The new mobilities paradigm and critical security studies: exploring common ground

Matthias Leese & Stef Wittendorp

Introduction

> The rapid expansion of academic research on mobilities is evident in disciplines such as geography, sociology, performance studies, media studies, history, and literary studies, but how inter- or multi-disciplinary are the research programs, questions, and dialogues being explored? Are scholars from these different disciplines engaging in meaningful two-way dialogues with each other, and are they developing shared research agendas? (Merriman et al. 2013, 147-8)

This was the guiding question for a panel discussion on mobilities studies, held at Aberystwyth University in September of 2012. It shall be the guiding question for this introduction as well, as it explores the intersections between mobilities studies and critical security studies that make up the theme of this Special Issue.

Matters of interdisciplinarity and overlapping research agendas, as well as of productive ways to explore these overlaps, have in fact always been pertinent for mobilities scholarship. Since the publication of its original 'manifestos' in an article entitled 'The New Mobilities Paradigm' (Sheller and Urry 2006) and the editorial of the then newly-founded journal *Mobilities* (Hannam, Sheller, and Urry 2006), scholars have repeatedly highlighted the fact that a field dedicated to research into a wide range of mobilities questions must almost by default be open to influences from beyond narrow disciplinary boundaries. While having its roots and main outlets in geography, Büscher et al. (2016, 485) characterise mobilities studies as a 'hub of analytical insight for a diverse and expanding range of different parties, whether academic, applied, or creative,' and call for close attention to the 'intersections' that tie the field to adjacent disciplines.

These adjacent disciplines include the likes of sociology, anthropology, history, science and technology studies, security studies, theories of risk and cosmopolitanism, urban studies, design studies, media studies, feminist and gender studies, transition theory, disability studies, and economics (Büscher, Sheller, and Tyfield 2016, 486; Merriman et al. 2013, 147; Sheller and Urry 2016, 15-6). This impressive list of disciplinary overlaps clearly resonates with Sheller and Urry's (2006, 208) original claim that 'issues of movement, of too little movement or too much, or of the wrong sort or at the wrong time, are central to many lives and many organisations.' Mobilities scholarship puts movement at centre stage for inquiries into its modalities, seeking to explore 'the power and politics of discourses and practices of mobility in creating both movement and stasis' (Hannam, Sheller, and Urry 2006, 3-4). Faulconbridge and Hui (2016, 3) in this vein speak of mobilities studies as 'a "style of analysis" in which mobilities are treated critically and in context.'

The notion of something being 'new' in the study of mobilities must thereby not be misunderstood as a claim that movement and mobility would be novel phenomena. On the contrary, as Cresswell (2012) highlights, movement and forms of (im-)mobility have historically always played a crucial role in social, political, and economic organization, while at the same time undergoing transformations due to new technologies and changing modes of governing. Acknowledging this fact, the emphasis of the new mobilities paradigm lies in a processual angle that is interested in movement itself, in its production, and in the social, political, and economic repercussions generated by distinct forms of

movement and its underpinning enablers. In mobilities scholarship, movement is thus turned into the central object of inquiry, rather than conceiving of movement as the mere outcome of a set of other social, political, and economic processes (Faulconbridge and Hui 2016, 3). In this vein, the new mobilities approach was formulated against what Sheller and Urry (2006) deemed 'sedentarist' and 'static' accounts of mobility in the social sciences. For mobilities scholars, what is paramount is the 'constitutive role of movement within the workings of most social institutions and social practices' (Sheller and Urry 2016, 11).

This emphasis has opened up a broad research agenda that includes the movement of people, things, ideas, and potentials, as well as their underlying material grids and infrastructures. However, while it is in fact hard to contest the empirical ubiquity and multiplicities of movement in questions of social, political, and economic organization, it is precisely this ubiquity that at the same time bears the risk of turning the scope of mobilities scholarship into an empty signifier that lacks conceptual coherence and clarity. Adey (2006b) has in this vein cautioned against overstating the role of mobility as an analytical category. As he argues, 'if everything is mobile, then the concept has little purchase' (Adey 2006b, 76). To a large extent, mobilities scholarship has managed to address this quandary through an empirical research agenda that carefully contextualizes mobilities. At the same time, scholars have over the past decade undertaken firm efforts to anchor the mobilities agenda not only within (human and transport) geography, but have reached out to other fields to build the 'meaningful two-way dialogues' and 'shared research agendas' that Merriman et al. (2013, 148) have called for.

In a recent survey of the progress of this process, Sheller and Urry (2016, 16) diagnose that the mobilities paradigm has been successfully integrated into the mainstream of geography, and that it is 'generating subfields related to disasters and emergencies, climate change, and energy transitions and mobility.' Moreover, they note that a quite strong institutionalisation of mobilities can be found in sociology, anthropology, gender studies, social work and social policy, disability studies and health studies (Sheller and Urry 2016, 15). While this appears to confirm the intellectual and analytical attractiveness of mobilities studies across disciplinary boundaries, it in turn raises the question why no equally strong institutionalization of mobilities in critical scholarship on security has yet emerged. This neglect appears rather puzzling since, as Sheller and Urry (2016, 16) note, 'issues of security, securitization and surveillance have become significant in the contemporary world and these have brought about interesting overlaps between such areas and mobilities scholars.'

While the notions of movement and mobility and the regulation thereof have been analysed by critical security scholars, they have done this mostly as a 'second-order concern' (Guittet 2017, 211). Apart from few notable exceptions (Aradau 2016; Aradau, Huysmans, and Squire 2010; Leese and Wittendorp 2017; Salter 2013), critical security scholars have so far refrained from explicitly referencing the mobilities paradigm. In this special issue, we take this lack of engagement as the starting point for an exploration of common ground and opportunities for mutual productivity. We claim that despite the relative lack of explicit mutual engagement, a broad range of already implicit thematic overlaps can be identified in the existing literature on both mobility and security, including: (1) questions of power and government; (2) spaces of regulation and intervention; (3) the quandary of freedom and control in a globalized world; (4) infrastructures that enable movement and at the same time need to be protected; and (5) issues of justice and ethics. We seek to foreground how mobilities studies and critical security studies meet each other in these common grounds and can benefit from each other. In order to do so, we will first briefly sketch out the distinctiveness of a critical agenda of studying security and outline how mobility has become a prevalent theme for security politics and academic analyses thereof. We will then go on to engage the five intersections in some more depth, and along the way introduce the contributions to this Special Issue.

