UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Introduction

Security

Diphoorn, T.; Grassiani, E.

Publication date
2015

Document Version
Final published version

Published in
Etnofoor

License
Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act

Citation for published version (APA):
Diphoorn, T., & Grassiani, E. (2015). Introduction: Security. *Etnofoor*, *27*(2), 7-13.
http://www.jstor.org/stable/43656016

Introduction

Security

Tessa Diphoorn and Erella Grassiani
University of Amsterdam

'Security' is a hot topic, for academics as well as for politicians, corporations and a broad range of state or quasi-state actors. It is a term that is increasingly used in both public as well as academic debates, yet what does security actually mean and for whom is it intended? Which dominant and counterhegemonic definitions or framings are used by different groups or individuals, and to what effects? How do such interpretations, implementations and consequences differ across states, societies and neighbourhoods? In a broad variety of domains, we can recognize attempts to increase security by detecting, assessing and intervening in threats. Security and risk management have become increasingly prominent themes (see, for example, Beck 1992; Baumann 2001; and Zedner 2009), with consequences for governments, citizens and a range of other actors. Concepts such as human security, food security, and social security further highlight this preoccupation.

Yet despite this increase of the use of the term 'security', the study of security has primarily been the focus of political science and international relations, and has, until recently, been rather neglected by anthropologists. Although anthropologists have often conducted research in contexts and about issues that are unquestionably related to security, the 'anthropology of security' is a rather new sub-discipline. This lack of research was emphasised by Daniel Goldstein in 2010 in his thought-provoking call for a 'critical security anthropology'. In this article, which has become an essential reading for this sub-discipline, Goldstein urges anthropologists to analyse the numerous ways in which security is employed and constituted. Furthermore, he conceptualizes security by looking at the meaning it has for (in)secure people themselves. This is

in contrast to the Copenhagen school, which primarily employed a state centered approach, despite the emphasis placed on securitisation as intersubjective and performative (Buzan, Wæver and De Wilde 1998). In his words, an anthropological critical approach to security is encompassing and permits an exploration of 'the multiple ways in which security is configured and deployed – not only by states and authorized speakers but by communities, groups, and individuals – in their engagements with other local actors and with arms of the state itself' (Goldstein 2010: 492).

Since this call, numerous anthropologists have taken on Goldstein's plea and have explored the many ways in which security is enacted, performed and articulated. The 'anthropology of security' has developed into an established sub-discipline. This is reflected in several books that have been published with this title (Hurtado and Ercolani 2013; Maguire, Frois, Zurawski 2014; Abrahamsen and Leander 2015) and the growth of panels at international anthropology conferences that concern themselves with this theme. In fact, the European Association for Social Anthropology (EASA) has even set up its own security network. The main objective of this issue of *Etnofoor* is to further develop this insightful body of work and to engage with and contribute to this growing sub-discipline by analysing security from various perspectives.

The first perspective concerns the increasingly pluralised nature of security, pointing towards a growing recognition that the nation-state no longer holds a monopoly on the provision of security for its citizens. Although 'policing' was traditionally associated by many with the 'police' and conceived as a public good that was provided for all citizens in public spaces, numerous studies have shown that the public-private policing divide is blurry, weak, non-existent or frequently trespassed, as state and non-state policing have become increasingly alike and interconnected. Furthermore, we now recognize a plethora of security providers (vigilante groups, gangs, private security companies and neighbourhood watches) that engage in performances of security and often use violence as a means of usurping authority. Numerous anthropologists have studied non-state security actors across the globe, such as gangs (Rodgers 2006; Jensen 2008; van Stapele 2015), criminal organisations (Jaffe 2013), private security officers (Higate 2012; Diphoorn 2015), vigilante organisations (Buur 2006; Pratten and Sen 2007; Goldstein 2012), traditional authorities (Buur and Kyed 2006; Sieder 2011), and community policing schemes (Ruteere and Pommerolle 2003; Kyed 2009; Di Nunzio 2014). Therefore, rather than thinking in terms of public versus private security, security is best analysed within a 'security quilt' (Ericson 1994) and a 'policing web' (Brodeur 2010), resulting in landscapes of 'plural policing' (Jones and Newburn 2006) and performances of 'twilight policing' (Diphoorn 2015).

