed) traditional territorial basis

Europe and Beyond, London: Routledge, 2014; D. Melossi, *The state of social control. A sociological study of concepts of state and social control in the making of democracy*, Cambridge: Palgrave Macmillan, 1990.

14 The present research adopts the theoretical approach of Didier Bigo's 1996 study *Polices en réseaux: l'expérience européenne*. The work explores – from a new sociological perspective – the information exchange between law enforcement bodies and the inter-European cooperation on matters of public security, focusing on the internationalization of the activities carried out by the ministries in charge of homeland security from the early 1970s. Bigo, basing his analysis on the available sociological and historical literature, examines the different stages that led to the creation of Europol, which has its origins in European public security cooperation from the Schengen treaties onwards. Also, his study takes into account the geographic scope of each nation's homeland security jurisdiction and considers it in relation to the transnational fluxes of people they experienced. Regarding the multilateral European cooperation, the meetings of European security experts in the so-called TREVI (acronym for "Terrorisme, Radicalisme, Extrémisme, Violence Internationale") groups, and the role played by Franco-German relations in European security policies, see the recent work of: Oberlsokamp, *Codename TREVI*.

15 Regarding the history of the police and territorial control in Italy examined from an international perspective, cf. the project: Le Polizie e il Controllo del Territorio, www.cepoc.it (accessed 19 October 2017).

16 W. Laqueur, *A History of Terrorism*, New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2001; Cf. also: M. Dahlke, *Demokratischer Staat und transnationaler Terrorismus: drei Wege zur Unnachgiebigkeit in Westeuropa 1972–1975*, Munich: De Gruyter, 2011; Reichardt, *Nuove prospettive sul terrorismo europeo degli anni Settanta e Ottanta*.

17 Terhoeven, *Deutscher Herbst in Europa*.

18 S. Springer and P. Le Billon, "Violence and Space: An introduction to the geographies of violence", *Political Geography* 52 (2016). See also: D. Gregory and A. Pred (eds.), *Violent Geographies: Fear, Terror, and Political Violence*, London: Routledge, 2006; M. Foucault, *Security, territory, population*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

19 N. R., Fyfe, The police, space and society: the geography of policing, in: *Progress in Human Geography*, 15, 3, 1991, p. 250.

of politics, but their conceptualization genuinely depends on their territorial fixation. There is a mutual interdependency between territoriality and the concepts of sovereignty, integration, the function of borders, and national security.²⁰ Moreover, “territoriality nevertheless represented a basic, if not the basic, paradigm and guideline to organize politics in modernity”. If, however, we consider sovereignty as something that is not only connected to territoriality but also “as a social relationship which describes the interactions between transnational agents and states as well as among transnational agents themselves”,²¹ then we are led to view the space of surveillance as a response to a space of violence, and the two as forming an interdependent relationship.

Thanks to the introduction of new technologies for observation and control, we can recognize the emergence of a techno-political dimension acquired by surveillance (which can be defined as techno-surveillance) in this relationship, as performed by police bodies and intelligence apparatuses in the second half of the 1970s, although the latter had adopted such technology much sooner due to their military nature. One of the immediate effects of techno-surveillance was to make the repressive power exercised by the state more sophisticated and more covert, as the pre-emptive approach created a form of control that was “as painless as possible of the class tension existing within society”.²² In other words, pre-emptive surveillance differed from traditional police practice in that it was often exercised over subjects who were unaware of being under surveillance and could not, therefore, exercise their rights.²³ Such considerations do not imply the existence of an Orwellian dictatorship, but they do point to the emergence of a surveillance culture inextricably tied to the notion of national security,²⁴ which was evident from the late 1960s onwards. Pre-emptive efforts such as data and intelligence collection are, in fact, correctly identified by historiography not as mere control tools, but rather as a relationship model that existed between the opposing necessities of maintaining inland security and safeguarding personal freedom: a dialectic of mutual dependence.²⁵ Surveillance creates “models of order”, supplies data upon which future policies can be planned, and feeds into approaches towards urban planning and welfare, but it also contributes to the fight against crime and political dissent.²⁶

What is more, from a historiographic perspective, techno-surveillance can be viewed within the sphere of centre-periphery dynamics. The introduction of real-time and immediate data control significantly reduced geographical distances. Techno-surveillance, in other words, created new fields of action for public security, redesigning both territory and its organization in socio-spatial terms.²⁷

Through a historical appraisal of security social control and the processes of resignification of national and supranational power in a global space,²⁸ it is possible to understand the reasons of such a substantive transformation of police practices and the challenges faced by state power. Within the chosen case study, the key actors of such interaction are, on the one hand, the authorities in charge of inland security (governments, the ministries of interior and justice, the judicial and public security organs, intelligence agencies) and, on the other hand, the ever-changing face of social protest, from street violence to domestic or international terrorism. Finally, special emphasis has been given to the following issues:

- social control and intelligence exchange between West German and Italian police forces and the respective interior ministries;
- the surveillance of extremist or armed groups as a means for defining the spaces of social control;
- the increased technological capability of police bodies.