Critical security studies and the security/mobility nexus

Traditionally, a large portion of the study of security has been confined to the discipline of International Relations (IR). Since the end of the Second World War, IR scholars have thereby conceptualized security primarily in terms of foreign policy, warfare, and military capacities between sovereign nation states (e.g., Baldwin 1997; Wolfers 1952). Starting in the late 1970s, however, this narrow agenda has become increasingly challenged through the influences of new conceptual currents such as peace research, post-structuralism, feminism, constructivism, human security, post-colonialism, or critical theory (Buzan and Hansen 2009, 187-8). These new influences 'deepened' the study of security by going beyond the state as the single referent object that needed protection, and instead highlighted that security should be about the individual or society as a whole (e.g., Booth 1991; United Nations Development Program 1994; Wyn Jones 2001). At the same time, they 'widened' the field through suggestions to include other sectors than the military in the study of security, notably domestic and trans-border issues. Subsequently, for many IR scholars questions of security are no longer exclusively tied to considerations of military force and territorial sovereignty, but include more 'mobile' phenomena such as terrorism, crime, (illegal) migration, natural catastrophes, global health, poverty, or climate change (e.g., Bigo 2001; Buzan and Hansen 2009, 187-225; Buzan, Wæver, and de Wilde 1998).

During the 1990s, the dispute between proponents of classical ways of studying security and scholars in favour of opening up the field essentially led to a branching-off in the disciplinary development. On the one hand, primarily in the US, some authors (e.g., Nye and Lynn-Jones 1988; Walt 1991) pledged to maintain the study of security within IR, thereby keeping it in clearly confined conceptual and methodological boundaries. On the other hand, primarily (but not exclusively) in Europe and Canada, and inspired by the rediscovery of classical European thinkers in sociology and philosophy, scholars made decisive efforts to open up the study of security to influences from other fields (e.g., Bigo 2002; c.a.s.e. collective 2006; Krause and Williams 1997). This geographical divide should certainly not be overstretched, but it was primarily in Europe and Canada that security scholars subscribed to a critical paradigm that refused to take core assumptions about security and its politics and practices as a given, and instead sought to highlight the multiple discursive, practical, and material entanglements through which security is produced and reproduced.

Krause and Williams (1997), in their seminal volume entitled *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*, have in this vein diagnosed a 'development of a self-consciously critical perspective within security studies' (Williams and Krause 1997, vii) that they use as a demarcation against 'orthodox' security studies. Krause and Williams posit the need to call into question the ontological and epistemological premises of security as much as – in close conjuncture with the widening and deepening debates – its political, societal, and ethical ramifications. Thereby, they have opened up the field to a diverse, wide-ranging, and interdisciplinary agenda that has since been increasingly adopted by scholars from IR and other fields. Over the past 20 years, critical security studies has established itself as a vibrant field that now features its own textbooks (e.g., Fierke 2007; Jarvis and Holland 2014; Peoples and Vaughan-Williams 2010) and handbooks on methods (e.g., Aradau et al. 2015; Salter and Mutlu 2013). Notably, it has consolidated itself as a field that decisively seeks to transcend the disciplinary boundaries of IR, and that takes inspiration from multiple adjacent fields when it comes to research questions, methods, and theoretical perspectives (e.g., Buzan and Hansen 2009; c.a.s.e. collective 2006; Hansen 2008; Mutimer, Grayson, and Beier 2013).

As already suggested above, a key outcome from the widening and deepening debates in security studies, and at the same time speaking to actual political efforts of regulation, was the

acknowledgment of trans-boundary and mobile phenomena as security-relevant issues that require some form of government. As Sheller and Urry (2016, 12) have in this sense diagnosed from a mobilities studies angle, 'it turned out that migrating across borders are terrorists, environmental risks, military power, medical pandemics, trafficked women, drug smuggling, international crime, outsourced work, slave trading, pornography, asylum seekers, gambling, smuggled workers, movements of waste, financial risks and vast untaxed flows of money.' In other words: bad things do travel just as fast and globally as good things, and this poses challenges for the production of security. But the demarcation between what is good and bad is inherently ambiguous rather than clear-cut and objectively verifiable. What characteristics, for instance, identify a potential terrorist, or why should migration not be considered a humanitarian question rather than a security issue?

Buzan et al. (1998) have conceptualized security in terms of existential threats which mandate extraordinary and urgent counter-measures in order to ensure survival. To turn something into a security issue, so their argument goes, would be to lift it out of normal politics and into an exceptional mode of action. 9/11 and the subsequent introduction of extraordinary security measures by the US in the 'fight against terror' is a pertinent example of such a logic of exception. Other authors have contested the analytical primacy of the exceptional and have instead pointed to the role of security professionals and their networks and expertise in the production of security (e.g., Bigo 2002; Bigo et al. 2007), the bureaucratic processes within policy-making (e.g., Neal 2009), or the importance of security practices and professional cultures (e.g., Bigo 2014; Côté-Boucher, Infantino, and Salter 2014; Leese and Koenigseder 2015; Salter 2007).

At the same time, critical security studies have paid attention to the ways of governing a changing and notably mobile threatscape, and have thereby highlighted questions of risk and knowledge production, and the modes of surveillance and data collection that they are predicated upon. Scholars have here investigated biometrics (e.g., Epstein 2008; Leese 2018; Muller 2008; Scheel 2013) and algorithms (e.g., Amoore 2011; Amoore and Raley 2017; Leese 2014), but also 'low-tech' ways of organising practical knowledge through paper files (e.g., Bonelli and Ragazzi 2014). What unites many of these tools and practices is their anticipatory character. Analyses have in this sense highlighted the logics of precaution, pre-emption, and prevention that are to a large extent underpinned by a calculus of risk (e.g., Amoore and de Goede 2008; Aradau and van Munster 2007; Corry 2012), as well as more creative practices of imagining the future through media and pop-culture (e.g., de Goede 2008; Grusin 2010).

If there is good movement and there is bad movement, or, as Beauchamps et al. (2017, 1) frame it, 'mobility today is regarded as both a condition of global modernity and as a source of insecurity,' then the identification of threats among flows of global mobility becomes paramount for politics and policy-making. According to this logic, only once knowledge has been created about who or what might threaten security can corresponding preventive measures be undertaken. Scholars have in this vein shown how the rendering secure of mobility through the filtering out of dangerous elements at spatial bottlenecks, such as checkpoints or border crossings, is intimately tied up with the production of knowledge about global flows of mobility (e.g., Jones 2009; Salter 2008). Such a 'security/mobility' nexus (Leese and Wittendorp 2017) has notably been studied through a Foucauldian (2007, 2008) lens of biopolitics that highlights the modes of governing (mobile) populations as opposed to (static) territory. Foucault, in foregrounding the work required to uphold processes of circulation, has thereby drawn attention to questions of power that emerge from an analytical lens on the management of flows.

(1) Power and government

We propose such issues of power and government as the first conceptual common ground where critical security studies and mobilities studies can productively encounter each other. In fact, as Cresswell (2012, 650) argues from a mobilities perspective, 'perhaps most importantly, scholars have continued to insist on the role of mobilities in the constitution of power,' and adds that 'speeds, slownesses, and immobilities are all related in ways that are thoroughly infused with power and its distribution' (Cresswell 2010, 21). Power manifests in the capacities to slow down or accelerate, in the authority to keep flows going or to make them stop, and in all the distributed techniques and technologies that assist in doing so. In critical security studies, Foucault's (2007, 2008) work on governmentality and biopolitics has been instructive in the ways in which scholars have studied the mutual constitution of power and knowledge in the government of mobile populations. Such analyses engage the devices and techniques of knowledge production about mobile populations on which a large portion of contemporary security politics and practices is predicated.

