



Delft University of Technology

Socially responsible innovation in security

Critical reflections

Burgess, J. Peter; Reniers, Genserik; Ponnet, Koen; Hardyns, Wim; Smit, Wim

DOI

[10.4324/9781351246903](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351246903)

Publication date

2018

Document Version

Final published version

Citation (APA)

Burgess, J. P., Reniers, G., Ponnet, K., Hardyns, W., & Smit, W. (Eds.) (2018). *Socially responsible innovation in security: Critical reflections*. Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351246903>

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Routledge New Security Studies

SOCIALLY RESPONSIBLE INNOVATION IN SECURITY

CRITICAL REFLECTIONS

Edited by
J. Peter Burgess, Genserik Reniers, Koen Ponnet,
Wim Hardyns and Wim Smit



Socially Responsible Innovation in Security

This book examines the possibility of socially responsible innovation in security, using an interdisciplinary approach.

Responsible innovation in security refers to a comprehensive approach that aims to integrate knowledge related to stakeholders operating at both the demand and the supply side of security – technologists, citizens, policymakers and ethicists. Security innovations can only be successful in the long term if all the social, ethical and ecological impacts, and threats and opportunities, both short term and long term, are assessed and prioritized alongside technical and commercial impacts.

The first part of this volume focuses on security technology innovation and its perception and acceptance by the public, while the second part delves deeper into the processes of decision-making and democratic control, raising questions about the ethical implications of security ruling.

This book will be of much interest to students of critical security studies, sociology, technology studies and IR in general.

J. Peter Burgess is Professor and Chair of Geopolitics of Risk at the École Normale Supérieure, France, and Adjunct Professor at the Centre for Advanced Security Theory (CAST) at the University of Copenhagen, Denmark.

Genserik Reniers is a Full Professor at the Engineering Management Department of the University of Antwerp in Belgium, and at the Safety and Security Science Section of the Delft University of Technology in the Netherlands.

Koen Ponnet is an Assistant Professor at IMEC-MICT, Ghent University, Belgium.

Wim Hardyns is an Assistant Professor at the Institute of International Research on Criminal Policy (IRCP) in the Department of Criminology, Criminal Law and Social Law, Ghent University, Belgium.

Wim Smit is a former army chaplain at the Belgian army, and the Director-General of Wereld Missie Hulp, a Flemish development organization.

Series: Routledge New Security Studies

Series Editor: J. Peter Burgess

École Normale Supérieure (ENS), Paris

The aim of this book series is to gather state-of-the-art theoretical reflection and empirical research into a core set of volumes that respond vigorously and dynamically to new challenges to security studies scholarship. This is a continuation of the PRIO New Security Studies series.

Security Expertise

Practice, power, responsibility

Edited by Trine Villumsen Berling and Christian Bueger

Transformations of Security Studies

Dialogues, diversity and discipline

Edited by Gabi Schlag, Julian Junk and Christopher Daase

The Securitisation of Climate Change

Actors, processes and consequences

Thomas Diez, Franziskus von Lucke and Zehra Wellmann

Surveillance, Privacy and Security

Citizens' perspectives

Edited by Michael Friedewald, J. Peter Burgess, Johann Čas, Rocco Bellanova and Walter Peissl

Socially Responsible Innovation in Security

Critical Reflections

Edited by J. Peter Burgess, Genserik Reniers, Koen Ponnet, Wim Hardyns and Wim Smit

Visual Security Studies

Sights and Spectacles of Insecurity and War

Edited by Juha A. Vuori and Rune Saugmann Andersen

For more information about this series, please visit: www.routledge.com/Routledge-New-Security-Studies/book-series/RNSS

Socially Responsible Innovation in Security

Critical Reflections

**Edited by J. Peter Burgess,
Genserik Reniers, Koen Ponnet,
Wim Hardyns and Wim Smit**

First published 2018
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2018 selection and editorial matter, J. Peter Burgess, Genserik Reniers, Koen Ponnet, Wim Hardyns and Wim Smit; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of the editors to be identified as the authors of the editorial matter, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN: 978-0-8153-7139-7 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-351-24690-3 (ebk)

Typeset in Times New Roman
by Wearset Ltd, Boldon, Tyne and Wear

Contents

<i>List of figures</i>	vii
<i>List of tables</i>	viii
<i>Notes on contributors</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xii
Introduction: responsible innovation in security – setting the scene	1
J. PETER BURGESS, GENSERIK RENIERS, KOEN PONNET, WIM HARDYNS AND WIM SMIT	
1 Danger, innovation, responsibility: imagining future security	12
J. PETER BURGESS	
PART I	
Security technology, public perception and acceptance	23
2 Drones – dull, dirty or dangerous? The social construction of privacy and security technologies	25
MARC VAN LIESHOUT AND MICHAEL FRIEDEWALD	
3 The influence of technological innovations on theft prevention: perspectives of citizens and experts	44
KIM VAN HOORDE, EVELIEN DE PAUW, HANS VERMEERSCH AND WIM HARDYNS	
4 When it rains in Paris, it drizzles in Brussels?	63
HANS VERMEERSCH, ELLEN VANDENBOGAERDE AND EVELIEN DE PAUW	

PART II

Public and private decision-making 83

- 5** **Securitization by regulation? The Flemish mayor as democratic anchor of local security policies** 85

TOM BAUWENS

- 6** **Raising the flag: the state effects of public and private security providers at East Jerusalem's national parks** 97

LIOR VOLINZ

PART III

Democratic control and ethical implications 115

- 7** **Evaluation and effectiveness of counter-terrorism** 117

FIONA DE LONDRAS

- 8** **The bleak rituals of progress; or, if somebody offers you a socially responsible innovation in security, just say no** 129

MARK NEOCLEOUS

Index 141

Figures

2.1	Number of projects from FP5, FP6 and FP7 with ‘privacy’ and/or ‘security’ mentioned in their objectives	30
2.2	Relative keyword usage over time	31
2.3	Relative keyword usage over time	31
6.1	Private armed escort at the entrance to the City of David National Park	102
6.2	Guardhouse above a Jewish-Israeli settlement compound in Silwan	106
6.3	The Old City’s Dung Gate	109

Tables

2.1	Factors driving and hindering technology development and use	32
4.1	Sample profile	71
4.2	Changes in attitudes between 2014 and 2016	71
4.3	Average differences between 2014 and 2016, <i>P</i> values for differences (one-way ANOVA), effect of wave, controlling for demographic differences and respective <i>P</i> values	72
4.4	Average differences between respondents that had a terror or control frame in 2016 and effect of this frame, controlling for demographic differences	73
4.5	Average differences according to time of completion, and effect of arrest of Salah Abdeslam, controlling for demographic differences	74
5.1	Overview of the interpretative repertoires	90

Contributors

Tom Bauwens is a postdoctoral researcher at the research group Crime & Society (CRiS) in the Department of Criminology, Vrije Universiteit Brussel. His research and teaching interests centre around the policy and politics of prevention, crime control and local security practices.

J. Peter Burgess is a philosopher and political scientist. He is Professor and Chair of Geopolitics of Risk at the École Normale Supérieure, Paris, and Adjunct Professor at the Centre for Advanced Security Theory (CAST) at the University of Copenhagen. He is Series Editor of the Routledge New Security Studies collection. His research and writing concern the meeting place between culture and politics, especially in Europe, focusing in particular on the theory and ethics of security and insecurity.

Fiona de Londras is the inaugural Chair of Global Legal Studies at the University of Birmingham, a post she took up in 2015 following three years as Professor of Law at Durham University. She writes widely on counter-terrorism, constitutionalism and human rights, and has (co)authored or (co)edited 10 books and yearbooks and approximately 60 articles and book chapters on these themes.

Evelien De Pauw works as an assistant and PhD candidate since 2016 at Ghent University, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Department of Public Administration, Research Group of Governing and Policing Security (GaPS). She is also a guest lecturer at VIVES University College. Her main research topics are technology and innovation processes, security networks and the governance of security.

Michael Friedewald, EngD is a senior research fellow at the Fraunhofer Institute for Systems and Innovation Research ISI in Karlsruhe Germany and leads the ICT research group. His recent work focuses on the privacy and data protection challenges of future and emerging information and communication technologies. He is also working in the field of foresight and technology assessment. He has coordinated several FP7 projects including PRESCIENT, SAPIENT and PRISMS. He is co-editor of *Privacy and Security in the Digital Age* (Routledge, 2014) and *Surveillance, Privacy and Security: Citizens' Perspectives* (Routledge, 2017).

Wim Hardyns is an Assistant Professor at the Institute of International Research on Criminal Policy (IRCP) in the Department of Criminology, Criminal Law and Social Law, Ghent University, Belgium. His current interests are crime mapping and statistics, environmental criminology, crime prevention, new security technologies, big data, radicalization and terrorism.

Mark Neocleous is Professor of the Critique of Political Economy at Brunel University, UK. He is the author of a number of books, most recently *War Power*, *Police Power* (2014) and *The Universal Adversary: Security, Capital, and 'The Enemies of All Mankind'* (2016). He is currently working on a book on *The Politics of Immunity* and a co-authored work on the manhunt.

Koen Ponnet is Assistant Professor and Researcher at IMEC-MICT of the Faculty of Political and Social Sciences of Ghent University. His main research interests are the (mental) health, risk and problem behaviour of adolescents and adults, both offline and online.

Genserik Reniers obtained a Master of Science degree in Chemical Engineering at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel and received his PhD in Applied Economic Sciences from the University of Antwerp. He founded the Antwerp Research Group on Safety and Security (ARGoSS) in 2006 and was appointed part-time full professor at the University of Antwerp, responsible for safety and risk teaching and research. In October 2013, he was appointed in a part-time capacity as a full professor at the Safety Science Group of Delft University of Technology in The Netherlands.

Wim Smit, PhD in Moral Theology, obtained his doctorate at KU Leuven with a dissertation on the topic of 'violations of civil and human rights in the fight against terrorism'. He wrote several (opinion) articles and books on the theme and has a blog (<https://veilighedenrechten.wordpress.com>). In 2005 he edited an English book on *Just War and Terrorism*, and in 2007 he published his first book in Dutch: *Rechtvaardige oorlog en terrorisme: Recht en onrecht in tijden van terreur*. In February 2015 another book was published: *Onveilige burger bange politiek? Van 9/11 tot Snowden en verder*. For more than 13 years he was a chaplain in the Belgian army, but since the beginning of 2015 he has been Director-General of Wereld Missie Hulp.