20 H. Behr, “Political Territoriality and De-Territorialization”, *Royal Geographical Society* 39 (2007) 1, p. 113.

21 *Ibid.*, p. 362.

22 R. Canosa, *La polizia in Italia dal 1945 ad oggi*, Bologna: Mulino, 1976, p. 389.

23 The topic has been well expanded upon by Frohman, *Datenschutz, the Defense of Law, and the Debate Over Precautionary Surveillance*, p. 313.

24 E. Conze, “Securitization. Gegenwartsdiagnose oder historischer Analyseansatz? in: Daase C., *Die Historisierung der Sicherheit. Anmerkungen zur historischen Sicherheitsforschung aus politikwissenschaftlicher Sicht*” *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 38 (2012) 3.

25 Reichardt, *Überwachungsgeschichte(n). Facetten eines Forschungsfeldes*, p. 10.

26 *Ibid.*, p. 8.

27 Fyfe, *The police, space and society*.

28 M. Geyer and C. Bright, “World History in a Global Age”, *The American Historical Review* 100 (1995) 4; M. Middell and K. Naumann, “Global History and the Spatial Turn. From the Impact of Area Studies to the Study of Critical Junctures of Globalisation”, *Journal of Global History* 5 (2010).

3 Case Study: Italian-West German Cooperation against Political Terrorism (1967–1982)

The history of Italy and that of the Federal Republic of Germany have shared many parallels since the Second World War. Two democracies born from the ashes of tyrannical systems embarked onto a democratic-constitutional path, which saw them meet similar and defining turning points and deal with a comparable set of challenges, such as the transition from a dictatorial regime to a democracy as it impinged on the reelaboration of the nations' memory of their totalitarian past; the creation of a democratic discourse within society and especially within its institutions; the emergence of student activism; the radicalization of political protest; escalating (and sometimes armed) social conflict; and the institutional attempts to mediate between different interests and social actors.²⁹

The 1970s were the decade during which a generational turnover took place within the higher ranks of West German law enforcement, which caused some discontinuity in hierarchies. A new ideal of police officer took over the imagination of German law enforcement and the social democratic government in office began to pay much more attention to issues such as demilitarization (especially in matters of public order) and the definition of the respective competency limits enjoyed by federal and local bodies.³⁰ Such reforms and new security policies arose from a climate of governmental stability that allowed for long-term planning in policing activity.

In Italy, on the other hand, attempts to bring about reforms within the police forces were met by a barrier of obstacles and vested interests, which found a regulatory resolution only in 1981 with the Public Security Reform Bill. At this point, over ten years had passed since 1968 and its democratizing winds that had swept through the ranks of Italian law enforcement. In the course of that year, shortcomings in the management of public order triggered an internal political debate between law enforcement officials on issues such as disarmament and the need to unionize. The reform, as has just been mentioned, had to wait for over a decade to be approved. It was eventually approved in a political and cultural climate very different from the one in which the movement was born.³¹

From the early 1970s onwards, the technical-political power of surveillance (telecommunications and electronics, computer devices, cryptography, etc.) strongly influenced the administration of the Italian State Police (Polizia di Stato, PS). The advent of IT technology significantly transformed the in-house management of the police force through the relocations of human resources to specific divisions, the creation of special operations forces, and the diversification and specialization of police functions. What is more, computerization played a significant role in the transformation of officers' work practices (in the widest sense of the term) and in the evolution of the very concept of public security and the range of application of surveillance practices.

3.1 The FRG Case

The FRG's need to maintain internal security against political extremism and terrorism was high on the political agenda of the social democratic government led by Willy Brandt and then by Helmut Schmidt.³² This was part of a broader debate around *Unregierbarkeit* (ungovernability), which recognized within the complex economic, social, political, and cultural changes of the 1970s the symptom of a crisis that threat-

29 C. Jansen, *Italien seit 1945*, Göttingen: UTB, 2007. For a study of their mutual perception in recent history, see: P. Terhoeven, *Italien, Blicke. Neue Perspektiven der italienischen Geschichte des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010; M. Tolomelli, *Terrorismo e società, il pubblico dibattito in Italia e in Germania negli anni Settanta*, Bologna: Mulino, 2006.

30 Weinbauer, *Controlling Control Institutions*.

31 M. Di Giorgio, *Per una polizia nuova. Il movimento per la smilitarizzazione e per la riforma della Pubblica Sicurezza in Italia (1969–1981)*, PhD Thesis, University of Venice, 2016, p. 238; Cf. Canosa, *La polizia in Italia dal 1945 ad oggi*; H. Reiter and D. Della Porta, *Polizia e protesta. L'ordine pubblico dalla Liberazione ai "no global"*, Bologna: Il Mulino, 2003; Reiter and Weinbauer, *Police and Political Violence in the 1960s and 1970s*.

