Journal of

Theoretical & Philosophical Criminology

Policing and its spatial imaginaries

Elaine Campbell, Newcastle University, UK

Abstract

This paper takes critical stock of the spatial imaginaries which currently map the policing landscape. Shared understandings and common vocabularies of policing spatialities - territories, borders, scales and networks - are called into question and regarded as poorly equipped to capture the ontological and political complexities of contemporary policing geographies. Turning to poststructuralist geography and its innovative work in `thinking space relationally', the paper draws on the insights of topological approaches to space to work through the difference that a topological reading of policing spaces might make. In so doing, the paper not only introduces an alternative, conceptual vocabulary for talking about space as folded, twisted, stretched, and entangled, but also (ambitiously) opens up an interdisciplinary dialogue at the intersections of criminology, policing/security studies and human geography, which takes space seriously. To work through the analytical and political potential of a topological framework, the paper draws on Schatzki's `site ontology' to signal what a relational reading of policing spatialities might entail.

Keywords: policing spaces; topology; site ontology; territories and borders; networks; scales; criminology; security studies; human geography.

Introduction

As an assemblage of heterogeneous security practices, policing[1] is often mapped across a number of spatial imaginaries. In common parlance, when we talk of the `thin blue line', `crime scenes',

---

[1]   Throughout this paper, I am using the terms `security' and `policing' interchangeably. Policing scholars have long since acknowledged a shift to `multi-lateralized' (Bayley and Shearing, 2001) and `pluralised' (Jones and Newburn, 2006) modes of policing. Such terms not only indicate the wide array of government, market and informal actors, practices and sites now involved in the delivery of policing, but also that state-centric models of public policing are only one component of a wide array of `security assemblages' (Schuilenburg, 2015). When conflated with `security', `policing' is uncoupled from the narrower concept of `the police' and its implied denotation of `public policing'. Indeed, Johnston and Shearing complain that `despite

`bobbies on the beat', `accident hot-spots', and `no-go areas', a particular topography of policing practices is implied, albeit one which is metaphorical and representational. Yet such terms also function as heterotopias of control, danger, and exclusion, and invest `real' places with meaning, value and significance, marking them out as spatially bounded, territorialised sites of protection, investigation, risk-management, and surveillance. At the same time, recent attention to global and transnational policing (Bowling and Sheptycki, 2012) - and other scalar abstractions such as neighbourhood, local, national, regional and international policing - imagines a vertical scale, or a `nested hierarchical ordering' (Howitt, 2002: 305) of policing terrains which, `etched from shadows cast from above' (Marston *et al*, 2005: 420) move upwards and onwards in terms of operational level, geographical scope and territorial size. Moreover, the emergence of pluralised, nodal and networked policing (Jones and Newburn, 2006; Loader. 2000), which works across territorial, sectoral and organisational boundaries, suggests a more spatially fluid and extensive policing terrain which not only has reach and scope beyond the constricting enclosures of fixed, jurisdictional spaces, but which also acknowledges that proximity and distance, the here and there of policing have been dissolved within horizontal planes of cooperation and partnership. It seems reasonable, therefore, to suggest that how we talk, write and think about policing and, importantly, how we *do* policing, is cast within a distinctly spatial lexicon. For all that, the spatialized and spatializing relations of policing remain, at best, under-theorised and, at worst, unexamined and left to speak for themselves. Indeed, within criminology in general, and policing studies in particular, *forms* of space - that is, spatialities such as territory, borders, scale and network – as much as the phenomenon of space itself are seldom topics for discussion or theoretical rumination; as Massey notes, `(it is) a debate which never surfaces; and it never surfaces because everyone assumes we already know what these terms mean' (1994: 250).

Why should all this matter? At one level, of course, to obsess about such commonly used, and culturally embedded spatial expressions could be regarded as an exercise in pedantry. If, however, `everything, but everything, is spatially distributed' (Thrift, 2006: 140), then space is deeply social and emerges from the continuous interplay of bodies, nature and things which encounter, interact and connect with each other in more or less organised, and more or less continuous circulations (Massey, 1994). Yet, when viewed through a criminological lens, space is consistently figured as a neutral or abstract backdrop, or as an inert, empty container within which events unfold. Even when, *especially* when policing is analytically foregrounded as a territorialised, bordered, scaled and/or networked set of practices, forms of space are presented as conceptual givens, as always-already ordered templates upon which the `real' analysis can be superimposed. As a result, criminology's ontological commitments to, and political investments in different spatialities remain unquestioned and unproblematised. In the next several sections, I unpack the conventional wisdoms which pervade criminological approaches to territorial, bordered, scaled and networked space. This sets the ground for opening up a conversation with poststructuralist geography and its innovative work in thinking space relationally; in so doing, the paper engages with topological frameworks of spatial analysis and goes on to delineate an ontology of policing space centred on Schatzki's (2002) concept of `the site'.