Marc van Lieshout, MSc, is Senior Scientist at the Nederlandse Organisatie voor Toegepast Natuurwetenschappelijk Onderzoek (TNO). He works within the TNO Department of Strategy & Policy on privacy and identity management issues, looking especially at strategic and policy perspectives. He is Business Director of the Privacy and Identity Lab, a knowledge centre of TNO, with Dutch universities Tilburg and Nijmegen. He acted as Programme Manager of TNO's programme on the societal impact of ICT from 2005–2012, and is now managing the knowledge part on privacy and e-identity. He was a visiting scientist at JRC-IPTS from July 2008–July 2009. He has been engaged in several (inter)national projects on the assessment and

evaluation of national and international activities related to privacy and data protection, for the European Commission, the European Parliament and national departments. He has been actively engaged with the FP7-project PRISMS. His research interests are on innovation policy and privacy, including regulatory, business and societal processes.

Ellen Vandenbogaerde joined the Research Centre for Social Innovation at Vives University College, after graduating from the University of Sussex with a PhD in Development Studies. Before that she obtained an MA in Criminology from Ghent University and worked as a social and political researcher for various companies in England. Her interests centre around security studies, urban sociology, youth violence, inequality, governance and research methods.

Kim Van Hoorde conducted the project ‘The Influence of Technological Innovations on Theft Prevention – A Citizen Perspective’, and started as a researcher at the Vives University College at the beginning of October 2014 after her Master Studies in Criminology and Advanced Master’s in Conflict and Development. This one-year project was recommended by the Directorate Local Integral Security of the Federal Government Service Internal Affairs and accomplished in cooperation with the University of Antwerp. Promoters of the project are Evelien De Pauw (Vives), Hans Vermeersch (Vives) and Wim Hardyns (University of Antwerp).

Hans Vermeersch works as a senior researcher at the Vives University College, Centre of Expertise in Social Innovation, Research Group Society & Security, Doorniksesteenweg 145, 8500 Kortrijk, Belgium, hans.vermeersch@vives.be.

Lior Volinz is a PhD candidate at the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research (AISSR) at the University of Amsterdam. His research focuses on the privatization and pluralization of security and military functions in Jerusalem and their relation to the (re)production of differentiated citizenship in a divided city. Lior can be contacted at l.volinz@uva.nl.

Acknowledgements

This collection of essays emerged out of a two-day workshop held at the University of Antwerp in October 2015. This interdisciplinary workshop aimed at moving beyond the techno-centric and security focus to investigate the social, ethical and organizational impacts of the security business, to understand the implications for individuals and the nature of society and to gain insight into how security norms are embedded in cultural norms. The two-day workshop brought together over 20 researchers from Europe to discuss their research projects.

We are grateful to all who presented papers in the original workshop and to everyone who attended. We owe gratitude to the whole team at the University Centre Saint-Ignatius Antwerp for organizing the workshop and for making this volume possible. Special thanks are due to our authors for taking part in the project and making this volume possible.

Antwerp, September 2017

Introduction

Responsible innovation in security – setting the scene

*J. Peter Burgess, Genserik Reniers, Koen Ponnet,
Wim Hardyns and Wim Smit*

Few question today the notion that innovation is a core thrust of modernity. Innovation – the sustained introduction of the new – is more than a principle, more than a norm, more than a value. It is a primary assumption of our time, a milestone indicating the inevitable rise in the quality of life in society – sometimes paradoxically measured in quantitative terms, the guarantee that life should and will continuously improve, that the present is better than the past and that the future will be better than the present. The expectation is so imposing that one might even say that the new is old, that it has always been so and thus that that innovation is paradoxically obsolete. Innovation is such a powerfully present supposition that it has become indiscernible and thereby de-politicized and de-socialized.

Responsible innovation in security refers to the comprehensive approach of guiding security innovation in a manner such that all stakeholders, involved in the process of such innovation in some way, can obtain knowledge at an early stage on the consequences of the outcomes of their decisions and actions and on the range of options open to them, letting them effectively evaluate both outcomes and options in terms of societal needs and moral and ethical values.

As an example, in security innovation, an important ethical value in society that promptly comes to mind is the concern of many citizens about privacy. It has traditionally not been straightforward for engineers and technicians to include privacy as an essential factor in the design phase of novel security technologies. Technicians are mainly concerned with technological innovation and managers with economic success. Nonetheless, societal stakeholders concerned with responsible innovation obviously require security innovators to take moral issues such as privacy into consideration in the design phase, as well as other ethical factors such as fairness, equity, safety, ergonomics, environmental impacts and the like (Grinbaum and Groves, 2013).

The purpose of this book is to integrate knowledge about responsible innovation related to stakeholders operating on the demand side of security: technologists, citizens, policy makers and ethicists. It develops the hypothesis that the failure of innovative solutions and approaches to meet with societal and citizens' needs can only be avoided by true responsible innovation. A number of well-known innovative technologies that have been contested on ethical grounds are,

for instance, nanotechnology, genetically modified organisms, nuclear technology and military innovations. If such innovations are not responsible, and do not take ethical aspects into account in the earliest stages, investment can be weakened or lost as a consequence of lack of a ‘license to exploit the innovation’ by society, and hence by policy makers. Moreover, innovations with respect to security (related to e.g. theft, terrorism, military operations, etc.) will likely always be in the interest of citizens and thus be under the attention of public stakeholders, if only because of their intrinsically public nature. Security innovations can only be successful in the long term if their social, ethical and ecological impacts, and threats and opportunities, both short term and long term, are assessed and prioritized alongside technical and commercial impacts, and if the security innovators are transparent about the approach and decisions.

The discussion on responsible innovation engages a broad and growing field of scholarship. Research carried out in this field sets itself apart by its unique proximity to private industry and to the new partnerships between industry and public organizations, known under the blanket concept of the ‘public–private partnerships’. Considerable public resources are at present being mobilized and redirected towards initiatives carried out under this banner. While a range of benefits for innovation are often rehearsed by supporters of public private partnerships – including flexible financing arrangements, tailored legal arrangements, hybrid labour practices and tailored tax incentives – the most significant impact of combining resources into such partnerships is the redistribution of risk.

It is a commonplace of innovation science that financial risk does not map directly onto innovation risk. Obviously, large-scale innovation requires large-scale financial support; however, the risks taken in innovation tend to belong to a different order of danger and a different kind of uncertainty. De Saille and Medvecky (2016), for example, translate the notion of responsibility into purely economic terms, judging its success and failure in terms of the growth or stagnation it provokes. Large-scale, sustainable innovation requires more than finance alone; it also carries a distinct moral thrust. By interpreting the notion ‘responsibility’ as a moral term with strong normative valence, as do, for example, Pelle and Reber (2015), innovation becomes a far more subjectively oriented matter, a philosophical enterprise with deep cultural roots and directions. Here even ‘corporate socially responsibility’ is less inclined towards the societal means and ends of innovation than with the social ethics that it powers.

Responsible innovation is an activity deployed through the wide range of consultative practices it is obliged to attend to. In practice it is a novel form of cultivating the points of contact between society and the technologically oriented industries that interface with it; namely, the interplay between the social structures, political institutions, shared commercial activities and common fields of social interaction like schools, religious institutions and local cultural traditions. Commercial innovation must be new, reaching beyond the status quo, while at the same time maintaining a link to its imbedding. Even in the cases where it does not explicitly seek to advance or put into play the cultural values and social norms of the society in which it is operating, it must engage with them. For this

reason concern for the efficiency of innovation processes warrants a direct approach. Indeed, some argue that the communities involved directly in innovation processes must solicit the perspectives and opinions of society and bring together the many audiences, and their knowledge in the activity of scientific and technological decision-making (Van Oudheusden, 2014, pp. 70–73).

Responsible innovation is in this sense a bridging and integration mechanism. Its success lies not only in its ability to generate technologically viable solutions but to manage the tensions between involved stakeholders. Similarly, outcomes are not measured merely by their ability to bring novel technological solutions that plug into a societal configuration or a cultural or political setting; rather, they have to function and provide results – in the case of security this implies integrating with the particular insecurities of society. Innovation must innovate by engaging with the conservative forces in society around long-standing and sometimes ensconced expectations. Technological success does not automatically imply innovation (Bozeman, 2007; Bozeman and Sarewitz, 2011).

The new discourse of responsible innovation is marked deeply by its imposing intransitivity: Grammatically, ‘innovation’ has no object. It is a verbal action without an object of action. It is an action unto itself, a relation of subjectivity, of the subject to the self. Innovation does not externalize; it expands the internal, deploying the self, the logic, the discourse, the materials of the self, into the world. It is never purely fresh, purely new; it is always re-combinatory, a jumbling or shuffling of the civilizational code of what is already or has already been but perished. In a strict sense one can reasonably ask whether innovation in any refined form is thinkable when its raw materials are necessarily the materials of the past. Innovation is a system only partially opened to the new, to what is new, to what can change. Innovation is a system of endogenous possibilities and endogenous dangers. This is true not only for the actual material foundations on which innovation must stand – the existing technologies, the actual natural and human resources, and most prominent, the values that determine and predetermine the moral and political frames of reference and the horizon of possibilities for thinking new values. If, as many argue today, a primary aim of all innovation is the creation of value, then this value system must be seen in continuity with those that come before it and those from which it cannot be separated.

The matter of value is of course the core of innovation. Time passes; the past flows ceaselessly towards the future. There is change. And yet when can one say that this change has taken the form of innovation? If there is an experience of time, if time has passed, then it is only because there is a difference between the present and the past, between now and before. To ascertain this there must be a qualitative measure of difference, of the experience of change. This change is calibrated as a change of value. Successful innovation corresponds to the creation of value, itself measured in a number of ways. The correlation of success metrics is irregular and on occasion disruptive, pitting value systems against each other, and highlighting clashing assumptions of what science itself is, what its role is in society, where and how it is accountable and ‘responsible’. Market success, the easiest and inevitably first-order metric of innovation, guarantees

neither technological results nor fruitful public benefit from the research and development involved in innovating; that is, the furtherance or preservation of widely accepted public values such as safety, privacy and choice. As Valdivia and Guston suggest, innovation is fraught with paradoxes and trade-offs: innovation has simultaneously advanced and undermined public values dear to democratic societies (2015, p. 6).