In this issue of *Etnofoor*, Ivasiuc also employs this perspective by analysing vigilante security forces in Rome who frame Roma inhabitants in the city as elements of threat. She shows how a force of voluntary agents performs nightly patrols in order to increase the sense of security of Rome's inhabitants. Although the city's formal authorities criticize these *rondes*, the citizens feel they need to take matters into their own hands. Ivasiuc shows that the anti-Roma rhetoric used by these vigilantes is framed within a discourse of urban decay on a material and visible level. Such well-

8

written case studies reinforce the notion that we need to move away from the traditional idea of the state having a monopoly on the use of violence, and instead, emphasize and further unravel the intricate dynamics between non-state security actors and violence.

A second theme of interest is the increasing globalised nature of security. Across the globe, we can see how security models and technologies find their way to the global market and shape domestic conceptions of security. One such example is the extensive Israeli security industry that brands itself as superior and operates worldwide, ranging from Kenya, Brazil to the US and Europe (Grassiani forthcoming). This is also reflected in policing models that are exported to and implemented in other countries, often from the Global North to the South as part of police reform projects or general Security Sector Reform (SSR) initiatives (Sedra 2010). For example, Steinberg (2011) discusses the unforeseen consequences of importing Anglo-American ideas of crime prevention and community policing in South African policing institutions. He shows how particular elements of paramilitary policing that were reminiscent of apartheid rule, flourished in South Africa through these imported policing bodies. Similarly, numerous scholars have highlighted how SSR is often instigated and funded by international donors and agencies that neglect local practices and understandings of security (Albrecht et al. 2010; Albrecht and Jackson 2014).

This matter is addressed in this issue of *Etnofoor* by Kohl's piece on security sector reform in Guinea-Bissau. He shows that while these reforms are aimed at increasing security for citizens, they often fail. Kohl, furthermore, shows how the end-users of reforms have to navigate through a landscape of formal and informal rules. Therefore, despite these international efforts, people still largely depend on their own social networks within the security establishment. Such case-studies not only highlight how particular understandings of security move across states, but also how they influence local power dynamics that need to be considered beforehand.

In a similar vein, Smith's contribution to the issue traces the dynamic movement of security affairs across different scales and registers in Nairobi, Kenya. More specifically, she identifies both processes of localization and globalization, by which security measures both scale down and scale up, and how this is related to the various means in which people give meaning to experiences of (in)security. This scalar approach that Smith introduces not only presents the diverse means in which security acquires meaning, but also how the interactions between various scales shape the security landscape of a large urban center such as Nairobi.

A third important issue within an anthropological approach to security that is discussed in this issue is an analysis of how the increase of different security actors in societies shapes the daily-lived experiences of citizens/political subjects and their feelings of belonging. How do security measures in-or exclude different groups in society? And how do these different groups employ measures to affect their (in)secure circumstances? In what ways do they talk about their own (in)securities? While the political discourse on security may portray such measures as positive that will reduce feelings of fear, in-depth ethnographic studies have demonstrated that security for one does not necessarily mean security or safety for another. Security

measures, such as more security personnel on the street, the construction of high walls and fences, and the possession of more weapons, can simultaneously increase perceptions of insecurity and fear.

Menon, for example, explores feelings of fear and distrust of the Muslim community of Old Delhi. In her work she shows how this Muslim community retracts more and more to the old part of the city as this is a 'safe haven' and a 'Muslim space' within an increasingly threatening anti-Muslim surrounding. She shows how different citizens, in this case Hindus and Muslims, in one city react differently to the securitization of their surroundings, showing how citizenship and feelings of belonging are differentiated. One of the examples she discusses is how Muslim women change their clothing when leaving the neighbourhood as a way of showing how (in)security is navigated on a daily basis.