32 Conze, *Die Suche nach Sicherheit*.

ened democracy and the nation state.³³ In the late 1960s and early 1970s the leitmotif of internal security represented a central issue of the FRG's domestic policy.³⁴ In many recent studies, German historians have often described the 1970s as the "decade of internal security", aimed at curbing a generalized perception of *Verunsicherung* (insecurity).³⁵

The history of this decade's quest for security is rooted in a long-term process³⁶ that saw how two opposing models of democracy came into conflict: firstly a concept that can be defined as "protected democracy", which was the legacy of the 1950s and 1960s (*die streitbare Demokratie*) and secondly the model born from the brief experience of the Weimar Republic (*die Schwäche Weimarer Republik*).³⁷ Weimar³⁸ strongly influenced the West German political and public debate surrounding the defence of democratic order against all forms of extremism and armed violence.³⁹ The social democratic government enforced emergency legislation with the explicit aim of protecting traditional politics, preventing the kind of takeover by radical parties that occurred in the 1930s with the rise of Nazism and the end of the Weimar Republic. In fact, the origins of such a strong political culture pre-date the Cold War, and can be ascribed to the tragic experiences of the 1920s, which saw a capitulation of democratic forces and the advent of totalitarian regimes both in Italy and in Germany.

On the investigative front, Horst Herold, head of the German Federal Criminal Police Office (Bundeskriminalamt, BKA) and leading figure of the fight against terrorism (nicknamed "Mister Computer" by those in the sector and the public opinion alike) was the first to understand the benefits of focusing on the modernization of technological equipment such as computers and data collection tools.⁴⁰ The perfecting of the *Rasterfahndung*, that is, the computerized investigation of large data samples extracted from registry offices, represented the tool through which counterterrorism operations carried out investigations across all of the national territory.⁴¹ Sample selection was carried out based on criteria such as physical descriptions and behaviour, and for this reason computerized data collection became the centre of much controversy, being accused by public opinion to serve as the basis of an Orwellian state system that was at odds with citizens' rights to freedom and privacy, especially from the second half of the 1970s onwards. Such criticism arose from a more general line of thinking that saw in the extension of police surveillance an erosion of constitutional boundaries and a move away from *Rechtsstaat* in favour of a regime of preventive and post-liberal surveillance.⁴² In such a climate, the techno-political character of contemporary surveillance took on an experimental role in the regulation of territorial control.⁴³

33 On the concept of *Staatsversagen*, cfr. G. Metzler, "Staatsversagen und Unregierbarkeit in den siebziger Jahre?", in: K. Jarausch (ed.), *Das Ende der Zuversicht? Die Siebziger Jahre als Geschichte*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.

34 See: S. Scheiper, *Innere Sicherheit. Politische Anti-Terror-Konzepte in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland während der 1970er Jahre*, Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2010; K. Hanshaw, *Terror and Democracy in West Germany*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

35 Such perceived insecurity was the result of growing unemployment and the economic crisis experienced by the FRG, considered at the time to be "die verunsicherte Republik", according to the definition given by J. Hürter, "Sicherheit, Recht und Freiheit. Zum Balanceakt der bundesdeutschen Anti-Terrorismus-Politik in den 1970er Jahren", in: M. Löhnig, T. Schlemmer, and M. Preisner (eds.), *Reform und Revolte. Eine Rechtsgeschichte der 1960er und 1970er Jahre*, Tübingen: Mohr, 2012.

36 Public discourse regarding internal security in the 1970s represents an evolution of the topos "Ruhe und Ordnung", a legacy of Weimar, and later Adenauer.

37 Hürter, *Sicherheit, Recht und Freiheit*, p. 275.

38 On the transformation of the Weimarian "Ruhe und Ordnung" and the origins of internal security in the 1970s, see: A. Saupe, "Von 'Ruhe und Ordnung' zur 'inneren Sicherheit'. Eine Historisierung gesellschaftlicher Dispositive", *Studies in Contemporary History* 9 (2010), <http://www.zeithistorische-forschungen.de/2-2010/id=4674> (accessed 19 October 2017).

39 Cf. Scheiper, *Innere Sicherheit*.

40 *Computerwoche* 47, 19 November 1976.

41 Oberloskamp, *Codename TREVI*; H. Mangold, *Fahndung nach dem Raster. Informationsverarbeitung bei der bundesdeutschen Kriminalpolizei, 1965–1984*, Zurich: Chronos, 2017.

42 Frohman, *Datenschutz, the Defense of Law, and the Debate Over Precautionary Surveillance*.

43 In the Federal Republic of Germany, exchange of information between the Federal Criminal Police Office and the State Criminal Police Office (Landeskriminalamt, LKA) was ensured by an electronic data transfer system called Elektronische Datenverarbeitung (EDV). Other systems for collecting data and detecting criminal *modus operandi* were INPOL (another data transmission system between central and peripheral offices), NADIS (Nachrichtendienstliches Informationssystem) and the PIOS documentation system (Personen, Institutionen, Objekte, Sachen). The security service collected a sample of data from subjects across the country and through search criteria (loss of personal documents, resettlement changes), were able to narrow down the sample on which to focus the investigations. Police and Crime Control in the Federal Republic of Germany, in: *Police Studies* (March 1978). Cf. also Oberloskamp, *Codename TREVI*.