Progress is not continuous, but rather fragmented, moving in fits and spells, buffeted by the flows of finance, political economy, technology, fashion and culture. These forces amplify and dampen the variations in interpretation and in the application of public values in decision-making on public policy. This is a source of the ‘third tension shaping the governance of innovation’, the one which opposes experts to citizens, and corresponds to differences in ways that public values are internalized and then concretized in the different spheres (2015, p. 7).

Responsible innovation can and must also be regarded from another perspective, from another angle. Not only can the political and ethical argument be made that innovation, which is in and of itself neither responsible nor irresponsible, should indeed be responsible. But responsibility itself can quite naturally be regarded as an object of innovation. ‘Responsibility’ can also be regarded not as an autonomous regulatory checklist but as the object of a critical gaze, subject to review and revision, to innovation and improvement. A critical angle on responsible innovation can also question the character of the responsibility in responsible innovation. As Stilgoe, Owen and Macnaghten have clarified, responsibility towards science implies a responsibility towards society as well. To the degree that responsible innovation focuses on developing responsible technological approaches to challenges and possibilities, they must also foresee evolving risks in the social sphere. Innovative societal governance is, however, of a fundamentally different order than the governance of technologies. The ‘dilemma of control’ generated by the very notion of societal innovation redoubles complexity and with it, responsibility (2013). Not least, quickly developing technologies create ‘institutional voids’ by simple virtue of the fact that they engage a new form of responsibility. Governance implies responsibility, even when it is invoked implicitly or tacitly. Thus, according to Stilgoe, Owen and Macnaghten, innovation implies an additional innovation of anticipating the societal impact of yet unseen and still unforeseeable products of innovation (2013, pp. 1574–1577).

Innovation is thus widely conceived as a situation within a set of extant public values. This implies a recognition of these values and acceptance that some component of public values constitutes a starting point with the innovative ethos. Public values are never entirely innovated: they are a signpost, an index for a path that has a continuity starting well before the moment of innovation and ostensibly ending well after it. It is thus, in terms of Taebi *et al.*, a recognition of a set of values, but not entirely an endorsement of it. Engaging with public values is regarded as a way of preserving them in order to make partial use of them, or even negate them while at the same time preserving them (Taebi *et al.*, 2014, pp. 118–120).

From this mid-level interaction with public values, we may also move to the macro-view and a layer of questions about responsibility to society at large. As

Stahl has pointed out, responsible innovation is not only a question of the implication and impact of those directly present in an immediate or concrete innovation; it can also be raised as a question of the orientation of society as such – its ‘grand challenges’ such as employment, well-being, growth, societal coherence, development and democracy (Stahl, 2013, p. 2). In this sense the responsibility of responsible innovation can refer to the core well-being of members of society, to the reinforcing or re-casting of the core principles and practices of society and of democracy itself. It can be applied as a tactical approach to counteracting the negative effects of the ‘fragmentation of moral authority’ due to other evolving tendencies that are perceived as threats to society (Appleyard and Stahl, 1995; Davies, Glerup and Horst, 2014). It can also provide a regulatory measure for the governance of private sector actors, to their vulnerabilities to the changing relationship between the market and society (Sholten and van der Duin, 2015). This perspective on responsible innovation links it with the logic of economic growth and the complex link between technological development and the economics of inflation and stagnation (De Saille and Medvecky, 2016, pp. 7–10).

Certain segments of the discourse of responsible innovation reformulate the challenges as linked to personal values of individuals in society. Pelle and Reber, for example, take pains to show the relationship between intersubjective value positions and the technological changes that structure society as a whole. They regard responsible innovation as a question of personal responsibility and moral agency. Corporate-level responsibility is in this sense linked to individual responsibility. The concept of responsibility, according to this perspective, can be clarified through the methods of moral philosophy, ‘which defines responsibility as role, task, capacity, authority, virtue, responsiveness, obligation, accountability, blameworthiness, liability’, since the moral sphere of responsibility ‘begins before and goes beyond legal frontiers, ethical concerns frequently arise before new laws have been discussed or enacted’ (2015, p. 113).

These processes become socially – but also politically, culturally, morally – more complex when it is security that lies at the heart of the innovation. As several contributors point out, the call for security – securitization – is among the most powerful forces for innovation that we know. It has left a significant mark on the way that innovation is considered, justified and put into practice. Surveillance of society is of course not simply one security measure among many, but rather among the most powerful and consequential of them all. Surveillance innovation is consequentially more contentious than most, often even regarded as being at odds with democratic principles (De Jong, Kupper and Broerse, 2016, p. 27).

As becomes clear through the contributions to this volume, for example in chapters by Burgess and van Lieshout and Friedewald, the European Commission regards responsible innovation as key support for an overall agenda of free trade, growth and industrial innovation that aligns with the principles of the European liberal project, which is couched in principles of fairness and rights. Through the channel of the European liberal project, the concept of responsible innovation has found its way into European Commission research and development and the Framework research programmes.

The Science Shop model of participatory research and innovation has been successful in bringing students, researchers and civil society together towards tackling real issues at the local and regional levels. Aside from positively impacting on the co-creation of solutions to real world problems, the process of engaging with society has strengthened both the research process and its outcomes, thereby contributing to research excellence and acceptability of innovation outcomes.

(European Commission, 2016, p. 11)

From a theoretical point of view it is simple to map the liberal progress-oriented, technological-valorized, econometrically governed virtues of responsible innovation onto the principles of European Construction, from the Schuman Declaration to the Maastricht Treaty. The European Union is the prototype of responsible innovation, itself a model for all other responsible innovations. It addresses gender imbalances, inequalities, principles for freedom, equality and dignity. It both symbolizes and nurtures science. It is for these reasons that the European Commission was a front runner in both funding and organizing research under the banner of ‘responsible innovation’. According to the 2013 European Commission plan, the notion of responsible innovation is not only a virtue associated with innovation in general, emphasizing ‘responsible’ approaches to it, but it is also implicit in the logic of invention, novelty and transformation. It links to the general challenge of integrating ethics into research to address social needs and meet the ‘grand challenges’ of our time. It assumes that innovation will be contested, thus calling on the ability to make value-based decisions beyond mere questions of feasibility (European Commission, 2013). Among the challenges which the Commission associates with responsible innovation is that associated with the speed of technological change. Because of bureaucratic and procedural slowness, conventional regulation cannot adapt quickly enough to remain relevant. The time-lag effect is exacerbated by the more intense difficulties in predicting technological advances, giving rise to what von Schomberg has identified as the ‘Collingridge dilemma’; that is, ethical issues that would ordinarily be addressed early on in the design process are not foreseen and thus not addressed in time to make a meaningful difference (2011, p. 8). Responsiveness is thus regarded as the key element, and innovation itself, which von Schomberg defines as ‘a transparent, interactive process by which societal actors and innovators become mutually responsive to each other with a view on the (ethical) acceptability, sustainability and societal desirability of the innovation process and its marketable products’ (2011, p. 11; also Gardner and Williams, 2015). In this sense, according to Owen, Macnaghten and Stilgoe (2012, pp. 3–4) or Blok and Lemmens (2015, pp. 23–24), responsible innovation means first and foremost creating the space of possibility for this kind of dialogue and exchange. The more rarefied concerns of social ethics, the good life and the rights of the individual follow from this basic principle. Moreover, the forum thus created will make possible the necessary predictive adaptability to societal ethical concerns.

Today, public debate is centred on emerging technologies such as mentioned above (nanotechnology etc.); however, discussion about innovative security solutions is rapidly gaining interest due to the recent iconic terrorist attacks; that is, the 9/11 terrorist attacks in New York in 2001, the Madrid and London attacks of 2004 and 2005 respectively, and the most recent attacks in Paris (2015) and in Brussels (2016). Security technologies of interest are, for instance, innovative cameras, all kinds of identification technology or body scanners, drone technology, smart sensors for security purposes, etc. It is essential that a shared understanding of the appropriate behaviour of the authorities, governments, businesses, NGOs and researchers is developed and achieved for such technologies. A joint understanding and perspective on responsible security innovations is indeed basic for gaining and maintaining the trust and confidence of the public and stakeholders.

Responsibility should not be seen as a barrier to security innovation, but, on the contrary, as an incentive for its success. Sustainable development and use of security innovations require an involvement of society in the creation of its vision, the articulation of its values and use, and the making of the innovation itself. Nonetheless, one should realize that sometimes difficult and unpopular decisions have to be taken. Involving stakeholders and the public at large at an early stage, thus upstream, does not guarantee that there will not be differences of opinion between them. However, responsible innovation ensures clear and effective communication about the decisions taken and about the influences having led to the chosen options. As such, the decision-making process concerning security innovations is legitimate, inclusive and transparent, which will undoubtedly build confidence in the process, even if stakeholders don't always agree with the consequences.

These themes, their discourses and discordances, are developed in the chapters of this book, structured according to three main lines of current reflection on security and innovation: (1) security understood as technological innovation, and the tension between the public sphere and its own perception and acceptance of security technologies; (2) the public and private decision-making processes that support and legitimate security innovation; and (3) the democratic and ethical suppositions and implications of the innovation as an ideal of governance.

The volume is opened by J. Peter Burgess, who situates the question of responsible innovation in its broader cultural context. That context is one in which security and technological innovation, liberalism and an intensified values discourse converge to legitimize new forms of policing and social control. These new societal forms, Burgess notes, in turn solicit new technologically based protections through new and innovative technical security solutions. The chapter reveals 'responsible innovation' as both a concept and a political strategy, with an ambivalent, even contradictory relationship with the process of modernization. The chapter inquires into what responsible innovation has gained or lost in relation to the modern project of innovation, and suggests that while granting itself a new lease of life through the notion of responsibility, innovation – particularly in its European reincarnation – pays the price of discarding the moral, cultural or even spiritual dimensions that make innovation responsible. It concludes by asking whether the very concept of innovation is itself under innovation relative to its predecessors.