In a similar vein, Grant's article on Rwanda also deals with the daily navigation of people in an insecure environment. In her contribution to this issue, she analyses how young people interpret and navigate the complex and dangerous political landscape. Although Rwanda is considered to be a safe country, particularly when compared to its neighbouring states, Grant depicts an opposing picture. She does so by introducing the concept of 'quiet insecurity', which refers to the insecurity that is experienced through the indirect ways of control exerted by the Rwandan state. She argues that there is in fact an increase of mistrust and fear among families and friends within a politicized context that often sees the young men she studies as security threats. Grant's contribution emphasises that contexts that may initially appear to be more secure, and may therefore not act as prime candidates for studies on (in)

security, may in fact contain other, less obvious forms of insecurity. Furthermore, it also compels us to recognise that feelings of (in)security are not inherently linked to direct acts of violence and high crime rates, but are also shaped by indirect political forces and are pervasive in countries that are perceived to be 'safer'.

Such subjective feelings of (in)security are also the main concern of Schwell's article in this issue. She critically examines security studies and calls for more attention to what security and fear really mean on the ground and to what (active) role the 'audience' of security measures plays. By drawing from her own experiences in Montreal and Jerusalem, she aims to move away from a perception of citizens as passive audience of securitization towards a perception of all parties as actors with active roles. The citizens' fears and emotions, based on their previous experiences, form the foundation for their interpretation of security issues in both a physical and intellectual sense.

A fourth perspective of security that is addressed in this issue is how the growing emphasis on security has impacted the architectural structures of many urban centres that are now increasingly marked by CCTV cameras, fences, high walls, and a range of other gadgets and systems (Davis 1990; Caldeira 2000; Low 2004; Bremner 2004). In her contribution, Smith also discusses how the built environment of Nairobi is related to feelings of security and how this touches upon issues of prestige and aesthetics that are inter-twined in the city's architecture. She shows how the built environment both reflects and influences percep-tions of (in)security in two different neighbourhoods, namely affluent Spring Valley and the colonial-era type housing estate of Kaloleni. This comparison, which is

10

visually aided through the use of numerous photographs, allows Smith to contribute to a growing discussion on the architectural dimension of security and how it represents and mediates conflicting emotions and processes of exclusion and aspiration.

Another closely related issue is the increasing use of technologies in many urban centres. What do these various technologies mean for people living in the city, how do they impact how citizens experience their mobility within urban centres, and what does this reveal about the aesthetics of security? In this issue, we have two articles that deal with the more technological side of security. Murphy and Maguire discuss Automatic Border Control (ABC) in Europe and thereby draw attention to the ways in which a focus on the technological can provide insights into other anthropological debates about migration and border encounters. By drawing from two different research projects, the authors shed light on how such security technologies work and what they can contribute to anthropological conversations about security. Furthermore, in their conclusion, the authors offer some insights into what this means for anthropology and how anthropologists can approach such emerging technologies and practices of border security.

In a similar vein, Harris and van der Veen focus on the dynamics between security, infrastructure and power in their contribution. They discuss how the development of borderland airports in China and India reveal key issues pertaining to regional security. More specifically, these authors argue that the expansion of various borderland infrastructural projects, such as airports, is often created under the guise of security, yet result in a chain of unexpected consequences. Although numerous reasons are used to justify the construction of large infrastructural projects, such as regional economic growth and integration of peripheral provinces, the authors question whether such aspirations are fulfilled on the level of human security and job security.

The focus of this issue of *Etnofoor* and the themes we have highlighted show that the sub-discipline of the 'anthropology of security' is a thriving one and continues to incite fascinating research and innovative approaches to security. This further emphasizes the diverse ways by which anthropologists can shed new light and propel new ideas, concepts and perspectives on issues that are socially, theoretically and politically relevant.

References

Abrahamsen, Rita and Anna Leander (eds.)
2015   *Routledge Handbook of Private Security Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
Albrecht, Peter, Finn Stepputat, and Louise Andresen.
2010   Security Sector Reform, the European Way. In: M. Sedra, (ed.) *The Future of Security Sector Reform*. Waterloo: Centre for International Governance Innovation. Pp. 74-87.
Albrecht, Peter and Paul Jackson
2014   State-building through Security Sector Reform: the UK Intervention in Sierra Leone. *Peacebuilding* 2(1): 83-99.
Bauman, Zygmunt
2001   *Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Beck, Ulrich
1992   *Risk Society. Towards a New Modernity*. London, Thousand Oaks, and New Delhi: SAGE.