A 'biopolitics of security' (Dillon and Lobo-Guerrero 2008) highlights the governmental aspirations to classify and sort populations according to criteria of threat and harmlessness. At the same time, it speaks to questions of surveillance and monitoring. Only through the continuous creation of knowledge, according to this rationale, can security be ensured and mobility be intervened upon in a mutually constitutive fashion. Even movement itself can thereby serve as an indicator for suspicious behaviour and ensuing potential threats. As Sheller and Urry (2016, 12) observe, 'mobilities [...] are shown to be tracked, controlled, governed, under surveillance and unequal in effect' as they increasingly rely on (large amounts of) digital data that are created, collected, and analysed in an automated fashion. This digitisation of mobilities renders them at the same time attractive for the production of security knowledge. Glouftsious' (2018) analysis of the European Entry-Exit System (EES) in this issue speaks closely to this idea, as the electronic documentation of border crossings into the Schengen area is supposed to identify visa overstayers, but at the same time is productive of power that is predicated upon knowledge about individuals' whereabouts.

Analysing security and mobility from a vantage point of power and government has at the same time enabled scholars to reformulate questions of authority. Critical security studies has in this sense made efforts to break with the prevailing focus on state authority/institutions as the preferred locus of control and intervention for (in-)security speech and practices. Questions of government, when approached from an angle of governmentality, foreground the principle of government (or governing), rather than the institution itself. The organisation, management of, and intervention into social and political life can thus be conceptualized as complex, layered constellations that have resulted in analytically novel and distributed empirical sites and processes that are productive of (in-)securities. Scholars have highlighted how security becomes produced in complex assemblages that, for example, include co-operations between public authorities and private companies, and mediation through various technologies (e.g., Acuto and Curtis 2014; Salter 2013; Schouten 2014). In this vein, Hönke and Cuesta-Fernández's (2018) analysis of the port of Dar es Salaam foregrounds local practices, knowledges and actors that bring an often underappreciated power angle to the production of security and mobility, and thereby highlights controversies and inconsistencies in their government from a Global South perspective.

A quite different perspective on power and government is offered in this issue by Suliman (2018), who challenges state-centric accounts of international mobility and security. Engaging global migration, he argues that a mobilities perspective can help to unhinge statist accounts of international migration politics that are predicated upon sovereignty over national territory. Instead, he foregrounds the productive forces of international movement, and highlights how movement has

been deeply implicated in the shaping of national communities and of our understandings of sovereignty and citizenship in the first place. Reeves (2018), on the contrary, choses to address issues of sovereignty from an angle of memorialization and the reassurance of national identity that is produced by carefully curated choreographies that we can encounter at museums. Her account of tourist mobilities at Jerusalem's Holocaust History Museum reflects how representational practices at these sites also (re)produce ideas about security, sovereignty, and nationhood.

(2) Spaces of regulation and intervention

A second (and perhaps the most obvious) intersection where security and mobility meet is constituted by the spaces and sites where movement is regulated and intervened into, where it is sorted and filtered according to distinct criteria, and where it is slowed down or accelerated. In this sense, the infrastructures of global travel and transport have been prevalent objects of inquiry for mobilities scholars as well as critical security scholars. Among these infrastructures, borders (as actual physical barriers at the edges of sovereign territory, or as virtual entry points as part of airports) have arguably attracted the most attention. Both geographers (e.g., Amoore 2006; Amoore, Marmura, and Salter 2008; Rajaram and Grundy-Warr 2007; Richardson 2013; Rumford 2010; Sparke 2006) and a wide array of critical security scholars (e.g., Basaran 2008; Bigo 2001; Côté-Boucher, Infantino, and Salter 2014; Jeandesboz 2016; Leese 2016; Wittendorp 2017) have foregrounded the role of borders in the production of distinct forms of mobility that are characterized by either speed and seamlessness (for the 'bona fide' global elites) or slowness and interruption (for the unwanted, the poor, and the 'risky').

As Cresswell (2012, 650) puts it from a mobilities studies perspective, 'mobilities scholars, when thinking about the ways mobilities are resisted and regulated, need to be involved in the rethinking of borders.' Borders are not static phenomena, but undergo constant change in response to the phenomena that they are supposed to regulate (e.g., Balibar 1998; Parizot et al. 2014; Walters 2006). At the same time, like any other hubs and bottlenecks in the global mobility system, borders operate under the boundary condition of security. In this issue, Leese (2018) and Glouftsios (2018) demonstrate how European borders are currently being re-structured, and highlight how the complex interplay of security rationales and novel technological tools produces distinct velocities with which borders can be crossed. Leese (2018) foregrounds how the standardization of biometric Automated Border Crossing (ABC) systems at the European Union's (EU) external borders transforms the mobility infrastructure as much as it empowers new practices of security. For those entitled to enter the EU, the possession of an electronic passport with a biometric facial image stored on it enables seamless mobility, while freeing up resources to intensify controls for the rest. His diagnosis is thereby in line with Cresswell's (2012, 649) observation that 'one place where kinds of stillness happen, for some more than others, is at borders.'

At the same time, these distinct mobilities are (re-)productive of discourses of threat and security, as cross-border mobilities stand in close conjuncture with questions of the nation state and its territorial integrity and sovereignty that could become threatened by certain types of illegitimate mobility. Glouftsios (2018) argues here that European borders to a large extent hinge on technologically mediated ways of engaging mobile bodies. In what he calls 'security practice-networks', circulation becomes governed through the enrolment of mobile populations in large-scale databases, thereby generating security-relevant knowledge that has direct implications for the individual's capacity to be mobile. His argument thus speaks closely to Sheller and Urry's (2016, 17) claim that 'mobilities research is central to future socio-technical transformations,' as border

technologies are developed and designed with the entwined purposes to facilitate 'good' mobility while shutting down 'bad' mobility.

Hönke and Cuesta-Fernández (2018), in a related fashion, draw attention to ports as key sites for global connectivity. In contrast to narratives of universal technologies and global modes of regulation, their analysis foregrounds the emergence of local controversies about the production of security and mobility that run counter to hegemonic aspirations of transnational governance. Instead, they point to the stakes of local actors as they become part of the global logistics infrastructure. Hönke and Cuesta-Fernández's account, like so many others in the study of mobility and security, thereby focuses on the hubs of globalized travel as sites where technologies become implemented, policies are enacted and security becomes tangible as it (possibly) interrupts movement.