3.2 The Italian Case

In Italy, the years between 1968 and 1981 were characterized by a strong escalation of violence and terrorist attacks. The year 1977 represented a crucial moment for both Italy and the FRG, but for different reasons: in Italy, social conflict exploded forcefully and included not only violent armed acts but also a wide and heterogeneous range of social demands. In West Germany, on the other hand, far-left political armed violence was accompanied neither by the demands of strong and outspoken activist movements, nor by the presence of more diverse forms of social conflict. In Italy, terrorist activity took place against the backdrop of the social conflicts that exploded in the second half of the 1970s as the result of economic restructuring produced by the demise of Fordism and by the progressive detachment of state politics from society.

From 1974–1975, the crisis of extra-parliamentary groups that channelled most of the far-right and the far-left militancy paved the way to a more fluid space for political engagement, which was open to new forms of political action and expression.⁴⁴ In such a context, the grey area that separated political extremism and armed violence became progressively smaller; guns and violence started making their appearance in political marches and rallies. This, in turn, determined a progressive radicalization of far-left extra-parliamentary groups as they challenged each other for leadership, the adoption of terrorist-style tactics in the fight between opposing extra-parliamentary groups (such as violence and killings between far-right and far-left militants), and the consequent prevention and repression from the state.⁴⁵

The Italian General Department of Public Safety (Direzione Generale di Pubblica Sicurezza) and Italy's national gendarmerie (Arma dei Carabinieri) are under the authority of the Ministry of Interior. The Italian Financial Guard (Guardia di Finanza, GdF) is a militarized police force under the authority of the Italian Ministry of Economy and Finances. In 1975 they still managed the electronic data processing systems used for investigations separately, and no effort aimed at integrating them had been made at that point.⁴⁶ The years between the kidnapping of the judge Mario Sossi in 1974 and the assassination of the Christian Democrats' secretary Aldo Moro, however, brought about some changes⁴⁷. Several electronic archives were created in those years. In the following two years, the technology division's electronic centre became fully operative and was equipped with two state-of-the-art computers that worked around the clock. At that time, there were 600 public security employees in total, who specialized in electronic data processing. Most of them were analysts, programmers, system administrators, or operators, while the rest worked in the peripheral offices. State Police (PS) operatives would search for information about suspects from the records and input it into computer databases, which immediately linked the information based on criteria such as the suspects' modus operandi and physical description. In July 1978, the Italian parliament allocated 100 billion lire to the modernization of the police forces (PS and Carabinieri). The funding was intended to finance the purchase of equipment that would improve safety and effectiveness in departments operating in hazardous conditions. This allowed the introduction of closed-circuit television cameras and transceivers in police headquarters, patrol cars, helicopters, and so on. Great attention was paid to information technology and to the ability to store data on magnetic tapes and to access and update it in real time from police stations scattered throughout the national territory.⁴⁸

44 On the origins of far-right armed violence in Italy and West Germany, see: D. Della Porta, *Social movements, political violence and the state. A comparative analysis of Italy and Germany*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995; Id. *Clandestine Political Violence*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013; T. Hof, *Staat und Terrorismus in Italien. 1969–1982*, Munich: De Gruyter, 2011. See also the historical comparison drawn by Christian Jansen, who has analysed the similarities and differences within the historical-political context that gave rise to far-left terrorism in the two countries: C. Jansen, "Brigate Rosse and Rote Armee Fraktion. ProtagonistInnen, Propaganda und Praxis des Terrorismus der frühen siebziger Jahre", in: O. Von Mengerssen et al. (eds.), *Personen-Soziale Bewegungen-Parteien. Beiträge zur Neuesten Geschichte*, Heidelberg: Manutius, 2004.

45 L. Di Fabio, "Simpatizzante quindi terrorista? La sorveglianza delle polizie in Italia e nella Repubblica Federale di Germania (1968–1982)", in: M.A. Matard-Bonucci and P. Dogliani (eds.), *Democrazia insicura. Violenze, repressioni e stato di diritto nella storia della Repubblica (1945–1995)*, Rome: Donzelli, 2017.

46 Baravelli, *Istituzioni e terrorismo negli anni Settanta*.

47 M. Galfré, *La guerra è finita. L'Italia e l'uscita dal terrorismo 1980–1982*, Rome-Bari: Laterza, 2014; G. Panvini, *Ordine nero, guerriglia rossa. La violenza politica nell'Italia degli anni Sessanta e Settanta (1966–1975)*, Turin: Einaudi Storia, 2009; A. Cento-Bull and P. Cooke, *Ending Terrorism in Italy*, London: Routledge, 2013; M. Lazar - M.A. Matard Bonucci (edited by) *Il libro degli anni di piombo*, Milan, Rizzoli, 2010.