11

Bremner, Lindsay

2004   Bounded Spaces: Demographic Anxieties in Post-Apartheid Johannesburg. *Social Identities* 10(4): 455–468.

Brodeur, Jean-Paul

2010   *The Policing Web.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buur, Lars

2006   Reordering Society: Vigilantism and Expressions of Sovereignty in Port Elizabeth's Townships. *Development and Change* 37(4): 735-757.

Buur, Lars and Helene Maria Kyed

2006   Contested Sources of Authority: Re-claiming State Sovereignty by Formalizing Traditional Authority in Mozambique. *Development and Society* 37(4): 847-869.

Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver and Jaap de Wilde

1998   *Security. A New Framework for Analysis.* Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Caldeira, Teresa P.R.

2000   *City of Walls. Crime, Segregation, and Citizenship in Sao Paulo.* Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.

Davis, Mike

1990   *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles.* London: Verso.

Di Nunzio, Marco

2014   Thugs, Spies and Vigilantes: Community Policing and Street Politics in Inner City Addis Ababa. *Africa* 84(3): 444-465.

Diphoorn, Tessa

2015   *Twilight Policing: Private Security and Violence in Urban South Africa.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ericson, Richard

1994   The Divison of Expert Knowledge in Policing and Security. *British Journal of Sociology* 45(2): 149-175.

Goldstein, Daniel M.

2012   *Outlawed. Between Security and Rights in a Bolivian City.* Durham: Duke University Press.

2010   Toward a Critical Anthropology of Security. *Current Anthropology* 51(4): 487–517.

Grassiani, Erella

Forthcoming Commercialized occupation skills: Israeli security experience as an international brand.

Higate, Paul

2012   Drinking Vodka from the 'Butt-Crack': Men, Masculinities, and Fratriarchy in the Privatized Military Security Company. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 14(4): 450-469.

Hurtado, Fina Antón and Giovanni Ercolani

2013   *Anthropology and Security Studies.* Universidad de Murcia, Nottingham Trent University and College of William and Mary.

Jaffe, Rivke

2012   Criminal dons and extralegal security privatization in downtown Kingston, Jamaica. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 33(2): 184-197.

Jensen, Steffen

2008   *Gangs, Politics and Dignity in Cape Town.* Oxford: James Currey Ltd.

Jones, Trevor and Tim Newburn (eds.)

2006   *Plural Policing. A Comparative Perspective.* London and New York: Routledge.

Kyed, Helene Maria

2009   Community policing in post-war Mozambique. *Policing and Society* 19(4): 354-371.

Low, Setha M.

2004   *Behind the Gates. Life, Security, and the Pursuit of Happiness in Fortress America.* London and New York: Routledge.

12

Maguire, Mark, Catarine Frois and Nils Zurawski

2014   The *Anthropology of Security: Perspectives from the Frontline of Policing, Counter-Terrorism and Border Control.* London: Pluto Press.

Pratten, David and Atryee Sen, eds.

2007   *Global Vigilantes.* London: Hurst & Company.

Rodgers, Dennis

2006   The State as a Gang: Conceptualizing the Governmentality of Violence in Contemporary Nicaragua. *Critique of Anthropology* 26(3): 315-330.

Ruteere, Mutuma and Marie-Emmanuelle Pommerolle

2003   Democratizing Security or Decentralizing Repression? The Ambiguities of Community Policing in Kenya. *African Affairs* 102: 587-604.

Sedra, Mark (ed.)

2010   *The Future of Security Sector Reform.* Waterloo: Centre for International Governance Innovation.

Sieder, Rachel

2011   Contested Sovereignties: Indigenous Law, Violence and State Effects in Postwar Guatemala. *Critique of Anthropology* 31(3): 161-184.

Steinberg, Jonny

2011   Crime Prevention goes Abroad: Policy Transfer and Policing in Post-Apartheid South Africa. *Theoretical Criminology* 15(4): 349-364.

van Stapele, Naomi

2015   *Respectable 'Illegality': Gangs, Masculinities and Belonging in a Nairobi Ghetto.* Unpublished PhD dissertation: University of Amsterdam.

Zedner, Lucia

2009   *Security.* London and New York: Routledge.