This primacy is contested in this issue by Forman (2018, 2 -XXX replace with final page number XXX-) who suggests moving beyond such analyses by paying increased attention to 'the dangers that emerge as entities circulate between nodal sites of circulatory governance.' In his study of the gas distribution infrastructure in the United Kingdom, he zooms in on the material transformations that gas undergoes on its travels and highlights the maintenance work that is required to ensure smooth and secure transportation and distribution. Mobilities studies and critical security studies have in the past often looked at the same sites and spaces of regulation and intervention – however in a parallel rather than an intertwined fashion. We suggest here that rather than exclusively focusing on the production of either security or mobility at airports, border crossing points, train stations, cargo terminals, or, following Forman, the infrastructural connections between them, we should be mindful of their inseparable nature. Changes in the government of either security or mobility will almost necessarily result in transformations of the other.

(3) Freedom and control

A third overlap between mobilities studies and critical security studies, so we suggest, can be found within the predominant neoliberal narrative of globalization that is, on the one hand, constituted by ideas of progress and prosperity, while, on the other, being undergirded by notions of oppression and control. As Sheller and Urry (2016, 12) argue, mobilities scholarship 'interrogates the master frames and cultural narratives that link mobility with freedom' as promised by imaginaries of a modernity that was supposed to be characterized by seamless connectivity and travel (Shamir 2005). As highlighted earlier, however, it was precisely these imaginaries that turned out to become problematic vulnerabilities from a security perspective. In fact, as Rumford (2010, 952) somewhat cynically summarizes, 'what was promised by the idea of a borderless world – the untrammelled mobility of people, goods, and finances coupled with the inability of nation-states to contain the processes unleashed by contemporary globalisation – is exactly what is now perceived to be such a threat in the post-9/11 world, and the reality is that an increasing awareness of the interconnectedness of the world has brought with it a demand for more and better borders.'

This apparent contradiction has sparked political attempts to reconcile security and mobility that are far removed from a simple re-establishment of hard borders between nation states or slow and fragmented forms of mobility. Quite to the contrary, strategies to cope with the dangers of unbridled movement have foregrounded flexibility and adaptation that are grounded in the accumulation of knowledge about the global flows to be regulated, such that certain mobilities can be rendered frictionless while other mobilities can be brought to a halt and isolated from the flow. The EU is a pertinent example of a political space where the idea of 'free movement' is understood as key to

fostering economic and political integration and cooperation, while at the same time establishing a multiplicity of institutions and agencies that are concerned with the monitoring and management of cross-border and internal movement (Wittendorp 2016, 2017).

In this vein, the politics, tools, and infrastructures of mobility have been re-configured with regard to the reinforced need for security. Smart borders with automated lanes aim to speed up border crossings while filtering out risky elements (e.g., Amoore, Marmura, and Salter 2008; Jeandesboz 2016; Leese 2016); the standardisation of shipping containers allows for seamless intermodal freight transport while exposing containers to high-tech screening devices that scan for trafficked humans and illegal drugs (e.g., Heins 2015; Martin 2014); people and goods on the move can easily be tracked and monitored through RFID technology or the locating of mobile phones (e.g., Hayles 2009; Lyon 2014); and interoperable (digital) information infrastructures link different systems and databases for optimised awareness and intervention (e.g., Geyer 2008; Marquis 2003; Ruppert 2012). Scholars have, with regard to these developments, explored the (discursive) mechanisms and practices through which the link between security and mobility is formed, altered, and reproduced. Moreover, they have been concerned with the tensions, marginalisations, exclusions, unintended consequences and failures that the entwined regulation of security and mobility produces. In this issue, the analyses by Glouftsios (2018) and Leese (2018) present pertinent accounts of technological attempts to put security and mobility into a productive relationship without undermining either, and Hönke and Cuesta-Fernández (2018) demonstrate how this produces (unintended) consequences for local populations.

Glouftsios, Leese, and Hönke and Cuesta-Fernández critically zoom in on the political attempts to govern security and mobility in an entwined fashion and thereby to enact both freedom and control at the same time. By contrast, Suliman (2018) fundamentally challenges the international regulation of migration, arguing that it is still premised on a statist and sedentarist reading of mobility that speaks closer to an organization of movement along the lines of territorial boundaries than it does to actual realities. He therefore calls for an approach to the political that starts from movement itself as the central category of analysis. Only if political categories of migration become based on a notion of kinetics, he argues, could the promise of freedom within globalized modernity be eventually realized not only for global elites, but on a larger and inclusive scale. After all, if, as Freudendal-Pedersen et al. (2016, 1) write, 'historically, mobility has contained the idea and promise of frictionless movement, freedom and speed,' then these capacities today are unevenly distributed and call for critical reflection of the political ways in which freedom and control are entangled.

(4) Infrastructures

The fourth productive overlap between critical security studies and mobilities studies that we suggest is infrastructures – or what Sheller and Urry (2006, 210) have called the 'fixities and moorings' that configure and enable mobilities. Infrastructures are characterised by a tendency to blend in with their environment as long as they function properly (Bowker and Star 1999; Star 1999). However, in case infrastructures become dysfunctional, their significance for security and mobility becomes forcefully apparent (Freudendal-Pedersen, Hannam, and Kesselring 2016, 1). Interrupted movement makes tightly scheduled business travel and global just-in-time production chains collapse, and directs attention to the seemingly banal systems of wires, tubes or roads that underpin movement. Critical security scholars have in this sense explored how infrastructures are rendered as 'critical' for security and so require special attention in terms of preparedness plans or functional redundancies.

Aradau (2010) argues that in conjunction with notions of disruption and emergency, securitization processes turn infrastructures into objects that must be protected at all cost in order to uphold public order. In a similar fashion, Collier and Lakoff (2007, 2008, 2015) analyse how the mapping of vulnerabilities is being used to identify areas that need enhanced attentiveness to preparedness since they are considered to be 'vital.' Coward (2009) and Graham (2010, 2014) foreground urban infrastructures as critically relevant not only to the upholding of our everyday lifestyles, but also as security risks that, when exposed to disruption, would unfold far-reaching cascade effects. As Graham (2014, 469) reminds us, 'whilst sometimes taken for granted […] energy, water, sewerage, transport, trade, finance and communication infrastructures allow modern urban life to exist.'

Thinking about infrastructures in terms of disruption or failure is in a certain sense already implied in the concept of security itself. Being geared towards the future, security measures must always strive to prevent harm from unfolding. But at the same time, they must establish contingency preparations. Whether disruptions and failures then come from man-made incidents (e.g., terrorist attacks), natural catastrophes (e.g., floods, wildfires, earthquakes) or from the complexity and fragility of contemporary infrastructures themselves (e.g., industrial accidents, power outages, breakdown of transportation infrastructures) is thus only of secondary importance. What scholars have highlighted instead is that both security and mobility systems must have mechanisms and protocols in place that mediate the effects of interruption, keep people and objects secure and on the move, and eventually re-establish order.

