



Workshop Report: Governing Security and Making Space, 5th September 2008

“Governing Security and Making Space” was the theme of a workshop jointly organized by the Leipzig Research Training Group „Critical Junctures of Globalization” and the Berlin Research Center (SFB) 700 „Governance in Areas of Limited Statehood” on September 5th 2008 at the Freie Universität Berlin. The workshop brought into dialogue key interests of the two partners: The SFB’s interest in *new modes of governance*, and the Research Training Group’s interest in *new spatial configurations* emerging through processes of globalization.

The workshop aimed at engaging with the plurality of relations between governing security and producing space. Two sets of questions guided papers and discussions:

1) *The constitution and transformation of space through security:*

How can we, from a social science point of view, describe transformations of space in the course of transformations of (security) governance? How do new forms of regulation / new assemblages of security actors affect physical, social, and symbolic space?

2) *Use of space in security governance.*

How is space strategically used in new governance formations? What effects with regards to exclusion or shaping (situational) human behaviour can be discovered?

Special guest to the workshop was Professor **Clifford Shearing**, from the University of Cape Town, whose works have considerably influenced policing studies around the world. Prof. Shearing has significantly contributed to the opening up of traditional research in policing and criminology through introducing concepts such as “security governance”, “nodal governance” and “polycentric governance”.

In his introductory remarks, Shearing outlined critical conceptual links between the emergence of new spaces and the prevalence of new actors in security. The emergence and rapid growth of “mass private property”, for example, has served to raise the importance of private auspices of governance, and therefore; private security. Related to that development was a shift in the focus within policing from “doing things to people” to “changing the conditions within which people act”. This focus on opportunities led to the creation of innumerable new technologies for governing space as a means to govern security. Consequently, according to Shearing, space in security governance is both: a source of the polycentric nature of governing auspices and a context of technologies of governing security.

Drawing on the assumption that different spaces produce or enable different configurations in security governance, **Jana Hönke** (FU Berlin) offered some insights into local political

orders in enclaves of extraction in the DRC and South Africa. Focusing on security strategies employed by Transnational Companies (TNC), she outlined a regime of risk management combining two logics; fortress protection and strategic philanthropy. Transnational business spaces, she concluded, can be investigated using a three-fold understanding of space: first, the physical space, including the transport nodes that construct the fortress project; second satellite spaces, these are responsible for social philanthropy in the area; third, spaces of transfer, in which TNC shape more general security discourses and transfer knowledge to other actors.

New forms of urban ordering were discussed in Henning Füller, Anja Feth and Christine Hentschel's papers. **Füller** (University of Frankfurt) showed how recent inner city redevelopment in Los Angeles has led to a sophistication of the privatized city through creating a more "authentic version of urbanity". This "soft urbanism" seeks to provide the comforts of a safe environment, while retaining an air of looseness and disorder that creates an 'edgy' urban atmosphere. The creation of downtown neighborhoods ("place-making") is combined with specific measures directed at the homeless population, which is segmented: partly masked, integrated, or abandoned. In Füller's analysis of Los Angeles, space is both a *mechanism* for shaping social interaction and an *outcome* of urban ordering.

Anja Feth (FU Berlin) shared her insights from the spatial practices of neighborhood alert networks in Buenos Aires. Through discursive and communicative mechanisms around "the barrio", as a threatened space, a new set of practices dividing a dangerous public sphere from a safe private sphere emerge. In a 21st version of Jane Jacob's "eyes on the street", Feth also drew attention to a multifaceted re-configuration of public-private tasks in the domain of 'watching'. In her example, concerned neighbours have access to the CCTV system in the (dangerous) train station and can monitor an unsafe public space from their home computers, in a safe private space - a striking example of how a particular space makes a specific set of security practices and configurations possible all while constructing "the barrio" as a new social space.

With her essay on "instant space", **Christine Hentschel** (University of Leipzig) thematized the interrelation between governing security and governing selves in the field of security. Drawing on her research in Durban, South Africa, she constructs instant space as an assemblage of user-friendly and immediate devices that "everyone" can adopt to cope with insecurity by informing themselves and others. SMS crime information systems, radio blogs, or web-based do-it-yourself crime mapping systems are all examples of such new, mainly beyond-state devices to help people to *avoid* crime (situation/personal dimension), rather than *prevent* crime (general dimension). Governing through space, in this case, is not understood in terms of creating safe neighbourhoods but as an array of devices for navigating through an ocean of insecurity. Spaces of temporal safety, in the conception of instant crime prevention, unfold with the communicative habits of "everyone".

The discussion, led by **Heather Cameron** (FU Berlin), covered a broad array of issues. A central interest amongst the participants concerned the pluralized nature of actors in policing; their possible accountability and the potential for collaboration with each other. This included questions about the future of the state ("Who can and should the state be when the dream of the monopoly is no long credible?" - Shearing) and the police ("ensure that capable guardianship exists?" - Shearing). Security, in this context, was discussed in relation to notions

of pragmatism vs. justice, probing possibilities for imagining security as a common good, also beyond the state.

A second dominant set of interests focused on the nature of governance. Governing, as “shaping the flow of events” (Shearing, interpreting Foucault) included a broad set of logics in the case studies presented, such as practicing philanthropy, shaping ambiances, creating lifestyle spaces, and facilitating communication. Understanding such soft mechanisms as governance, Cameron pointed out, calls for a consideration of the way such incitements and messages are perceived. Implicit with the practice of governing opportunities are numerous assumptions about how those addressed through/in the regulations will react to them. Shearing used the lifestyle-governance theme to ask another question that, according to him, is gaining importance: “How do you live as a rich person (safely) in the middle of poverty”? The notion of “bubbles of governance” as spatially and temporally contained spheres of service delivery was widely referred to by the discussants.

The debate on the social effects of space-specific governance solutions raised questions about contemporary forms of exclusion, a theme that ran through all of the presented work. Exclusion has become “liquid” and can no longer be understood solely in racial, social or spatial terms. In addition, issues such as access to technology and the ability to consume need to be included in reflections on contemporary social sorting through or in security.

Participants expressed their desire to continue reflecting on the relationship between (security) governance and space and a continued workshop series and publications are envisaged.

The workshop was organized by Christine Hentschel, Jana Hönke, and Anja Feth and held at the SFB 700, Binger Straße 40, Berlin.

Contact:

hentschel@uni-leipzig.de
hoenke@zedat.fu-berlin.de

Program

14.00 Welcome and introduction:

Thomas Risse (Freie Universität Berlin)
Christine Hentschel (Universität Leipzig)

14.15 *Clifford Shearing (University of Cape Town)*

Governance, security, and space: conceptual links

15.00 Making space through governing security

Chair: Heather Cameron (Freie Universität Berlin)

Jana Hönke (Freie Universität Berlin)

Topographies of rule in areas of extraction, Witwatersrand and Katanga.

Henning Füller (Johann Wolfgang Goethe Universität Frankfurt)

Soft Urbanism: Securing an urban renaissance in Downtown Los Angeles.

16.30 Pause

17.00 Governing security through making space

Chair: Heather Cameron (Freie Universität Berlin)

Anja Feth (Freie Universität Berlin)

Governable Spaces: Neighbourhood Alert Nets in Buenos Aires.

Christine Hentschel (Universität Leipzig)

Instant space: Crime prevention in your pocket, Durban, South Africa.

18.00 Final discussion

20.00 Dinner