The technological dimensions of this dilemma are further concretized in Part I, 'Security technology, public perception and acceptance', which is opened by Marc van Lieshout and Michael Friedewald. While privacy and security are often considered to be traded off against each other, these authors propose a perspective on privacy and security that regards them as two sides of the same coin. They present material from a four-year EU research project that studied the way that privacy and security are designed into systems meant to secure airports, to assist the police in detecting hooligans in a football stadium or aggressive protesters during a demonstration, or to check for signs of radicalism on social media. Based on an institutional analysis over a period of ten years of security and privacy research in the European Research Area, they showed the dominance of security over privacy in institutional settings, roadmaps and research activities concerning security and privacy. The analysis is complemented by a socio-technical analysis of the ways privacy and security considerations are addressed by designers during the product development process. The authors examine the ongoing discourse of privacy and security in the design process and show how privacy and security are inscribed in early stages of the design process as well as into the discourse of space used by designers and in the technical systems that result from the design process.

The next chapter, 'The influence of technological innovations on theft prevention: perspectives of citizens and experts', looks at how technological innovations designed to improve theft prevention are received by citizens and experts. Kim Van Hoorde, Evelien De Pauw, Hans Vermeersch and Wim Hardyns argue that while the internet and innovative technologies are opening up tremendous possibilities for governments and their citizens, they also facilitate the carrying out of crimes. In their chapter they present results from a study including measures involving home automation, biometrics and track-and-trace. They survey the impact of such systems on citizen expectations and acceptance and on the overall sustainability of security technologies. Their results indicate that while individuals have their own perceptions and visions, preventative security measures adapt to their pre-existing attitudes rather than to objective and correct information. This permits the authors to conclude that technological features should not be regarded as a black box tool to achieve security. Instead, they are the requirement of securing technological systems in themselves. As a consequence, citizens are called to understand the basic concepts, possibilities and limitations when applying the internet and new technologies, as for now they are easy targets by means of their open and unprotected virtual – and hence physical – doors.

The following chapter, 'When it rains in Paris, it drizzles in Brussels?' by Hans Vermeersch, Ellen Vandenbogaerde and Evelien De Pauw, evaluates the impact of terror attacks on perceptions concerning the use of surveillance-orientated security technologies (SOSTs) by the Belgian government. The chapter assesses the common assumption that citizens are more inclined to support government measures that risk limiting their privacy when they are invoked in the wake of terror attacks. The study focusses on public perceptions

among Belgian students following the events of 2015 in Paris and beyond, based on a survey comparing the attitudes towards the use of SOSTs in 2014 and in 2016, after a year in which terror attacks dominated the headlines. The analysis indicates that respondents are indeed more inclined to accept potentially privacy-intruding government measures, and that risk perception (though not fear of crime and trust in public authorities) increased, with exceptions, between 2014 and 2016. Nonetheless, the analysis suggests that this result does not necessarily translate into increased acceptance of SOSTs. A more detailed view suggests that public opinion on the use of SOSTs defies a simple privacy–security trade-off.

Part II of this volume, ‘Public and private decision-making’, opens with Tom Bauwens’ study of local security policy, ‘Securitization by regulation? The Flemish mayor as democratic anchor of local security policies’. The chapter examines in detail the modern social imaginary, and in particular the view that prevails that security is the *raison d’être* of liberal democratic governments, which we tend to hold responsible for ensuring public order and security in the name of the common good. As a consequence it becomes clear that security is arguably the most potent and dangerous of all policy goals. Public order and security are considered legitimate goals to restrict fundamental rights, albeit temporarily. Yet, according to the European Convention of Human Rights, these restrictions are only legitimate when they are in accordance with the law and necessary in a democratic society. Crucially, however, the use of the ‘security label’ does not necessarily reflect whether a problem is a security problem – in the sense of a real, ‘objective’ existential threat. Bauwens’ chapter analyses the restraining orders issued by mayors to ban individual ‘troublemakers’ from attending certain parties, nightclubs and pubs in the municipality. These restraining orders emerged at the local level but have recently been institutionalized and explicitly included in the federal municipal law. The chapter concludes that regulating the pursuit of security does not suffice, but rather that law is only one of the repertoires used by mayors in Belgium. They are also responsive to participatory input and keen to provide effective and efficient public service output. The chapter concludes that mayors could ensure the democratic anchorage of security-based interventions, but only if their solutions-focused intentionality can be overcome.

In ‘Raising the flag: the state effects of public and private security providers at East Jerusalem’s national parks’, Lior Volinz examines the myriad ways in which public and private security providers perform the state and partake in a statecraft production of sovereignty. More specifically, the chapter explores the practices employed by public security actors and private security companies at the City of David/Wadi Hilweh national park in East Jerusalem. Volinz argues that the security provision at these spaces is not limited to the protection of the national parks’ personnel, property and visitors, but is aimed rather at the performance of Israeli sovereignty in an occupied territory. Through the examination of a national park embroiled in national and ethnic contestation, he posits that daily practices employed by security agents contribute to the effort of crafting the state and reconfiguring its relations with different residents of the region. He argues that these different practices include ‘showing presence’, reassuring some residents while

intimidating others and the deliberate enhancement of friction between security agents and local residents.

The concluding Part III of the book, 'Democratic control and ethical implications', opens with 'Evaluation and effectiveness of counter-terrorism' by Fiona de Londras. The chapter observes that in the past 15 years there has been an enormous expansion of counter-terrorism laws and policies at national, regional and international levels. Spurred on by the events of 9/11 and, later, the phenomenon of 'foreign terrorist fighters', states and international institutions have introduced laws and policies that encroach greatly on fundamental freedoms and human rights (at times in ways that undermine the democratic process), and the international conception of the 'rule of law' has been 'securitized' to a striking degree. What has been less common, however, is the comprehensive and reflexive evaluation of whether such measures are, in fact, effective. In this chapter, de Londras outlines this expansion in counter-terrorism and its impact on human rights, democracy and the rule of law in order to argue that an evaluation of effectiveness is key in maintaining the legitimacy of the counter-terrorist state and supra-state. The chapter then explores what the notion of 'effectiveness' means in this context, identifying both meta- and specific objectives as critical sites of analysis. Based on this, the chapter proposes key principles for the design of effectiveness evaluation, taking into account the particular challenges of evidence in the counter-terrorist context.

The book concludes with 'The bleak rituals of progress; or, if somebody offers you a socially responsible innovation in security, just say no' by Mark Neocleous. The chapter takes a stand against the idea that we should be searching for socially responsible innovations in security, taking as its starting point the way that security functions as an overwhelming power in modern society, justifying everything done in its name. The chapter seeks to connect this power to capital and the state more generally, arguing that the logic of security is to subsume everything it encounters, including developments in security which are thought of as 'socially responsible innovations'. The chapter argues that the idea of 'socially responsible innovations in security' is a means by which radicals and academics seek to assert some kind of influence in the social field, but which reveals what is in fact their complete powerlessness in the face of security (and therefore in the face of capital and the state). In seeking socially responsible innovations in security, the power of security is thereby confirmed rather than challenged. The chapter will therefore be an argument against the logic which underpins the rest of the chapters in the book.

References

- Appleyard, R.T. and Stahl, C.W., 1995. *South Pacific migration: New Zealand experience and implications for Australia*. Canberra: Australian Agency for International Development.
- Blok, V. and Lemmens, P., 2015. The emerging concept of responsible innovation: Three reasons why it is questionable and calls for a radical transformation of the concept of innovation. In: B.-J. Koops, I. Oosterlaken, H. Romijn, T. Swierstra and J. van den

- Hoven, eds., *Responsible Innovation 2: Concepts, approaches, and applications*. Dordrecht: Springer International Publishing, pp. 19–35.
- Bozeman, B., 2007. *Public values and public interest: Counterbalancing economic individualism*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Bozeman, B. and Sarewitz, D., 2011. Public value mapping and science policy evaluation. *Minerva*, 49(1), pp. 1–23.
- Davies, S.R., Glerup, C. and Horst, M., 2014. On being responsible: Multiplicity in responsible development. In: S. Arnaldi, A. Ferrari, P. Magaudda and F. Marin, eds., *Responsibility in nanotechnology development*. London: The International Library of Ethics, Law and Technology, pp. 143–159.
- De Jong, I.M., Kupper, F. and Broerse, J., 2016. Inclusive deliberation and action in emerging RRI practices: The case of neuroimaging in security management. *Journal of Responsible Innovation*, 3(1), pp. 26–49.
- De Saille, S. and Medvecky, F., 2016. Innovation for a steady state: A case for responsible stagnation. *Economy and Society*, 45(1), pp. 1–23.
- European Commission, 2013. *Options for strengthening responsible research and innovation*. Brussels: European Commission, Directorate General for Research and Innovation.
- European Commission, 2016. *Horizon 2020. Work Programme 2016–2017*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Gardner, J. and Williams, C.V., 2015. Responsible research and innovation: A manifesto for empirical ethics? *Clinical Ethics*, 10(1–2), pp. 5–12.
- Grinbaum, A. and Groves, C., 2013. What is ‘responsible’ about responsible innovation? Understanding the ethical issues. In: R. Owen, J. Bessant and M. Heintz, eds., *Responsible innovation: Managing the responsible emergence of science and innovation in society*. London: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, pp. 119–142.
- Owen, R., Macnaghten, P. and Stilgoe, J., 2012. Responsible research and innovation: from science in society to science for society, with society. *Science and Public Policy*, 39(6), pp. 751–760.
- Pelle, S. and Reber, B., 2015. Responsible innovation in the light of moral responsibility. *Journal on Chain and Network Science*, 15(2), pp. 107–117.
- Sholten, V.E. and van der Duin, P.A., 2015. Responsible innovation among academic spin-offs: How responsible practices help developing absorptive capacity. *Journal on Chain and Network Science*, 15(2), pp. 165–179.
- Stahl, B.C., 2013. Responsible research and innovation: The role of privacy in an emerging framework. *Science and Public Policy*, 40(6), pp. 708–716.
- Stilgoe, J., Owen, R. and Macnaghten, P., 2013. Developing a framework for responsible innovation. *Research Policy*, 42, pp. 1568–1580.
- Taebi, B., Correljé, A., Cuppen, E., Dignum, M. and Pesch, U., 2014. Responsible innovation as an endorsement of public values: The need for interdisciplinary research. *Journal of Responsible Innovation*, 1(1), pp. 118–124.
- Valdivia, W.D. and Guston, D.H., 2015. *Responsible innovation: A primer for policy-makers*. Washington, DC: Centre for Technology Innovation at Brookings Institute.
- Van Oudheusden, M., 2014. Where are the politics in responsible innovation? European governance, technology assessments and beyond. *Journal of Responsible Innovation*, 1(1), pp. 67–86.
- von Schomberg, R., 2011. Introduction. In: R. von Schomberg, ed., *Towards responsible research and innovation in the information and communication technologies and security technologies fields*. Brussels: European Commission, Directorate General for Research and Innovation, pp. 7–16.