Considering infrastructures from a mobilities perspective, Adey (2016) thus argues that when regular forms of mobility break down, a particular set of 'emergency mobilities' surfaces. As he puts it, 'the governance of emergency mobilities is not at all straightforward, involving messy, fragile, searching, sensing practices, presences and absences, in nearby or remote locations, with non and inhuman life and mediators' (Adey 2016, 45). Disruption of infrastructure and ensuing states of emergency and exception must thus be conceptualized as problems for the government of both security and mobility. This implies the invention of new tools and techniques or the re-deployment of already existing tools and techniques (Adey, Anderson, and Graham 2015). Similarly, Adey and Anderson (2012) have explored the designs, practices, and technologies that security agencies use to mobilize the unthinkable, and to prepare for emergency situations by developing protocols and alternative solutions.

In this issue, Forman (2018) directs attention to the gas infrastructure and the multiple security issues that emerge as gas moves through a complex system of valves and pipelines, thereby changing its physical form and requesting variegated measures and forms of maintenance in order to be secured. From a similar vantage point that also foregrounds the security problems that mobility infrastructures themselves pose, Kester (2018) investigates the security practices that become necessary to govern electric automobility. He highlights the fact that mobility that is predicated upon the use of electricity depends not only on roads, parking spaces, or service stations, but interweaves traditional automobility infrastructures with the electric (smart) grid. This new assemblage implies that, apart from integrating charging technology into existing structures (i.e. gas stations or parking lots), new vulnerabilities are created that need to be addressed through several governmental dimensions that are underpinned by security considerations.

What the accounts of Forman and Kester have in common is their emphasis on the security implications of possible infrastructure failures. As McCormack (2014, 225) reminds us in this regard, 'what emerges through thinking about such mundane things as pipes and cables is a sense of the rigging and routing of assemblages of mobility composed of multiple devices, materials, and agencies, organized in various ways and continuously generating […] the infrastructural conditions of

different experiences.' At the same time, they direct our attention to the relationship of the notions of disruption, failure, and emergency within the logics of security. Securitization theory points out that security discourses often hinge on an artificial distinction between the mundane and the exceptional, whereby exceptional states are mobilized and legitimized through the notion of threat. However, scholars from both critical security studies and mobilities studies have highlighted the need to look beyond the exceptional and to take into consideration the mundane ways in which security and mobility become interwoven in the design and planning of mobility systems.

(5) Justice and ethics

The last productive overlap that we seek to propose here is justice and ethics. The study of security almost by default resonates with ethical questions: security itself must be considered as an 'ambiguous symbol' (Wolfers 1952) that, even though desirable in the first place, can hardly be judged in an objective fashion, and that can notably unfold negative repercussions if there is too much of it. Critical security scholars have pointed to the potential of security to 'trump' other values, as it could be used as an argument for survival, without which other values could be easily subdued (Buzan, Wæver, and de Wilde 1998; Wæver 1995). Within political discourse, reference to security and the urgency to deploy measures against threat would then enable politicians to side-track the usual mechanisms of deliberation and parliamentary control, and would instead put an override on those democratic principles – eventually leading to the implementation of technologies and policies that might otherwise not have gained political traction.

By extension, arguments about security underpin population control through surveillance and monitoring, and are entangled in the production of particular undesirable mobilities. Different forms of mobilities here receive different treatment, as in the name of security some forms of movement become preferred, accelerated, and 'waved through' checkpoints, while other forms of movement arouse suspicion, become decelerated, diverted or brought to a sudden halt. The (political) decision of sorting which movements into which of the categories is thereby also decisively an ethical one. It entails normative valuations about which characteristics are considered dangerous and also unfolds considerable consequences for those that are rendered potentially harmful. For Freudendal-Pedersen (2014, 143) thinking about mobility thus necessarily 'encloses discussions of normativity and morality, as well as visions and utopias.'

Suliman's (2018) account in this vein shows how such normativities and moralities play out with regard to global migration. As he argues, the dominant position of the nation state in the international system with its emphasis on stasis turns migration into a concern – and sometimes undesirable phenomenon – rather than movement figuring as the normal condition. The consequence of stasis is that movement across borders is mediated according to the criteria of belonging to a particular country. As he puts forward in line with other scholars (e.g., Adey 2006a, 2008; Pallitto and Heyman 2008), the differentiation of the capacity to move throughout the world sorts travellers into categories of (mobile and secure) 'kinetic elites' versus (immobile and insecure) 'vagabonds'. This has far-reaching implications as questions of justice and ethics are mediated through whether or not someone can claim (and is granted) access to a national community.

Throughout both mobilities studies and critical security studies, many scholars have pointed to the normative downsides of the regulation of security and mobility, highlighting issues such as surveillance and control, profiling and discrimination, human rights and civil liberties violations, social injustices and the aggravation of power imbalances (e.g., c.a.s.e. collective 2006; Sheller 2016; Söderström et al. 2013). Often these issues occur in conjunction with larger trajectories of

globalization and (neo)liberal economics and politics, an increasing technologization of security and the reconfiguration of global mobility hubs and borders. Critical security scholars have highlighted the morality that is inherent in the concept of security itself, and have called for an ethical angle on security politics and practices (e.g., Browning and McDonald 2013; Burgess 2011; Nyman 2016; Nyman and Burke 2016).

A similar angle on the production of mobilities has been put forward by Söderström et al. (2013, X), who argue that 'the study of gradients of inequality has been central to mobility studies' and highlight the unequal distribution of mobility across societies – specifically when measured against the backdrop of mobility as resource or capital in a globalized economy that thrives on the capacity of people, goods, and data to move swiftly and in-time. Justice and ethics – or, in other words, questions about the just distribution of security and mobility as well as to the way we want to treat humans and the world that we want to live in – are paramount in the study of security and mobility. Considerations about which forms of mobility and movement are worthy of acceleration and which are risky enough to be shut down are often presented as overarchingly driven by security considerations. We must, however, keep in mind that they are always imbued with profound normative questions.

Conclusions

Throughout this introduction, in the modest hope of outlining a shared research agenda, we have suggested five larger thematic intersections between critical security studies and mobilities studies: (1) power and government; (2) spaces of regulation and intervention; (3) freedom and control; (4) infrastructures, and (5) justice and ethics. These common grounds, as we have argued, are already implicitly being addressed by scholars from both sides. There is however a lack of formal mutual acknowledgment. This Special Issue should be understood as an attempt to address this shortcoming, and to explicate the productivity that is inherent in a perspective that critically challenges and questions both 'security' and 'mobility,' as they are empirically being governed and regulated in an inseparably entwined fashion. The authors assembled here, while having their own disciplinary backgrounds in one of the fields, share an ambition to problematize the multiple dimensions that security and mobility prescribe. What unites them is an analytical angle that is informed by more than one literature, thus rendering their contributions valuable to scholars from security studies as well as to those who come from a mobilities perspective.