48 Ordine Pubblico, *Leletronica entra in polizia*, 1 (1978) 2.

3.3 The Italian-German Transnational Space of Police Surveillance

An exchange of information and knowledge between Italian and West German police forces in matters relating to public order and security began as early as the 1950s and 1960s in response to the activity of the South Tyrolean secessionist movement (South Tyrolean Liberation Committee, BAS). The border region of Alto Adige (South Tyrol) had become the scene of a number of violent actions calling for the reunification of the area with Austria. This was a struggle that had distant origins, and it immediately brings to mind the intense Italianizing effort undertaken by the Fascist regime as well as the independentist feelings of the German-speaking population living in the region.⁴⁹

In the course of the 1970s, Italian and West German government representatives agreed on a series of talks in order to debate issues such as the protection of nuclear installations; a coordinated inter-European response to hostage-taking situations; cross-border migration control; and a response to crime, arms trafficking, and drug trafficking. The archival documentation of such meetings clearly shows West Germany's close interest in Italian affairs.⁵⁰

The capture of 11 Israeli athletes by the Palestinian Black September Organization during the Olympic Games in Munich in September 1972 overwhelmed the governments of Western countries – above all Israel – and significantly affected the perception of the phenomenon of international armed violence.⁵¹ The many mistakes made by the German authorities in their handling of the crisis, unprepared as they were to construct an effective counterterrorist response, greatly affected the outcome of the event, namely the murder of all the hostages. A month later, on 29 October 1972, the federal government agreed to release the three men arrested for the massacre after a Lufthansa flight was hijacked by a Palestinian commando. In the meantime, the Israeli secret service, Mossad, was independently carrying out a covert operation named "Wrath of God", which planned to assassinate all individuals suspected of being involved in the Munich massacre.⁵²

In Italy, the Fiumicino attacks and hijacking of December 1973 constituted the most serious terrorist act to take place on Italian soil since the World War II and resulted in the deaths of 32 people on a Pan American plane at Fiumicino airport. One could say that this event represents a forgotten page of Italian history, because the Italian government never succeeded in having those responsible for the attack delivered to justice as the hijackers then flew to Kuwait, which relieved Italy of its responsibility to see the matter through.⁵³ This episode, however, did not prompt Italian authorities to internationalize their antiterrorist efforts: this would only happen years later, in the second half of the 1970s.

The space of police intervention, therefore, began to truly cut across national borders. For instance, armed destabilizing actions increasingly took place in what we could call *non-lieux*⁵⁴, that is, inside vehicles such as trains and aeroplanes or at connecting points, stations and airports, as well as during international events. Therefore, in addition to traditional modes of diplomatic relations, it was clear to European governments that something had to be done to foster a greater exchange of information and technical capability between security apparatuses and police forces. Any response should counter such episodes of armed violence, which were becoming increasingly international.

On the occasion of the Paris meeting of 21 November 1975, the Italian Minister of the Interior Luigi Gui and his German counterpart Wehner Maihofer agreed to schedule a consultation between police representatives of both nations, which would be aimed at devising strategies to strengthen Italian-German cooperation. The talks between the two delegations, led by the respective heads of police, took place on 22–23 January 1976 in Rome and on 13–14 July 1976 in Bonn.⁵⁵ Thus began the Italian-German cooperation against terrorism, which was first conceived as a cooperation against crime at large and which, for contingent reasons, later

49 A. Di Michele, *Die unvollkommene Italianisierung: Politik und Verwaltung in Südtirol 1918–1943*, Innsbruck: Wagner, 2008.

50 Bundesarchiv, B106/380739, *Bi- und multilaterale Zusammenarbeit Deutsch-Ita Gruppe, Deutsch-italienische AG, 'Innere Sicherheit'*, 1st ed., January 1975–October 1977; PAAA, B1, b. 178705, *Krise der italienischen Strafrechtspflege und situation der öffentlichen Ordnung in Italien*, 16 May 1977.

51 J. Hanimäki and B. Blumenau (eds.), *An international History of Terrorism. Western and Non-Western experiences*, London: Routledge, 2013. Blumenau, *The United Nations and Terrorism; Oberloskamp, Codename Trevi*.

52 S. Reeve, *One day in September. The full story of the 1972 Munich Olympics Massacre and the Israeli revenge operation "Wrath of God"*, London: Faber and Faber, 2005.

53 For a critical examination of this episode, see: Priore and Paradisi, *La strage dimenticata*.

54 M. Augé, *Non-lieux. Introduction à une anthropologie de la surmodernité*, Paris: Le Seuil, 1992.

55 Bundesarchiv, B106/380739, Bd.1, January 1975–October 1977, Deutsch-italienische AG, 'Innere Sicherheit'.

narrowed its focus down to the fight against political crime. Almost a month after the first set of talks, on 20 February, the officials in charge of preparing the meetings between the ministers of the interior met again. The frequency of such meetings remained unchanged and followed the same pattern, the ministerial meetings being preceded by those of the high officials. The issues on the agenda focused on short-term programmes to be implemented by the two countries, such as the exchange of information between police forces on how to respond to terrorist actions (relating to technical, psychological, and organizational experience), the exchange of expertise regarding electronic data processing, and the exchange of information regarding equipment and armaments, inquiry methodologies, and human resources.⁵⁶