Territorial and bordered imaginaries
Criminological interest in the notion of territory has been a central concern for historians of public policing. Read through theories of state formation (Giddens, 1985; Weber, 1966), as much as through the political geographies of emergent industrial capitalism and processes of urbanisation (Ogborn, 1993; Steedman, 1984), policing territory, as the spatial demarcation of police jurisdiction and authority, is cast from the complex interplay of state administrative power, nation and sovereignty. As Ogborn notes of the establishment of provincial policing in 19th century

---

our best efforts' (2003: 10) the discursive elision of `policing' with `*the* police' persists. In response, Johnston and Shearing opt for the terminology of the `governance of security' to incorporate all modes of policing; in this paper, I address the slippage by regarding `security' and `policing' synonymously.

England, `the `new' ... police force was a single body with the monopoly of policing over a defined area... (which) involved .... constantly patrolling their territory' (1993: 511).

The idea of territory as a delimited, bounded, spatially coherent, exclusive and calculable space is a formulation which is repeated across disparate bodies of scholarship. We certainly learn from administrative criminology and policing handbooks, how to map the organisational structures and operational practices of public policing across territorialised (and scaled) spatial framings – from local beats, to basic command units, area commands, force areas, through to spaces of national jurisdiction(s) (HMIC, 2005; Loveday, 2006). Equally, seminal ethnographies of urban policework, though they may discard formalised terms, nonetheless talk of territory as `the ground' – `this) belongs to the police..... (t)hey possess it; it is their territory and members of the force from adjoining stations have no right of entry into or patrol of the ground' (Holdaway, 1983: 36). More contemporary work, such as Zedner's (2009) exploration of the changing landscapes of security, notes that even with the proliferation of private policing actors and the spatial fragmentation of jurisdiction, governance still involves the regulation of delineated space leading to a territorial `patchwork' of security `quilts', `bubbles' and `corridors'. While Palmer and Warren suggest the contemporary proliferation of `governing territory through zonal controls' (2013: 430), Miraftab (2012: 284) identifies patterns of `zonification', based on old-style colonial practices of `location creation', in strategies of urban regeneration in Cape Town. At the same time, Paasche and colleagues note that non-state policing agents operating within these same City Improvement Districts, have reterritorialized urban spaces by creating `invisible boundaries' (2014: 1565) which displace not only `undesirables' from certain (improved) areas, but also the need for public policing within them. Hayward talks of `container spaces' and draws attention to the increasingly prevalent public policing usage of `kettling' as a means of `corralling.... protestors into a demarcated, confined space .... designed to keep people *inside* a perimeter' (2012: 453-454, *original emphasis*). On these analyses, territory comprises the spatial conditions of possibility for control over, access into, movement within, and exit from a particular space. This ontological position is certainly reflected in emerging criminological research of borders and border regimes (Aas, 2011; Loftus, 2015; Pickering and Ham, 2013). Borders encircle an imagined and territorialised community; as Loftus reminds us, `borders are characterised by their communicative function, signifying state control over territory and mobility' (2015: 115); or as Zureik and Salter put it, `the image of a controlled border allows for the construction of a national space as smooth space, safe space, domestic space' (2013: 4). Symbolically and materially positioned at territory's `edge', the border is both the localised site of intensified surveillance and control, and the frontier at which rights of entry and the identification (and exclusion) of risk and danger are determined.

On this reading, it would be fair to suggest that territory has been taken as an assumed spatial category which provides the material backdrop for a multifaceted and critical politics of control (and resistance), surveillance, exclusion, partition and segregation. In other words, territory comes as a ready-made ontology, and as the taken-for-granted spatial framing for politicised debates concerning injustices, rights abuses and differential treatment at the borders (Pratt, 2005; Weber and Bowling, 2004). It forms the cartographic stage for processes and practices of `social sorting' which deploy a myriad of surveillance technologies (ID cards, biometrics, CCTV, body-checks, scanners) to sift, monitor, profile and discriminate who and what has right of entry and exit (Lyon, 2002). Territory mobilises `geographies of citizenship' for some, and consigns marginalised, dispossessed and `undesirable' groups to `geographies of nowhere'(England, 2008: 2880). It partitions access to public space, and withholds what Lefebvre (1995) describes as `rights to the city'. In short, territory constitutes a key spatial technology for particularly divisive, pernicious, and demarcated modes of policing. Yet, despite the wide-ranging political implications of territory, what we might mean by the term, how we trace its genealogy, conceptual formation, discursive construction, and its usage in different times and contexts, has been given little attention within the criminological literature.