If this Special Issue could be conceived of as a first step of putting mobilities studies and critical security studies into a close and productive dialogue, what would further steps need to look like? We believe it would be beneficial for research at the intersection between security and mobility if scholars went beyond merely taking cues from, and referencing another body of literature. We could for example think of joint research projects that bring together scholars from either discipline – something that has become quite common at the intersections with other fields, for instance law or ethics. By extension, common workshops and conferences could further foster dialogue and a shift of perspective. Finally, in order to consolidate mutual productivity, we call for joint publications that go beyond conceptual reflection and engage questions of security and mobility in an empirically informed fashion. Only through such work can the common grounds that we have suggested here be filled with meaning.

There are plenty of opportunities to do so. As Cresswell (2014, 719) states, 'wherever there is mobility there always will be turbulence.' The same is without doubt true for security. Exploring these troubles in a joint endeavour, so we claim, is a worthwhile undertaking. With the identification

of already implicit, yet seldom explicated overlaps between the two fields, we hope to make a contribution to what we see as a promising dialogue. Sheller and Urry (2006, 210) have originally insisted that 'the new mobilities paradigm suggests a set of questions, theories, and methodologies rather than a totalising or reductive description of the contemporary world'. Similarly, our aim here has not been to suggest a sharply demarcated research agenda, but instead to propose a set of anchorages for others to contribute to, to expand upon and to modify. Our contribution should in this sense be understood as a humble and non-exhaustive attempt of encouraging intensified future dialogues.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the participants of the "Secure Worlds in Motion" workshop at EWIS 2016 in Tuebingen, where the idea for this special issue was born. Much gratitude also goes to the *Mobilities* editorial team, especially Pennie Drinkall and David Tyfield, for their generous support and guidance along the way. Last but not least, we would like to thank our colleagues who have helped us as anonymous peer reviewers for the articles in this issue.

References

Acuto, Michele, and Simon Curtis. 2014. "Assemblage Thinking in International Relations." In *Reassembling International Theory: Assemblage Thinking and International Relations*, edited by Michele Acuto and Simon Curtis, 1-16. Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Adey, Peter. 2006a. ""Divided we Move": The Dromologics of Airport Security and Surveillance." In *Surveillance and Security. Technological Politics and Power in Everyday Life*, edited by Torin Monahan, 195-208. New York/London: Routledge.

———. 2006b. "If Mobility is Everything Then it is Nothing: Towards a Relational Politics of (Im)mobilities." *Mobilities* no. 1 (1):75-94.

———. 2008. "Mobilities and Modulations: The Airport as a Difference Machine." In *Politics at the Airport*, edited by Mark B. Salter, 145-160. Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 2016. "Emergency Mobilities." *Mobilities* no. 11 (1):32-48.

Adey, Peter, and Ben Anderson. 2012. "Anticipating Emergencies: Technologies of Preparedness and the Matter of Security." *Security Dialogue* no. 43 (2):99-117.

Adey, Peter, Ben Anderson, and Stephen Graham. 2015. "Governing Emergencies: Beyond Exceptionality." *Theory, Culture & Society* no. 32 (2):3-17.

Amoore, Louise. 2006. "Biometric Borders: Governing Mobilities in the War on Terror." *Political Geography* no. 25 (3):336-351.

———. 2011. "Data Derivatives: On the Emergence of a Security Risk Calculus for Our Times." *Theory, Culture & Society* no. 28 (6):24-43.

Amoore, Louise, and Marieke de Goede. 2008. *Risk and the War on Terror*. London/New York: Routledge.

Amoore, Louise, Stephen Marmura, and Mark B. Salter. 2008. "Editorial: Smart Borders and Mobilities: Spaces, Zones, Enclosures." *Surveillance & Society* no. 5 (2):96-101.

Amoore, Louise, and Rita Raley. 2017. "Securing With Algorithms: Knowledge, Decision, Sovereignty." *Security Dialogue* no. 48 (1):3-10.

Aradau, Claudia. 2010. "Security That Matters: Critical Infrastructure and Objects of Protection." *Security Dialogue* no. 41 (5):491-514.

———. 2016. "Political Grammars of Mobility, Security and Subjectivity." *Mobilities* no. 11 (4):564-574.

Aradau, Claudia, Jef Huysmans, Andrew W. Neal, and Nadine Voelkner. 2015. *Critical Security Methods: New Frameworks for Analysis*. Milton Park/New York: Routledge.

Aradau, Claudia, Jef Huysmans, and Vicki Squire. 2010. "Acts of European Citizenship: A Political Sociology of Mobility." *Journal of Common Market Studies* no. 48 (4):945-965.

Aradau, Claudia, and Rens van Munster. 2007. "Governing Terrorism Through Risk: Taking Precautions, (Un)Knowing the Future." *European Journal of International Relations* no. 13 (1):89-115.

Baldwin, David A. 1997. "The Concept of Security." *Review of International Studies* no. 23 (1):5-26.

Balibar, Etienne. 1998. "The Borders of Europe." In *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, edited by Pheng Cheah and Bruce Robbins, 216-232. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Basaran, Tugba. 2008. "Security, Law, Borders: Spaces of Exclusion." *International Political Sociology* no. 2 (4):339-354.

Beauchamps, Marie, Marijn Hoijtink, Matthias Leese, Bruno Magalhães, Sharon Weinblum, and Stef Wittendorp. 2017. "Introduction: Security/Mobility and the Politics of Movement." In *Security/Mobility: Politics of Movement*, edited by Matthias Leese and Stef Wittendorp, 1-13. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Bigo, Didier. 2001. "The Möbius Ribbon of Internal and External Security(ies)." In *Identities, Borders, Orders: Rethinking International Relations Theory*, edited by Mathias Albert, David Jacobson and Yosef Lapid, 91-116. Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 2002. "Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease." *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* no. 27 (1):63-92.

———. 2014. "The (In)Securitization Practices of the Three Universes of EU Border Control: Military/Navy – Border Guards/Police – Database Analysts." *Security Dialogue* no. 45 (3):209-225.

Bigo, Didier, Laurent Bonelli, Dario Chi, and Christian Olsson. 2007. "Mapping the Field of the EU Internal Security Agencies." In *The Field of the EU Internal Security Agencies*, edited by Didier Bigo, 5-53. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Bonelli, Laurent, and Francesco Ragazzi. 2014. "Low-tech Security: Files, Notes, and Memos as Technologies of Anticipation." *Security Dialogue* no. 45 (5):476-493.

Booth, Ken. 1991. "Security and Emancipation." *Review of International Studies* no. 17 (4):313-326.

Bowker, Geoffrey C., and Susan Leigh Star. 1999. *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Browning, Christopher S., and Matt McDonald. 2013. "The Future of Critical Security Studies: Ethics and the Politics of Security." *European Journal of International Relations* no. 19 (2):235-255.

Burgess, J. Peter. 2011. *The Ethical Subject of Security: Geopolitical Reason and the Threat Against Europe*. Milton Park/New York: Routledge.

Büscher, Monika, Mimi Sheller, and David Tyfield. 2016. "Mobility Intersections: Social Research, Social Futures." *Mobilities* no. 11 (4):485-497.