In the first two years of activity, the German-Italian "Internal Security" working group adopted a strategy aimed at combatting crime at large, and then focused its resources on issues of internal security and the fight against terrorism in particular. The cooperation between the security services of the two police forces developed, through the following elements:

- an overall exchange of information and mutual assistance over concrete cases;
- preliminary consultations undertaken in view of multilateral conferences or agreements;
- exchange of personnel and organization of special training courses.⁵⁷

On 13 July 1976, the Italian-German working group "Internal Security" agreed that in matters of urgency, an investigation that began in one country could be carried further across borders. In its meeting of 21–22 October 1976 in Rome, the subgroup "Fight Against Terrorism" defined practical solutions to coordinate the pursuit of suspects: for all information or requests concerning terrorist activity, the Italian Ministry of Security and the German Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution (Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz, BfV) would act as representative central offices (liaison offices) in charge of relaying information to all competent authorities (security services, police).⁵⁸

As for the question of cross-border surveillance, direct agreements were made with the border authorities of Austria and Switzerland. This was a technical-organizational collaboration and can clearly be seen in a note addressed to the interior ministry regarding two meetings that took place in May 1977 between officials of the Italian and German security services with representatives of the Swiss and Austrian police. The document refers to consultations that occurred in Bern and Vienna "to set up an operational plan of direct cooperation in any instances requiring hot pursuit of dangerous elements travelling across the territory of the three countries".⁵⁹ During these meetings, it was decided to "experimentally carry out pursuit simulations", which could then be converted into full blown police operations whenever "real operational needs"⁶⁰ dictated.

The ministry reports reveal the interests and strategies that prompted the Federal Criminal Police Office and the Central Bureau for General Investigations and Special Operations (Ufficio centrale per le investigazioni generali e per le operazioni speciali, UCIGOS) investigations and illustrate the evolution of international contacts between Italian-German extremist and terrorist organizations.⁶¹ As an example, the Länderbezogene Informationssammlung (LISA) report is a chronological list of suspected and confirmed meetings between alleged Italian and German terrorists, including those who were considered sympathetic to their cause or who act as facilitators at specific times. The report is structured in four distinct parts, namely general information; the organizational structure of the armed formations investigated; data on members; and their movements to and from Italy. It is a document compiled by both the Federal Criminal Police Office and the UCIGOS, which in turn relayed the information to their respective interior ministries.⁶² This documentary evidence offers an invaluable insight into the Federal Criminal Police Office's view of Italian armed groups

56 Bundesarchiv, B106/146536, *Bekämpfung Terr mit Italien*, 1975–1978.

57 Bundesarchiv, B106/78846, *Entsendung deutscher Polizeibeamten nach Italien zur Verbesserung der polizeilichen Zusammenarbeit*, 1977–1978.

58 Bundesarchiv, B106/106873, b.1, *Zusammenarbeit mit Italien bei der Bekämpfung des Terrorismus. Bericht über die Besprechung der Delegationsleiter der Untergruppe 'Terrorismus' aus Anlaß der ersten Sitzung der deutsch-italienischen Arbeitsgruppe 'Innere Sicherheit' am 13. Juli 1976 in Bonn*, Attachment 2, 19 July 1976.

59 Archivio Centrale dello Stato (ACS), Ministry of Interior (M.I.), Gabinetto 1976–1980, b. 68, 28 November 1977.

60 Ibid. XVI, Report, 1 July–31 December 1984. Both Reports in ACS, M.I., Gabinetto 1981–1985, b.22.

61 Bundesarchiv, B106/106874, Bd. 3, *Verbindungen deutscher Terroristen nach Italien*, Wiesbaden, 24 October 1978.

62 Bundesarchiv, B106/106874, Bd. 4, *Zusammenarbeit mit Italien, 1978–1980, Deutsch-italienische Zusammenarbeit bei der Verbrechensbekämpfung, Ergebnisniederschrift*, Wiesbaden, 20 November 1979.

and illustrates, amongst other things, how many Italian left-wing extra-parliamentary groups formed links with their German counterparts,⁶³ although the document does not refer to common projects.

Within Italian-German cooperation, personnel exchanges between the respective police forces were frequent and served as a means to further training in matters such as counterterrorism, armed robbery, kidnapping, the handling of emergency situations with hostages, the work of scientific police bodies, the designing of courses for the general and specific training of Pubblica Sicurezza officers (men and women at various levels), the training and use of police dogs, special units and the fight against drugs, road patrol, and the protection of air transport.⁶⁴ The objectives set out during these meetings have, in fact, been pursued in parallel up to the present day, now within a wider context that also includes multilateral talks and the regulatory framework of the European Community.⁶⁵

4 Conclusions

The Italian-West German bilateral cooperation in the fight against terrorism thus matured in a context of deep economic and social crisis. Drawing on the records of parliamentary debates and police investigations in both countries, it appears clear that the state of emergency paradigm and the defence of democratic stability were used to legitimize a disciplining action aimed at strengthening state control. Such control expanded beyond national borders and gave way to bilateral government and police cooperation between Italy and the FRG. Border control paired with the exchange of intelligence between German and Italian security apparatuses at the time forms an exemplary case study of what will gradually become standard practice of international counterterrorist strategy.