Introduction

- Appleyard, R.T. and Stahl, C.W. , 1995. South Pacific migration: New Zealand experience and implications for Australia. Canberra: Australian Agency for International Development.
- Blok, V. and Lemmens, P. , 2015. The emerging concept of responsible innovation: Three reasons why it is questionable and calls for a radical transformation of the concept of innovation. In: B.J. Koops , I. Oosterlaken , H. Romijn , T. Swierstra and J. van den Hoven , 11eds., *Responsible Innovation 2: Concepts, approaches, and applications*. Dordrecht: Springer International Publishing, pp. 1935.
- Bozeman, B. , 2007. Public values and public interest: Counterbalancing economic individualism. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Bozeman, B. and Sarewitz, D. , 2011. Public value mapping and science policy evaluation. *Minerva*, 49(1), pp. 123.
- Davies, S.R. , Glerup, C. and Horst, M. , 2014. On being responsible: Multiplicity in responsible development. In: S. Araldi , A. Ferrari , P. Magaudo and F. Marin , eds., *Responsibility in nanotechnology development*. London: The International Library of Ethics, Law and Technology, pp. 143159.
- De Jong, I.M. , Kupper, F. and Broerse, J. , 2016. Inclusive deliberation and action in emerging RRI practices: The case of neuroimaging in security management. *Journal of Responsible Innovation*, 3(1), pp. 2649.
- De Saille, S. and Medvecky, F. , 2016. Innovation for a steady state: A case for responsible stagnation. *Economy and Society*, 45(1), pp. 123.
- European Commission , 2013. Options for strengthening responsible research and innovation. Brussels: European Commission, Directorate General for Research and Innovation.
- European Commission , 2016. Horizon 2020. Work Programme 20162017. Brussels: European Commission.
- Gardner, J. and Williams, C.V. , 2015. Responsible research and innovation: A manifesto for empirical ethics? *Clinical Ethics*, 10(12), pp. 512.
- Grinbaum, A. and Groves, C. , 2013. What is responsible about responsible innovation? Understanding the ethical issues. In: R. Owen , J. Bessant and M. Heintz , eds., *Responsible innovation: Managing the responsible emergence of science and innovation in society*. London: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, pp. 119142.
- Owen, R. , Macnaghten, P. and Stilgoe, J. , 2012. Responsible research and innovation: from science in society to science for society, with society. *Science and Public Policy*, 39(6), pp. 751760.
- Pelle, S. and Reber, B. , 2015. Responsible innovation in the light of moral responsibility. *Journal on Chain and Network Science*, 15(2), pp. 107117.
- Sholten, V.E. and van der Duin, P.A. , 2015. Responsible innovation among academic spin-offs: How responsible practices help developing absorptive capacity. *Journal on Chain and Network Science*, 15(2), pp. 165179.
- Stahl, B.C. , 2013. Responsible research and innovation: The role of privacy in an emerging framework. *Science and Public Policy*, 40(6), pp. 708716.
- Stilgoe, J. , Owen, R. and Macnaghten, P. , 2013. Developing a framework for responsible innovation. *Research Policy*, 42, pp. 15681580.
- Taebe, B. , Correlj, A. , Cuppen, E. , Dignum, M. and Pesch, U. , 2014. Responsible innovation as an endorsement of public values: The need for interdisciplinary research. *Journal of Responsible Innovation*, 1(1), pp. 118124.
- Valdivia, W.D. and Guston, D.H. , 2015. Responsible innovation: A primer for policymakers. Washington, DC: Centre for Technology Innovation at Brookings Institute.
- Van Oudheusden, M. , 2014. Where are the politics in responsible innovation? European governance, technology assessments and beyond. *Journal of Responsible Innovation*, 1(1), pp. 6786.
- von Schomberg, R. , 2011. Introduction. In: R. von Schomberg , ed., *Towards responsible research and innovation in the information and communication technologies and security technologies fields*. Brussels: European Commission, Directorate General for Research and Innovation, pp. 716.

Danger, innovation, responsibility

- Appadurai, A. , 1996. *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bauman, Z. , 2000. *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, U. , 1997. *The reinvention of politics: Rethinking modernity in the global social order*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Blok, V. and Lemmens, P. , 2015. The emerging concept of responsible innovation: Three reasons why it is questionable and calls for a radical transformation of the concept of innovation. In: B.J. Koops , I. Oosterlaken , H. Romijn , T. Swierstra and J. van den Hoven , eds., *Responsible innovation 2: Concepts, approaches, and applications*. Heidelberg: Springer International Publishing, pp. 1935.
- Brennan, T. , 2000. *Exhausting modernity: Grounds for a new economy*. London, New York: Routledge.
- European Commission , 2012. *Security industrial policy action plan for an innovative and competitive security industry {SWD (2012) 233 final}*. Brussels: European Commission.
- European Union , 2012. *Responsible research and innovation: Europes ability to respond to societal challenges*. Brussels: European Union Publications Office.
- European Union , 2013. *Options for strengthening responsible research and innovation: Report of the expert group on the state of art in Europe on responsible research and innovation*. Luxembourg: European Commission, Director-General for Research and Innovation.
- Giddens, A. , 1990. *The consequences of modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. , 1991. *Modernity and self-identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Godin, B. , 2015. *Innovation contested: The idea of innovation over the centuries*. London: Routledge.
- Schumpeter, J.A. , 2012 [1911]. *Theory of economic development*. New York: Transaction.22

Drones dull, dirty or dangerous?

- Adler, J. , 2012. #pii2012: the emergent privacy-industrial complex [online]. Available at: <https://jimadler.me/pii2012-the-emergent-privacy-industrial-complex-dd274f0523f> [accessed June 26, 2017].
- Agre, P.E. and Rotenberg, M. , 1997. *Technology and privacy: the new landscape*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Barnard-Wills, D. , 2013. Security, privacy and surveillance in European policy documents. *International Data Privacy Law*, 3(3), pp. 170180.
- 41 Berlin, I. , 1962. *Four essays on liberty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bijker, W.E. , 1987. The social construction of bakelite: toward a theory of invention. In: W. Bijker , T.P. Hughes and T. Pinch , eds., *The social construction of technological systems: new directions in the sociology and history of technology*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 159187.
- Bijker, W.E. , 1995. *Of bicycles, bakelites, and bulbs: toward a theory of sociotechnical change*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bijker, W.E. and Law, J. , 1992. *Shaping technology/building society: studies in sociotechnical change*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bijker, W.E. , Hughes, T.P. and Pinch, T.J. eds., 1987. *The social construction of technological systems: new directions in the sociology and history of technology*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bone, E. and Bolcom, C. , 2003. *Unmanned aerial vehicles: background and issues for congress* [pdf]. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service. Available at: www.fas.org/irp/crs/RL31872.pdf [accessed June 26, 2017].
- Braun, S. , Friedewald, M. and Valkenburg, G. , 2015. Civilizing drones: military discourses going civil. *Science & Technology Studies*, 28(2), pp. 7387. Available at: <http://ojs.tsv.fi/index.php/sts/article/view/55351> [accessed June 26, 2017].
- Clarke, R. , 2006. *Whats privacy?* In: Australian Government , Australian Law Reform Commission Workshop. July 28, 2006. Available at: www.rogerclarke.com/DV/Privacy.html [accessed June 26, 2017].
- Economist , 2011. *Flight of the drones: why the future of air power belongs to unmanned systems*. The Economist [online], October 8. Available at: www.economist.com/node/21531433 [accessed June 26, 2017].
- Eick, V. , 2009. Das Drhnen der Drohnen: Technisierung von berwachung und Kontrolle. *Brgerrechte und Polizei/CILIP*, 94(3/2009), pp. 2840.

ESRAB (European Security Research Advisory Board) , 2006. Meeting the challenge: the European security research agenda. A report from the European Security Research Advisory Board [pdf]. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. Available at: www.kowi.de/Portaldata/2/Resources/fp7/coop/security-esrab-report-2006.pdf [accessed June 26, 2017].

Esser, J. , Fleischmann, G. and Heimer, T. eds., 1998. Soziale Schlieung im Proze der Technologieentwicklung. Frankfurt, New York: Campus.

European Commission , 2009. A European security research and innovation agenda Commissions initial position on ESIRFs key findings and recommendations. COM (2009) 691 final, Brussels. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/documents/policies/security/pdf/comm_pdf_com_2009_0691_f_communication_en.pdf [accessed June 26, 2017].

European Commission , 2010. The EU internal security strategy in action: five steps towards a more secure Europe, COM (2010) 673 final, Brussels. Available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52010DC0673&from=EN> [accessed June 26, 2017].

European Commission , 2012. Security industrial policy: action plan for an innovative and competitive security industry, COM (2012) 417 final, Brussels. Available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2012:0417:FIN:EN:PDF> [accessed June 26, 2017].

European Commission and Council of the European Union , 2003. A secure Europe in a better world European security strategy. Brussels. Available at: www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf [accessed June 26, 2017].

42 European Security Research and Innovation Forum (ESRIF) , 2009. ESRIF final report, Ares(2014)74540, Brussels. Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/DocsRoom/documents/1413/attachments/1/translations/en/renditions/pdf> [accessed June 26, 2017].

Finn, R.L. and Wright, D. , 2012. Unmanned aircraft systems: surveillance, ethics and privacy in civil applications. Computer Law & Security Review, 28(2), pp. 184-194.

Finn, R.L. , Wright, D. and Friedewald, M. , 2013. Seven types of privacy. In: S. Gutwirth , R. Leenes , P. De Hert and Y. Pouillet , eds., European data protection: coming of age. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 332.