Buzan, Barry, and Lene Hansen. 2009. *The Evolution of International Security Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde. 1998. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder: Rienner.

c.a.s.e. collective. 2006. "Critical Approaches to Security in Europe: A Networked Manifesto." *Security Dialogue* no. 37 (4):443-487.

Collier, Stephen J., and Andrew Lakoff. 2007. "The Vulnerability of Vital Systems: How 'Critical Infrastructure' Became a Security Problem." In *Securing 'the Homeland': Critical Infrastructure, Risk and (In)Security*, edited by Myriam Dunn Cavelty and Kristian Søby Kristensen, 17-39. London: Routledge.

———. 2008. "Distributed Preparedness: the Spatial Logic of Domestic Security in the United States." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* no. 26 (1):7-28.

———. 2015. "Vital Systems Security: Reflexive Biopolitics and the Government of Emergency." *Theory, Culture & Society* no. 32 (2):19-51.
Corry, Olaf. 2012. "Securitisation and 'Riskification': Second-order Security and the Politics of Climate Change." *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* no. 40 (2):235-258.
Côté-Boucher, Karine, Federica Infantino, and Mark B. Salter. 2014. "Border security as practice: An agenda for research." *Security Dialogue* no. 45 (3):195-208.
Coward, Martin. 2009. "Network-Centric Violence, Critical Infrastructure and the Urbanization of Security." *Security Dialogue* no. 40 (4-5):399-418.
Cresswell, Tim. 2010. "Towards a Politics of Mobility." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* no. 28 (1):17-31.
———. 2012. "Mobilities II: Still." *Progress in Human Geography* no. 36 (5):645-653.
———. 2014. "Mobilities III: Moving On." *Progress in Human Geography* no. 38 (5):712-721.
de Goede, Marieke. 2008. "Beyond Risk: Premediation and the Post-9/11 Security Imagination." *Security Dialogue* no. 39 (2-3):155-176.
Dillon, Michael, and Luis Lobo-Guerrero. 2008. "Biopolitics of Security in the 21st Century: An Introduction." *Review of International Studies* no. 34 (2):265-292.
Epstein, Charlotte. 2008. "Embodying Risk: Using Biometrics to Protect the Borders." In *Risk and the War on Terror*, edited by Louise Amoore and Marieke de Goede, 178-193. London/New York: Routledge.
Faulconbridge, James, and Allison Hui. 2016. "Traces of a Mobile Field: Ten Years of Mobilities Research." *Mobilities* no. 11 (1):1-14.
Fierke, Karin M. 2007. *Critical Approaches to International Security*. Oxford: Polity.
Forman, Peter J. 2018. "Circulation Beyond Nodes: (In)Securities Along the Pipeline." *Mobilities* no. 13 (2):**???**
Foucault, Michel. 2007. *Security, Territory, Population. Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-78*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
———. 2008. *The Birth of Biopolitics. Lectures at the Collège de France 1978-79*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Freudendal-Pedersen, Malene. 2014. "Ethics and Responsibilities." In *The Routledge Handbook of Mobilities*, edited by Peter Adey, David Bissell, Kevin Hannam, Peter Merriman and Mimi Sheller, 143-153. Milton Park/New York: Routledge.
Freudendal-Pedersen, Malene, Kevin Hannam, and Sven Kesselring. 2016. "Applied Mobilities, Transitions and Opportunities." *Applied Mobilities* no. 1 (1):1-9.
Geyer, Florian. 2008. Taking Stock: Databases and Systems of Information Exchange in the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice. Challenge Research Paper No. 9.
Glouftsios, Georgios. 2018. "Governing Circulation Through Technology Within EU Border Security Practice-Networks." *Mobilities* no. 13 (2):**???**
Graham, Stephen. 2010. "When Infrastructures Fail." In *Disrupted Cities: When Infrastructure Fails*, edited by Stephen Graham, 1-26. New York/Milton Park: Routledge.
———. 2014. "Disruptions." In *The Routledge Handbook of Mobilities*, edited by Peter Adey, David Bissell, Kevin Hannam, Peter Merriman and Mimi Sheller, 468-471. Milton Park/New York: Routledge.
Grusin, Richard. 2010. *Premediation: Affect and Mediality After 9/11*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Guittet, Emmanuel-Pierre. 2017. "Unpacking the New Mobilities Paradigm: Lessons for Critical Security Studies?" In *Security/Mobility: Politics of Movement*, edited by Matthias Leese and Stef Wittendorp, 209-216. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Hannam, Kevin, Mimi Sheller, and John Urry. 2006. "Editorial: Mobilities, Immobilities and Moorings." *Mobilities* no. 1 (1):1-22.
Hansen, Lene. 2008. "From Camps to Conversations in Critical Security Studies." *International Studies Review* no. 10 (3):652-654.
Hayles, N. Katherine. 2009. "Waking Up to the Surveillance Society." *Surveillance & Society* no. 6 (3):313-316.