Moreover, border control represented (and still represents) a controversial issue, as it stood in the way of the European integration process and slowed the project of free circulation of EU citizens that was being negotiated in those years.⁶⁶ On the other hand, border control and the limitation of such circulation were necessary to impede the communication between the many “subcultures of violence” (*Subkulturen der Gewalt*).⁶⁷ This exchange manifested itself in different forms, including propaganda, emulation, competition, and legitimation. At the same time, Italian-German cooperation against terrorism at the police operational level followed emulative strategies that partly reproduced the modus operandi of armed groups, like in a game of mirrors: observation, knowledge, and application of antiterrorist tactics.⁶⁸

It is not surprising, then, that governments focused their attention on the surveillance of national borders. Here, the transmission of data and information between security apparatuses and the ministries of the two countries took on a major role. This intelligence exchange concerned chiefly:

-
- 63 Bundesarchiv, B106/106875, Bd.6, *Länderbezogene Informationssammlung-LISA, Italien. Verbindungen deutscher Extremisten zu Personen und Gruppen in Italien, Berichtszeitraum 1 January 1978–15 September 1980*, Wiesbaden, 17 September 1980; cf. also: ACS, M.I., *Gabinetto 1976–1980, Kidnapping of Aldo Moro*, b.5, Reports, December 1981.
- 64 Bundesarchiv, B106/78846, *Austausch von Beamten, Techniken und Erfahrungen zur Verbesserung der Polizeilichen Zusammenarbeit, 1977–1978*.
- 65 For an overview, see: Oberloskamp, *Codename Trevi*. and also S. Quirico, *L'Unione Europea e il terrorismo (1970–2010). Storia, concetti, istituzioni*, Perugia: Morlacchi, 2016.
- 66 We find evidence of this dilemma in the records of the Dublin summit and the IV ministers' conference held on 23 October 1979 in ACS, M.I., *Gabinetto 1976–1980*, b. 67, *European Cooperation against Terrorism*, Report to Ministers of meeting of Senior Officials in Dublin on 25 September 1979, particularly within: “Difficultés qui surgiraient si les contrôles aux frontières étaient supprimés”.
- 67 The definition belongs to the historian Petra Terhoeven, who described in a recent study the many instances of exchange and cooperation occurring between Italian and German extra-parliamentary and armed groups. In fact, Terhoeven has recognized how, in the worldwide network, which could truthfully be called global, the exchange of ideas and practices represents a key aspect of the radicalization that affected extra-parliamentary far-left groups and terrorists in Italy and in the FRG at the time. Cf. P. Terhoeven, *Deutscher Herbst in Europa*, p. 36; Cf. also: R. Gerwarth and H.G. Haupt, “Internationalising Historical Research on Terrorist Movements in Twentieth-century Europe” *European Review of History* 14 (2007) 3.
- 68 Petra Terhoeven's study has revealed the connections between both Italian and German extra-parliamentary and terrorist groups. See: Terhoeven, *Deutscher Herbst in Europa*.

- 1) far-right and far-left militant groups, the so-called sympathizers and militants believed to act in the contiguity area;
- 2) the fight against domestic and international terrorism;
- 3) the augmentation of the pre-emptive and repressive capacity of their respective public security organs.

Such records contain substantial evidence that the monitoring of travels, encounters, and visits of Italian militants to the FRG demonstrated points of contact between Italian and German organized violence or “the presence in Italy of German elements of dubious connotation”.⁶⁹ Information of such kind represented a valued acquisition that served three purposes:

- it enabled a progressively stronger and more capillary territorial control;
- it allowed the acquisition of intelligence regarding the mutual influence between activists and terrorists;
- it enabled the exchange of professional skills and knowledge between German and Italian investigative bodies.

Between 1968 and 1982, antiterrorist practice tended to subsume traditional control of extra-parliamentary areas. A substantial continuity in surveillance practices can undoubtedly be observed, but the advent of new technologies has contributed to an extension of control parameters.

At a national level, the technocratic processes have produced changes in society’s perception of the police and in the police’s perception of itself, moving away from the idea of “riot police” to a new image shaped by safety and technology. These technocratic processes that have affected public security, first in the wider sphere of internal security at large, and then, more specifically, in counterterrorism, have also resulted in a progressive refinement of the collection, indexing, and analysis of data and information.⁷⁰

At the international level, the present case study reveals how the decentralization of security control brought with it a consequent redesignation of power centres in charge of safeguarding national security. This is an important step, especially when observing the progressive move away from the centrality of the old institutions in charge of national security to the new multilateral institutions, which can be both European and international. The central Italian-German security systems become peripheral agents within a new approach to security management, which is itself now both European and international. But if, we recognize a delocalization of the national-international nexus in multilateral and bilateral relations, we see a progressive movement towards centralization within each country’s domestic context.