GAO (Government Accountability Office) and Koontz, L.D. , 2007. Homeland security: continuing attention to privacy concerns is needed as programs are developed (GAO-07630T) [pdf]. Washington, DC: United States Government Accountability Office. Available at: www.gao.gov/new.items/d05866.pdf [accessed June 26, 2017].

Harris, P. , 2011. How private firms have cashed in on the climate of fear since 9/11. Guardian [online]. September 5. Available at: www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/sep/05/private-firms-fear-9-11 [accessed June 26, 2017].

Hayes, B. , 2009. NeoConOpticon: the EU security-industrial complex. Amsterdam: Transnational Institute. Available at: www.statewatch.org/analyses/neoconopticon-report.pdf [accessed June 2, 2017].

Hing, J.T. and Oh, P.Y. , 2009. Development of an unmanned aerial vehicle piloting system with integrated motion cueing for training and pilot evaluation. In: K.P. Valavanis , P. Oh and L.A. Piegl , eds., Unmanned aircraft systems. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 319.

Homeland Security News Wire , 2011. Texas county police buys drone that can carry weapons. Homeland Security News Wire [online], October 31. Available at: www.homelandsecuritynewswire.com/texas-county-police-buys-drone-can-carry-weapons [accessed June 26, 2017].

Kornmeier, C. , 2012. Der Einsatz von Drohnen zur Bildaufnahme: Eine luftverkehrsrechtliche und datenschutzrechtliche Betrachtung. Mnster: Lit Verlag.

Lagazio, M. , 2012. The evolution of the concept of security. The Thinker, 43(9), pp. 3643.

Latour, B. , 2000. The Berlin key or how to do words with things. In: P.M. Graves-Brown , ed., Matter, materiality and modern culture. London: Routledge, pp. 1021.

London Economics , 2010. Study on the economic benefits of privacy-enhancing technologies (PETs) [online]. London: London Economics. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/privacy/docs/studies/final_report_pets_16_07_10_en.pdf [accessed June 26, 2017].

Milles, M. , 2004. The security-industrial complex. Forbes [online]. Available at: www.forbes.com/forbes/2004/1129/044.html [accessed June 26, 2017].

Strbing, J. , 2005. Pragmatistische Wissenschafts- und Technikforschung: Theorie und Methode. Frankfurt, New York: Campus.

Valkenburg, G. , 2015. Privacy versus security: problems and possibilities for the trade-off model. In: S. Gutwirth , R. Leenes and P. De Hert , eds., Reforming European data protection

law. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 253269.

van den Broek, T. , Ooms, M. , Friedewald, M. , van Lieshout, M. and Rung, S. , 2017. Privacy and security: citizens desire for an equal footing. In: M. Friedewald , J.P. Burgess , J. Cas , R. Bellanova and W. Peissl , eds., Surveillance, privacy and security: citizens perspectives. London: Routledge, pp. 1535.

van Lieshout, M. and Kool, L. , 2012. Designing privacy: motivating and hindering factors for Dutch companies. Amsterdam Privacy Conference. The Netherlands, Amsterdam, October 710, 2012.

43 van Lieshout, M. , van Schoonhoven, B. , Roosendaal, A. , Valkenburg, G. , Huijboom, N. , van Veenstra, A.F. , Braun, S. and Friedewald, M. , 2015. PRISMS Deliverable 2.3: Security and privacy technologies: understanding trends and developments [pdf]. Available at: http://publica.fraunhofer.de/eprints/urn_nbn_de_0011-n-3674295.pdf [accessed June 26, 2017].

van Lieshout, M. , Barnard-Wills, D. , Friedewald, M. and Gonzlez Fuster, G. , 2015. Deliverable 11.3: The PRISMS decision support system. Available at: <http://publica.fraunhofer.de/documents/N-349845.html> [accessed March 13, 2018].

van Schoonhoven, B. , Roosendaal, A. and Huijboom, N. , 2014. Privacy versus collective security: drivers and barriers behind a trade-off. In: M. Hansen , J.H. Hoepman , R. Leenes and D. Whitehouse , eds., Privacy and identity 2014, IFIP AICT, vol. 421. Heidelberg, Berlin: Springer, pp. 93101.

van Schoonhoven, B. , van Lieshout, M. and Roosendaal, A. , 2015. Deliverable 2.3: Security and privacy technologies: understanding trends and developments Part A. Available at: <http://publica.fraunhofer.de/documents/N-367429.html> [accessed March 13, 2018].

Wadhwa, K. and Rodrigues, R. , 2013. Evaluating privacy impact assessments. Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research, 26(12), pp. 161180.

Warren, S.D. and Brandeis, L.D. , 1890. The right to privacy. Harvard Law Review, 4(5), pp. 193220.

Westin, A.F. , 1967. Privacy and freedom. New York: Atheneum.

The influence of technological innovations on theft prevention

Byrne, J. and Marx, G. , 20112013. Technological innovations in crime prevention and policing: a review of the research on implementation and impact. Cahiers Politiestudies, 20, pp. 1740.

Christiaensen, S. and Dormaels, A. , 2012. De neuzen in dezelfde, juiste richting: de beheersing van diefstal in woningen vanuit integraal en gegtegreerd perspectief. In: S. Christiaensen , A. Dormaels and S. Van Daele , eds., Diefstal in woningen. Bijdragen voor een gegtegreerde beheersing vanuit beleid, praktijk en wetenschap. Antwerpen-Apeldoorn: Maklu.

Corbett, R. and Marx, G. , 1991. Critique: no soul in the new machine: technofallacies in the electronic monitoring movement. Justice Quarterly, 8(3), pp. 359414.

Cornish, D.B. and Clarke, R. , 2008. The rational choice perspective: environmental criminology and crime analysis. Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.

Das, R. , 2014. Biometric technology: authentication, biocryptography, and cloud-based architecture. New York: CRC Press.

Davis, F.D. , Bagozzi, R.P. and Warshaw, P.R. , 1989. User acceptance of computer technology: a comparison of two theoretical models. Management Science, 35(8), pp. 9821003.

Decorte, T. , 2011. Methoden van onderzoek: ontwerp en dataverzameling. Een handleiding. Gent: Academia Press.

Ding, A.Y. , Hafeez, I. , Tarkoma, S. , Krischenko, A. and Stalberg, M. , 2014. Securing smart homes: opportunities, risks, and techniques [pdf]. University of Helsinki and F-Secure Corporation. Available at: <http://docplayer.net/7021098-Smart-homes-bring-many-comforting-and-time-saving.html> [accessed on February 12, 2015].

Eklom, P. , 2005. Designing products against crime. In: N. Tilley , ed., Handbook of crime prevention and community safety. Cullompton, UK: Willan Publishing. pp. 203244.

ENISA , 2015. Threat landscape and good practice guide for smart home and converged media [online]. Available at: www.enisa.europa.eu/activities/risk-management/evolving-threat-environment/enisa-thematic-landscapes/threat-landscape-for-smart-home-and-media-convergence [accessed on June 16, 2015].

FTC , 2015. Internet of things: privacy and security in a connected world [pdf]. Federal Trade Commission. Available at: www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/reports/federal-trade-commission-staff-report-november-2013-workshop-entitled-internet-things-privacy/150127iotrpt.pdf [accessed on April 24, 2015].

Jacobsson, A. , Boldt, M. and Carlsson, B. , 2016. A risk analysis of a smart home automation system. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 56, pp. 719733.

Kerkab, R. and Deroover, M. , 2012. Naburig herhaald slachtofferschap bij woningin-braken: een verkenning van nieuwe paden voor het inbraakpreventiebeleid. In: S. Christiaensen , A. Dormaels and S. Van Daele , eds., *Diefstal in woningen. Bijdragen voor een gegtegreerde beheersing vanuit beleid, praktijk en wetenschap*. Antwerpen: Maklu, pp. 4770.

Kindt, E. and Dumortier, J. , 2008. Biometrie als herkenning- of identificatiemiddel? Enkele juridische beschouwingen. *Computerrecht: Tijdschrift voor Informatica, Telecommunicatie en Recht*, 132, pp. 185198.

Mangard, S. and Schaumont, P. , 2015. *Radio frequency identification: security and privacy issues*. New York: Springer.

Nuth, M.S. , 2008. Taking advantage of new technologies: for and against crime. *Computer Law & Security Report*, 24, pp. 437446.

62 Pavone, V. , Esposti, S.D. and Santiago, E. , 2013. Surveillance, privacy and security: a large scale participatory assessment of criteria and factors determining acceptability and acceptance of security technologies in Europe [pdf]. Seventh Framework Program. Available at: <http://surprise-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/SurPRISE-D2.2-Draft-Report-on-Key-Factors.pdf> [accessed on February 18, 2015].

Reuter, T. , 2013. Security analysis of wireless communication standards for home automation. Masters thesis in informatics. Universitt Mnchen, Fakultt fr Informatik.

Rose, K. , Eldridge, S. and Chapin, L. , 2015. The internet of things: an overview. Understanding the issues and challenges of a more connected world [pdf]. Internet Society. Available at: www.internetsociety.org/sites/default/files/ISOC-IoT-Overview-20151014_0.pdf [accessed on January 15, 2015].

Schoeters, I. , 2012. Een rationele technopreventie: anticiperen op het inbraakproces. In: S. Christiaensen , A. Dormaels and S. Van Daele , eds., *Diefstal in woningen. Bijdragen voor een gegtegreerde beheersing vanuit beleid, praktijk en wetenschap*. Antwerpen: Maklu, pp. 135152.

Skaraskien, A. and Kalinauskas, M. , 2015. The internet of things: when reality meets expectations. *International Journal of Innovation and Learning*, 17(2), pp. 262274.

Venkatesh, V. and Davis, F.D. , 2000. A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: four longitudinal field studies. *Management Science*, 46, pp. 186204.

Venkatesh, V. , Morris, M.G. , Davis, G.B. and Davis, F.D. , 2003. User acceptance of information technology: toward a unified view. *Management Information Systems Quarterly*, 27(3), pp. 425478.

Vielhauer, C. , 2006. *Biometric user authentication for IT security: from fundamentals to handwriting*. Advances in information security. Dordrecht: Springer.

Wayne, P. , 2002. Biometrics: a double edged sword security and privacy [online]. SANS Institute. Available at: www.sans.org/reading-room/whitepapers/authentication/biometrics-double-edged-sword-security-privacy-137 [accessed on May 7, 2015].