Heins, Matthew. 2015. "Globalizing the Nation-State: The Shipping Container and American Infrastructure." *Mobilities* no. 10 (3):345-362.
Hönke, Jana, and Iván Cuesta-Fernández. 2018. "Mobilising Security and Logistics Through an African Port: A Controversies Approach to Infrastructure." *Mobilities* no. 13 (2):**???**
Jarvis, Lee, and Jack Holland. 2014. *Security: A Critical Introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Jeandesboz, Julien. 2016. "Smartening Border Security in the European Union: An Associational Inquiry." *Security Dialogue* no. 47 (4):292-309.
Jones, Richard. 2009. "Checkpoint Security. Gateways, Airports and the Architecture of Security." In *Technologies of InSecurity. The Surveillance of Everyday Life*, edited by Katja Franko Aas, Helene Oppen Gundhus and Heidi Mork Lomell, 81-102. London: Routledge-Cavendish.
Kester, Johannes. 2018. "Governing Electric Vehicles: Mobilizing Electricity to Secure Automobility." *Mobilities* no. 13 (2):**???**
Krause, Keith, and Michael C. Williams. 1997. *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*. London: Routledge.
Leese, Matthias. 2014. "The New Profiling: Algorithms, Black Boxes, and the Failure of Anti-discriminatory Safeguards in the European Union." *Security Dialogue* no. 45 (5):494-511.
———. 2016. "Exploring the Security/Facilitation Nexus: Foucault at the 'Smart' Border." *Global Society* no. 30 (3):412-429.
———. 2018. "Standardizing Security: The Business Case Politics of Borders." *Mobilities* no. 13 (2):**???**
Leese, Matthias, and Anja Koenigseder. 2015. "Humor at the Airport? Visualization, Exposure, and Laughter in the "War on Terror"." *International Political Sociology* no. 9 (1):37-52.
Leese, Matthias, and Stef Wittendorp. 2017. *Security/Mobility: Politics of Movement*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Lyon, David. 2014. "Surveillance, Snowden, and Big Data: Capacities, Consequences, Critique." *Big Data & Society* (July-December):1-13.
Marquis, Greg. 2003. "Private Security and Surveillance: From the "Dossier Society" to Database Networks." In *Surveillance as Social Sorting: Privacy, Risk, and Digital Discrimination*, edited by David Lyon, 226-248. London/New York: Routledge.
Martin, Craig. 2014. "The Packaging of Efficiency in the Development of the Intermodal Shipping Container." *Mobilities* no. 9 (3):432-451.
McCormack, Derek P. 2014. "Pipes and Cables." In *The Routledge Handbook of Mobilities*, edited by Peter Adey, David Bissell, Kevin Hannam, Peter Merriman and Mimi Sheller, 225-232. Milton Park/New York: Routledge.
Merriman, Peter, Rhys Jones, Colin Divall, Gijs Mom, Mimi Sheller, and John Urry. 2013. "Mobility: Geographies, Histories, Sociologies." *Transfers: Interdisciplinary Journal of Mobility Studies* no. 3 (1):147-165.
Muller, Benjamin J. 2008. "Securing the Political Imagination: Popular Culture, the Security Dispositif and the Biometric State." *Security Dialogue* no. 39 (2-3):199-220.
Mutimer, David, Kyle Grayson, and J. Marshall Beier. 2013. "Critical Studies on Security: An Introduction." *Critical Studies on Security* no. 1 (1):1-12.
Neal, Andrew W. 2009. "Securitization and Risk at the EU Border: The Origins of FRONTEX." *Journal of Common Market Studies* no. 47 (2):333-356.
Nye, Joseph S., and Sean M. Lynn-Jones. 1988. "International Security Studies: A Report of a Conference on the State of the Field." *International Security* no. 12 (4):5-27.
Nyman, Jonna. 2016. "What is the Value of Security? Contextualising the Negative/Positive Debate." *Review of International Studies* no. 42 (5):821-839.
Nyman, Jonna, and Anthony Burke. 2016. *Ethical Security Studies: A New Research Agenda*. Milton Park/New York: Routledge.
Pallitto, Robert M., and Josiah Heyman. 2008. "Theorizing Cross-Border Mobility: Surveillance, Security and Identity." *Surveillance & Society* no. 5 (3):315-333.

Parizot, Cédric, Anne Laure Amilhat Szary, Gabriel Popescu, Isabelle Arvers, Thomas Cantens, Jean Cristofol, Nicola Mai, Joana Moll, and Antoine Vion. 2014. "The antiAtlas of Borders: A Manifesto." *Journal of Borderlands Studies* no. 29 (4):503-512.

Peoples, Columba, and Nick Vaughan-Williams. 2010. *Critical Security Studies: An Introduction*. Milton Park/New York: Routledge.

Rajaram, Prem Kumar, and Carl Grundy-Warr. 2007. *Borderscapes: Hidden Geographies and Politics at Territory's Edge*. Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press.

Reeves, Audrey. 2018. "Mobilizing Bodies, Narrating Security: Tourist Geographies at Jerusalem's Holocaust History Museum." *Mobilities* no. 13 (2):**???**

Richardson, Tim. 2013. "Borders and Mobilities." *Mobilities* no. 8 (1):1-6.

Rumford, Chris. 2010. "Global Borders." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* no. 28 (6):951-956.

Ruppert, Evelyn. 2012. "The Governmental Topologies of Database Devices." *Theory, Culture & Society* no. 29 (4-5):116-136.

Salter, Mark B. 2007. "Governmentalities of an Airport: Heterotopia and Confession." *International Political Sociology* no. 1 (1):49-66.

———. 2008. *Politics at the Airport*. Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 2013. "To Make Move and Let Stop: Mobility and the Assemblage of Circulation." *Mobilities* no. 8 (1):7-19.

Salter, Mark B., and Can E. Mutlu. 2013. *Research Methods in Critical Security Studies: An Introduction*. Milton Park/New York: Routledge.

Scheel, Stephan. 2013. "Autonomy of Migration Despite Its Securitisation? Facing the Terms and Conditions of Biometric Rebordering." *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* no. 41 (3):575-600.

Schouten, Peer. 2014. "Security as Controversy: Reassembling Security at Amsterdam Airport." *Security Dialogue* no. 45 (1):23-42.

Shamir, Ronen. 2005. "Without Borders? Notes on Globalization as a Mobility Regime." *Sociological Theory* no. 23 (2):197-217.

Sheller, Mimi. 2016. "Uneven Mobility Futures: A Foucauldian Approach." *Mobilities* no. 11 (1):15-31.

Sheller, Mimi, and John Urry. 2006. "The New Mobilities Paradigm." *Environment and Planning A* no. 38 (2):207-226.

———. 2016. "Mobilizing the New Mobilities Paradigm." *Applied Mobilities* no. 1 (1):10-25.

Söderström, Ola, Shalini Randeria, Didier Ruedin, Gianni D'Amato, and Francesco Panese. 2013. "Of Mobilities and Moorings: Critical Perspectives." In *Critical Mobilities*, edited by Ola Söderström, Shalini Randeria, Didier Ruedin, Gianni D'Amato and Francesco Panese, I-XXV. Lausanne: EFPL Press.

Sparke, Matthew B. 2006. "A Neoliberal Nexus: Economy, Security and the Biopolitics of Citizenship on the Border." *Political Geography* no. 25 (2):151-180.

Star, Susan Leigh. 1999. "The Ethnography of Infrastructure." *American Behavioral Scientist* no. 43 (3):377-391.

Suliman, Samid. 2018. "Mobilising a Theory of Kinetic Politics." *Mobilities* no. 13 (2):**???**

United Nations Development Program. 1994. *Human Development Report 1994*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wæver, Ole. 1995. "Securitization and Desecuritization." In *On Security*, edited by Ronnie D. Lipschutz, 46-86. New York/Chichester: Columbia University Press.

Walt, Stephen M. 1991. "The Renaissance of Security Studies." *International Studies Quarterly* no. 35 (2):211-239.

Walters, William. 2006. "Border/Control." *European Journal of Social Theory* no. 9 (2):187-203.

Williams, Michael C., and Keith Krause. 1997. "Preface: Toward Critical Security Studies." In *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*, edited by Keith Krause and Michael C. Williams, vii-xxii. London: Routledge.

Wittendorp, Stef. 2016. "Conducting Government: Governmentality, Monitoring and EU Counter-Terrorism." *Global Society* no. 30 (3):465-483.

———. 2017. "Suspicion, Knowledge, Control: Examining the Discourse on Removing Border Controls in the EC/EU." In *Security/Mobility*, edited by Matthias Leese and Stef Wittendorp, 132-149. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Wolfers, Arnold. 1952. ""National Security" as an Ambiguous Symbol." *Political Science Quarterly* no. 67 (4):481-502.

Wyn Jones, Richard. 2001. *Critical Theory & World Politics*. Boulder/London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.