To formulate a transnational response of police forces towards armed political violence, it was necessary to increase the computerization of control. In spatial terms, this signifies deterritorialization of a normative discourse. This goes hand in hand with deterritorialization of the threats and a significant increase of information exchange. In fact, the international dimension of the phenomenon has forced governments to rethink their standard approaches to emergency management of terrorist attacks on foreign soil.

Since the 1970s, the concept of security has been strongly tied to the perception of emergency, both domestically and internationally. The national-international nexus, as influenced by the Cold War, has become a highly significant factor in the complex interplay between what lies inside and what lies outside the sphere of state sovereignty and, therefore, what lies inside and what lies beyond national boundaries. The need to safeguard stability, however, is not necessarily or inherently democratic and in this regard, the distribution of competences is clearer and more straightforward in a federal system like the FRG than it is in Italy. Italian administrative centralism and the increased politicization of the police forces has hindered the democratization of pre-emptive and repressive actions. This is an aspect that appears evident when looking at the work of intelligence apparatuses and the transfer (or withholding) of sensitive information. The lack of coordination between national security apparatuses along with the discretion that undermined this coordination clearly produced a “democratic deficit” in the Italian case.

69 Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Archiv der sozialen Demokratie (FES), Horst Ehmke Nachlaß, 1/HEAA000459, *Über deutsche Präsenz in Italien*, undated, the folder is referenced as containing documents for 25 October 1977–31 December 1978.

70 Frohman, *Datenschutz, the Defense of Law, and the Debate Over Precautionary Surveillance*; Bergien, *“Big Data” als Vision*.

The interweaving and coexistence of different surveillance practices creates and defines several spaces of transnational control. On the spatial level, the use of new technologies shortens the distance between the controllers and the controlled. As distances shrink, security space becomes virtual: less tangible but no less real. So, in conclusion, what areas of surveillance can we recognize in the German-Italian counterterrorism cooperation?

The present research has attempted a categorization of different kinds of social control spaces by identifying the following types:

- 1) Geographical space as a territory separated by administrative boundaries;
- 2) The space of legality, affected by the introduction of new crimes in the penal code and the creation of emergency laws, which are later “normalized”.⁷¹ This space includes the activity of the courts and prisons. In this regard, an interesting debate on the creation of a judicial European space arose in the European forum throughout the 1970s and 1980s;⁷²
- 3) The cultural (and narrative) space. The notions of threat prevention⁷³ and military repression affected and transformed police management, the perception of police officers of themselves, the public discourse on security, and the image of the police in society. In fact, police documentation can be analysed while bearing Eckart Conze’s observations in mind on how security, “aside from a goal of government, a hope or a representation that society projects on its future” also represents “a social-cultural orientation”;⁷⁴
- 4) The space of security practices, intended here as the fields of action and the modes and mechanisms of police control;⁷⁵
- 5) The secret space, concerning secret security operations and intelligence;
- 6) The virtual space, including computer surveillance, technological progress of telecommunication police systems and the introduction of cameras, electronic databases and data processing (e.g. cryptography).⁷⁶

71 G. Frankenberg, *Political Technology and the Erosion of the Rule of Law. Normalizing the State of Exception*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Pub., 2014.

72 ACS, M.I., Gabinetto 1981–1985, b.22, *Resolution on recent terrorist attacks in several European states and on the need to create a “European legal and judicial community” adopted by the European Parliament on 14 February 1985*, 18 February 1985.

73 U. Beck, *Risk Society. Towards a new modernity*, London: Sage, 1992.

74 E. Conze, “Sicherheit als Kultur. Überlegungen zu einer ‘modernen Politikgeschichte’ der Bundesrepublik Deutschland”, *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 53 (2005), pp. 360–363.

75 Heitmeyer, Haupt, and Malthaner, *Control of Violence. Historical and International Perspectives on Violence in Modern Societies*.

76 BKA, *Datenverarbeitung, Arbeitstagung des Bundeskriminalamtes Wiesbaden vom 13. März bis 17. März 1972*, Schriftenreihe des BKA. See also: E. Oberloskamp, “Auf dem Weg in den Überwachungsstaat. Elektronische Datenverarbeitung, Terrorismusbekämpfung und die Anfänge des bundesdeutschen Datenschutzes in den 1970er Jahren”, in: C. Rauh and D. Schumann (eds.), *Ausnahmestände. Entgrenzungen und Regulierungen in Europa während des Kalten Krieges*, Göttingen: Wallstein, 2015.

CENTRE FOR AREA STUDIES



Working paper series des SFB 1199 an der Universität Leipzig No. 9

ISBN: 978-3-96023-088-5

ISSN: 2510-4845

Universität Leipzig
SFB 1199

E-Mail: sfb1199@uni-leipzig.de

<http://research.uni-leipzig.de/~sfb1199>

Funded by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft

DFG Deutsche
Forschungsgemeinschaft

UNIVERSITÄT LEIPZIG
Fakultät für Sozialwissenschaften und Philosophie
Centre for Area Studies

Leibniz-Institut
für Länderkunde **ifl**

Leibniz-Institut für
Geschichte und Kultur des östlichen Europa **GWZO**