When it rains in Paris, it drizzles in Brussels?

Bozzoli, C. and Miller, C. , 2011. Perceptions and attitudes following a terrorist shock: evidence from the UK. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 27, S89S106.

Byrne, J. and Marx, G. , 2011. Technological innovations in crime prevention and policing: a review of the research on implementation and impact. *Journal of Police Studies*, 20(3), pp. 1740.

81 Corbett, R. and Marx, G.T. , 1991. Critique: no soul in the new machine: technofallacies in the electronic monitoring movement. *Justice Quarterly*, 8(3), pp. 399414.

Davis, D.W. and Silver, B.D. , 2004. Civil liberties vs. security: public opinion in the context of the terrorist attacks on America. *American Journal of Political Science*, 48(1), pp. 2846.

Degli Esposti, S. and Gmez, E.S. , 2015. Acceptable surveillance-orientated security technologies: insights from the SURPRISE project. *Surveillance & Society*, 13(3/4), p. 437.

Dragu, T. , 2011. Is there a trade-off between security and liberty? Executive bias, privacy protections, and terrorism prevention. *American Political Science Review*, 105(1), pp. 6478.

Echebarria-Echabe, A. and Fernndez-Guede, E. , 2006. Effects of terrorism on attitudes and ideological orientation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36(2), pp. 259265.

Friedewald, M. , van Lieshout, M. , Rung, S. , Ooms, M. and Ypma, J. , 2014. Privacy and security perceptions of European citizens: a test of the trade-off model. In: J. Camenish , S. Fischer-Hbner and M. Hansen , eds., *Privacy and identity management for the future internet in the age of globalisation*. Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 3953.

Gosling, S.D. , Rentfrow, P.J. and Swann, W.B. , 2003. A very brief measure of the big-five personality domains. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37(6), pp. 504-528.

Haubrich, D. , 2003. September 11, anti-terror laws and civil liberties: Britain, France and Germany compared. *Government and Opposition*, 38(1), pp. 328.

Huddy, L. , Feldman, S. , Taber, C. and Lahav, G. , 2005. Threat, anxiety, and support of antiterrorism policies. *American Journal of Political Science*, 49(3), pp. 593-608.

Lerner, J.S. , Gonzalez, R.M. , Small, D.A. and Fischhoff, B. , 2003. Effects of fear and anger on perceived risks of terrorism: a national field experiment. *Psychological Science*, 14(2), pp. 144-150.

Parasuraman, A. , 2000. Technology Readiness Index (TRI): a multiple-item scale to measure readiness to embrace new technologies. *Journal of Service Research*, 2(4), pp. 307-320.

Patil, S. , 2015. Public perception of security and privacy: results of the comprehensive analysis of PACTs pan-European survey [pdf]. Santa Monica, CA and Cambridge, UK: Rand Corporation. Available at: www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR700/RR704/RAND_RR704.pdf [accessed on June 22, 2016].

Pavone, V. and Degli Esposti, S. , 2010. Public assessment of new surveillance-oriented security technologies: beyond the trade-off between privacy and security. *Public Understanding of Science*, 21(5), pp. 556-572 (originally published online August 26, 2010).

Pavone, V. , Degli Esposti, S. and Santiago, E. , 2015. D 2.4 key factors affecting public acceptance and acceptability of SOSTs [pdf]. Seventh Framework Program. Available at: <http://surprise-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/SurPRISE-D24-Key-Factors-affecting-public-acceptance-and-acceptability-of-SOSTs-c.pdf> [accessed on June 22, 2016].

Ponsaers, P. , Devroe, E. and Meert, D. , 2006. Tot de kern van de taak: het politieke kerntakendebat. *Orde van de dag: Criminaliteit en Samenleving*, 33, p. 55.

Posner, R.A. , 2008. Privacy, surveillance, and law. *The University of Chicago Law Review*, 75(1), pp. 245-260.

Rountree, P.W. and Land, K.C. , 1996. Perceived risk versus fear of crime: empirical evidence of conceptually distinct reactions in survey data. *Social Forces*, 74(4), pp. 1353-1376.

Smith, H.J. , Dinev, T. and Xu, H. , 2011. Information privacy research: an interdisciplinary review. *MIS Quarterly*, 35(4), pp. 989-1016.

Solove, D.J. , 2011. Nothing to hide: the false tradeoff between privacy and security. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Straus, S. , 2015. Citizen summits on privacy, security and surveillance: synthesis report [pdf]. Available at: http://surprise-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/D6.3_Country_report_Germany_final_30.9.pdf [accessed on June 22, 2016].

Vermeersch, H. and De Pauw, E. 2017. The acceptance of new security oriented technologies: a framing experiment. In: M. Friedewald , J.P. Burgess , J. as , R. Bellanova and W. Peissl , eds., *Surveillance, privacy and security: citizens perspectives*. Abingdon, New York: Routledge, pp. 5270.

Victorino, L. , Karniouchina, E. and Verma, R. , 2009. Exploring the use of the abbreviated technology readiness index for hotel customer segmentation. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 50(3), pp. 342-359.

Securitization by regulation?

Barber, B. , 2013. *If mayors ruled the world*. New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press.

Bauwens, T. , 2015. De burgemeester als regisseur van het lokale veiligheidsbeleid? Den Haag: Boom Lemma Uitgevers.

Bauwens, T. and Luyten, I. , 2015. Experiencing experience: killing the researcher? Paper presented at Experiencing Justice, Sint-Gillis.

Bauwens, T. , Enhus, E. , Ponsaers, P. , Reynaert, H. and Van Assche, J. , 2011. *Integraal veiligheidsbeleid tussen pragmatisme en idealisme. Het complexe samenspel van lokale en bovenlokale bestuurlijke actoren*. Brussels: VUBpress.

Edwards, A. and Hughes, G. , 2005. Comparing the governance of safety in Europe: a geo-historical approach. *Theoretical Criminology*, 9(3), pp. 345-363.

Flinders, M. , 2012. *Defending politics: why democracy matters in the twenty-first century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Floyd, R. , 2014. Just and unjust desecuritization. In: T. Balzacq , ed., *Contesting security*. London: Routledge.

Gadamer, H.G. , 2013. *Truth and method* (Transl. J. Weinsheimer and D.G. Marshall). London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Hajer, M. , 2009. *Authoritative governance: policy-making in the age of mediatization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hoppe, R. , 2010. *The governance of problems: puzzling, powering, participation*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Lees, A. and Lees, L.H. , 2007. *Cities and the making of modern Europe, 1750-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lippert, R.K. and Walby, K. , 2013. *Policing cities: urban securitization and regulation in a 21st century world*. London: Routledge.

Loader, I. and Walker, N. , 2007. *Civilizing security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Neocleous, M. , 2008. *Critique of security*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Neocleous, M. and Rigakos, G.S. eds., 2011. *Anti-security*. Ottawa: Red Quill Books.

Potter, J. and Wetherell, M. , 1987. *Discourse and social psychology: beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London: SAGE Publications.

Reeher, G. , 2006. *First person political: legislative life and the meaning of public service*. New York: New York University Press.

Rhodes, R. , t Hart, P. and Noordegraaf, M. eds., 2007. *So what? The benefits and pitfalls of being there*. In: R. Rhodes , P. t Hart and M. Noordegraaf , eds., *Observing government elites: up close and personal* (First edition). London: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 206-233.

Schinkel, W. , 2011. Prepression: the actuarial archive and new technologies of security. *Theoretical Criminology*, 15(4), pp. 365-380.

96 Schinkel, W. , 2012. *De nieuwe democratie*. Amsterdam: De Bezige Bij.

Schram, F. and Lievens, J. , 2015. *Gemeentelijke administratieve sancties. Een antwoord op overlast?* Brugge: Vanden Broele.

Stone, D. , 2012. *Policy paradox: the art of political decision making*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Taylor, C. , 2004. *Modern social imaginaries*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Valverde, M. , 2011. Questions of security: a framework for research. *Theoretical Criminology*, 15(1), pp. 322.

Valverde, M. , 2012. *Everyday law on the street: city governance in an age of diversity*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Wayenberg, E. , De Rynck, F. , Steyvers, K. and Pilet, J.B. , 2011. *Belgium: a tale of regional divergence?* In: J. Loughlin , F. Hendriks , and A. Lidström , eds., *The Oxford handbook of local and regional democracy in Europe*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Zedner, L. , 2007. Pre-crime and post-criminology? *Theoretical Criminology*, 11(2), pp. 261-281.

Zedner, L. , 2009. *Security*. London: Routledge.

Raising the flag

Abrams, P. , 1988. Notes on the difficulty of studying the state (1977). *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 1(1), pp. 58-89.

ACRI The Association for Civil Rights in Israel , 2009. *Unsafe space: the Israeli authorities failure to protect human rights amid settlements in East Jerusalem* [online]. Available at: www.acri.org.il/pdf/unsafe-space-en.pdf [accessed July 2015].

ACRI The Association for Civil Rights in Israel , 2014. *Appeal against the operation of private security guards in East Jerusalem; File Bagatz 8001/11* [online]. Available at: www.acri.org.il/he/24437 [Hebrew] [accessed July 2015].

Basaran, T. , 2008. Security, law, borders: spaces of exclusion. *International Political Sociology*, 2(4), pp. 339-354.

Cook, I.R. and Whowell, M. , 2011. Visibility and the policing of public space. *Geography Compass*, 5(8), pp. 610-622.

Dumper, M. , 2013. Policing divided cities: stabilization and law enforcement in Palestinian east Jerusalem. *International Affairs*, 89(5), pp. 1247-1264.

Dumper, M. and Pullan, W. , 2010. *Jerusalem: the cost of failure*. London: Chatham House/Royal Institute of International Affairs.

Giddens, A. , 1979. *Central problems in social theory: action, structure, and contradiction in social analysis* (vol. 241). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Goldstein, D.M. , 2015. Color-coded sovereignty and the men in black: private security in a Bolivian marketplace. *Conflict and Society: Advances in Research*, 1(1), pp. 182196.

114 Grassiani, E. , 2013. *Soldiering under occupation: processes of numbing among Israeli soldiers in the Al-Aqsa intifada*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Grassiani, E. and Volinz, L. , 2016. Intimidation, reassurance and invisibility: Israeli security agents in the Old City of Jerusalem. *Focaal*, 75, pp. 1430.

Greenberg, R. , 2009. Towards an inclusive archaeology in Jerusalem: the case of Silwan/the City of David. *Public Archaeology*, 8(1), pp. 3550.

Haaretz , 2014. Hasson Nir: the cost of providing security to a Jewish resident in East Jerusalem has surpassed 30,000 NIS this year. Haartez [online]. Available at: www.haaretz.co.il/premium-1.2492751 [Hebrew] [accessed July 2015].

Hansen, T.B. , 2006. Performers of sovereignty on the privatization of security in urban South Africa. *Critique of Anthropology*, 26(3), pp. 279295.

Havkin, S. , 2014. The privatization of the checkpoints in the West Bank and the Gaza strip: policy paper. Jerusalem: Van Leer Institute.

Ir Amim , 2012. Report: the giants garden [pdf]. Available at: www.ir-amim.org.il/sites/default/files/el%20bustan%20HEB.pdf [Hebrew] [accessed 10 July 2015].

Khamisi, R. , 2015. Conference notes. In: JIIS . *Between East and West: equality and inequality in Jerusalem*. Jerusalem, 6 July 2015.

Knesset Internal Affairs Committee , 2010. Protocol dated 22 December 2010 [Hebrew]. Available at: www.knesset.gov.il/protocols/data/rtf/pnim/2010-12-22.rtf [accessed July 2015].

Konopinski, N. , 2009. *Ordinary security: an ethnography of security practices and perspectives in Tel Aviv*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh.

Loader, I. , 1999. Consumer culture and the commodification of policing and security. *Sociology*, 33(2), pp. 373392.

Mbembe, J. and Meintjes, L. , 2003. Necropolitics. *Public Culture*, 15(1), pp. 1140.

Mitchell, K. , 2010. Ungoverned space: global security and the geopolitics of broken windows. *Political Geography*, 29(5), pp. 289297.

Mitchell, T. , 1999. Society, economy, and the state effect. In: G. Steinmetz , ed., *State/culture: state-formation after the cultural turn*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Nature and Parks Authority , 2009. Jerusalem Walls National Park, planning principles and programs status [online]. Available at: www.parks.org.il/ParksAndReserves/city-ofDavidJerusalemWalls/Pages/default.aspx [Hebrew] [accessed July 2015].

Ong, A. , 2000. Graduated sovereignty in south-east Asia. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 17(4), pp. 5575.

Ortner, S.B. , 2006. Introduction: updating practice theory. *Anthropology and social theory: culture, power, and the acting subject*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.

Pullan, W. and Gwiazda, M. , 2009. City of David: urban design and frontier heritage. *Jerusalem Quarterly*, 39, pp. 2938.

Pullan, W. , Misselwitz, P. , Nasrallah, R. and Yacobi, H. , 2007. Jerusalem's road 1: an inner city frontier? *City*, 11(2), pp. 176198.

Russell, B. , 2012. *Social research methods: qualitative and quantitative approaches*. London: Sage.

Sharon, A. , Brutkus, D.A. , Mordohovich, H. and Sharon, E. , 1973. *Planning Jerusalem: the old city and its environs*. Jerusalem: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Stepputat, F. , 2015. Formations of sovereignty at the frontier of the modern state. *Conflict and Society: Advances in Research*, 1(1), pp. 129143.

Trouillot, M. , Hann, C. and Krti, L. , 2001. The anthropology of the state in the age of globalization 1: close encounters of the deceptive kind. *Current Anthropology*, 42(1), pp. 125138.

Evaluation and effectiveness of counter-terrorism

Bonfanti, M.E. , 2015. Lets go for new or emerging security technologies! What about their impact on individuals and the society? Paper at EISA 9th Pan European Conference on International Relations, on file with author.

Chistyakova, Y. , 2015. Democratic legitimacy, effectiveness and the impact of EU counter-terrorism measures. In: F. de Londras and J. Doody , eds., *The impact, legitimacy and effectiveness of EU counter-terrorism*. London: Routledge.

de Londras, F. , 2011. Detention in the war on terror: can human rights fight back? Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

de Londras, F. , 2013. Privatised counter-terrorist surveillance: constitutionalism undermined. In: G. Williams , F.F. Davis and N. McGarrrity , eds., Surveillance, counter-terrorism and comparative constitutionalism. London: Routledge.

de Londras, F. , 2014. Counter-terrorist detention and international human rights law. In: B. Saul , ed., Research handbook on terrorism and international law. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

de Londras, F. , 2015. Governance gaps in EU counter-terrorism: implications for democracy and constitutionalism. In: F. de Londras and J. Doody , eds., The impact, legitimacy and effectiveness of EU counter-terrorism. London: Routledge.

de Londras, F. , 2016. Accounting for rights in EU counter-terrorism: towards effective review. *Columbia Journal of European Law*, 22(2), pp. 237274.

de Londras, F. , 2017. (Counter-)terrorism and hybridity. In: N. Lemay-Hbert and R. Freedman , eds., Hybridity: law, culture, and development. London: Routledge, pp. 5873.

European Commission , 2012. Communications security industrial policy action plan for an innovative and competitive security industry COM (2012) 417.

128 European Commission , 2015. The European agenda on security COM (2015) 185.

European Court of Human Rights , 2009. A & Others v. United Kingdom (2009) 49 EHRR 29.

Grozdanova, R. , 2014. Terrorism: too elusive a term for an international legal definition? *Netherlands International Law Review*, 61(3), pp. 305334.

Hayes, B. and Jones, C. , 2014. Report on how the EU assesses the impact, legitimacy and effectiveness of counter-terrorism. SECILE Consortium.

Hillyard, P. , 1993. Suspect community. London: Pluto Press.

Johns, F. , 2015. Global governance through the pairing of list and algorithm. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 34(1), pp. 126149.

Lazarus, L. , 2016. Securing legality. Oxford: Hart Publishing.

Martin-Maz, M. and Burgess, J.P. , 2015. The societal impact of European counter-terrorism. In: F. de Londras and J. Doody , eds., The impact, legitimacy and effectiveness of EU counter-terrorism. London: Routledge, pp. 93113.

Murphy, C. , Zammit-Borda, A. and Hoyte, L. , 2015. The perspectives of counter-terrorism operatives on EU counter-terrorism law and policy. In: F. de Londras and J. Doody , eds., The impact, legitimacy and effectiveness of EU counter-terrorism. London: Routledge, pp. 157180.

Strinati, D. , 1995. An introduction to theories of popular culture. London: Routledge.

UN Security Council , 2001, Resolution 1373.

UN Security Council , 2014, Resolution 2178.

Zedner, L. , 2007. Preventive justice or pre-punishment? The case of control orders. *Current Legal Problems*, 60, pp. 174203.

The bleak rituals of progress; or, if somebody offers you a socially responsible innovation in security, just say no

Arendt, H. , 1963. On revolution. New York: Viking.

Burke, E. , 1790/1968. Reflections on the revolution in France. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Burke, E. , 1795/1992. Letter to William Elliot, 26 May, 1795. In: E. Burke , Further reflections on the revolution in France. Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund.

140 Dardot, P. and Laval, C. , 2013. The new way of the world: on neoliberal society. London: Verso.

Foucault, M. , 2014. On the government of the living: lectures at the Collge de France, 19791980. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Gamble, A. , 2000. Politics and fate. Cambridge: Polity.

Godin, B. , 2008. Innovation: the history of a category. Working Paper No. 1. Montreal, Quebec: Project on the Intellectual History of Innovation.

Godin, B. , 2013. Innovation after the French Revolution, or, innovation transformed: from word to concept. Working Paper No. 14. Montreal, Quebec: Project on the Intellectual History of Innovation.

Godin, B. , 2015. Innovation: a conceptual history of an anonymous concept. Working Paper No. 21. Montreal, Quebec: Project on the Intellectual History of Innovation.

Koselleck, R. , 2002. The practice of conceptual history: timing history, spacing concepts. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Koselleck, R. , 2004. *Futures past: on the semantics of historical time*. New York: Columbia University Press.

London, F. , 2015. *Willing slaves of capital: Spinoza and Marx on desire*. London: Verso.

Marx, K. , 1843/1975. *Letters from Deutsch-Franzsische Jahrbcher*. In: K. Marx and F. Engels , *Collected works*, vol. 3. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Marx, K. , 1844/1975. *On the Jewish question*. In: K. Marx and F. Engels , *Collected works*, vol. 3. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Marx, K. , 1859/1987. *A contribution to the critique of political economy* . In: K. Marx and F. Engels , *Collected works*, vol. 29. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Marx, K. and Engels, F. , 1848/1984. *The manifesto of the communist party* . In: K. Marx and F. Engels , *Collected works*, vol. 6. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Neocleous, M. , 2000. *The fabrication of social order: a critical theory of police power*. London: Pluto Press.

Neocleous, M. , 2008. *Critique of security*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Neocleous, M. , 2011. *Security as pacification*. In: M. Neocleous and G. Rigakos , eds., *Anti-security*. Ottawa: Red Quill Books, pp. 2356.

Neocleous, M. , 2013. *Resisting resilience*. *Radical Philosophy*, 178, pp. 27.

Neocleous, M. , 2014. *War power, police power*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Neocleous, M. , 2016. *The universal adversary: security, capital and The enemies of all mankind*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Neocleous, M. , 2017. *Fundamentals of pacification theory: twenty-six articles*. In: T. Wall , P. Saberi and W. Jackson , eds., *Destroy, build, secure: readings on pacification*. Ottawa: Red Quill Books.

Neocleous, M. and Rigakos, G. eds., 2011. *Anti-security*. Ottawa: Red Quill Press.

Neocleous, M. , Rigakos, G. and Wall, T. , 2013. *On pacification: introduction to the special issue*. *Socialist Studies/tudes socialistes*, 9(2), pp. 16.

Nowotny, H. , 2008. *Insatiable curiosity: innovation in a fragile future*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Preus, J. , 1972. *Theological legitimation for innovation in the Middle Ages*. *Viator*, 3, pp. 126.

Schumpeter, J. , 1911/1983. *The theory of economic development: an inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Sunday Times , 1981. *Mrs Thatcher: the first two years*. *The Sunday Times*, 3 May.