I want to make two observations as a way of trespassing across this familiar ontological ground. Firstly, it is striking how far, and how consistently criminological work imagines territory as a two-dimensional surface which can be measured and mapped between fixed co-ordinates. The clearest expression of this kind of Euclidian thinking is found in the contemporary zeal for crime mapping, best exemplified by the Home Office's recent launch of a public portal (www.police.uk) which generates high-resolution spatial data of crime, readable at any scale of aggregation from police force area through to postcode, neighbourhood, and street level clusters (Home Office, 2010). While the value and utility of such a granular approach has invited its own critical commentary (Hayward, 2004), the representational format of the `crime map' perfectly exemplifies, as Elden notes, `the problems that arise when space is reduced to a surface, a plane; when territory is reduced to an area' (2013: 36). For Elden, thinking territory as area overlooks what Crampton (2010: 96) describes as `volumetric' space. Inspired by Sloterdijk's writings on `spheres' (2004; 2011[1998]; 2014[1999]), this line of argument calls for a three-dimensional approach to territorial space which moves beyond questions of area to take account of depth, height, volume and verticality. Such an approach is reflected in recent geo-political interest in the deterritorialised surveillance of aerial policing (Wall and Monahan, 2011), and the transcendent elevation of the vertical security of mega-cities, such as Mumbai, Lagos, Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo (Adey, 2010); it is also found in an embryonic criminological concern for the policing of subterranean space where the regulation of underground population flows is increasingly viewed as problematic – see, for example, Paperman, 2003, on the policing of the Parisian Métro. In the context of his substantial research of the fractured spaces of the West Bank, and its kaleidoscope of tunnels, bridges, walls, roads, hilltops, settlements and airspace, Weizman calls for a `politics of verticality' which:

> `... entails the revisioning of existing cartographic techniques. It requires an Escher-like representation of space, a territorial hologram in which political acts of manipulation and multiplication of the territory transform a two-dimensional surface into a three-dimensional volume' (2002: Section 2).

`Volumetric territory' certainly unsettles our sense of territory as a delimited, bounded space. However – and this is my second observation – it is questionable whether the ontological coupling of territory and its `edges' is empirically sustainable in the first place. Indeed, we learn from `border scholarship' that the isomorphism of territory, sovereignty, jurisdiction, nation and border is unravelling in the wake of what Loftus (2015) notes as the intensification, deepening and diversification of border control. Significantly, borders are increasingly deterritorialised in the sense that they may be drawn elsewhere and otherwise, and certainly located beyond the assumed frontiers of domestic territory (Albert and Brock, 1996). Indeed, McNevin's (2014) recent research into the border politics of Bintan Island, Indonesia, exposes the fragility of territorial framings which, she argues, fail to capture both conceptually and materially, the fluidities of human mobilities and their entanglements with bordered geopolitical spaces. Enjoining us to move `beyond territoriality', McNevin builds on Amoore's (2006) eloquent discussion of the governance of mobilities in the `war on terror'; here we are introduced to the notion of the `biometric border' where `the body itself is inscribed with, and demarcates, a continual crossing of multiple encoded borders – social, legal, gendered, racialized and so on' (2006: 337). Marx (2013) makes a similar point, and if we accept his suggestion that borders are manifest in spatial, institutional, temporal and bodily ways, then our commitments to territory as mappable across a planar surface begin to look a little frayed at the edges. Lussault summarises this kind of relationship to territory very well:

> `A propensity to use territorial vocabulary without defining its contours and specifying its content, to establish it as a universal descriptor of all humanised space, (is) in brief to give in to the magic of the word.... The problematic character of this development ... resides not in the important diffusion of the term, but in its banalisation, that is to say its propagation in all directions without precise and stable content' (2007: 107: *original in French*).

Scalar imaginaries

A similar set of arguments can be made about our ontological weddedness to the notion of scale where space is regarded as vertically differentiated and `anchored by the endpoints of the local and the global' (Jones *et al*, 2007: 265). It may be widely accepted that scale `is not simply an external fact awaiting discovery but a way of framing conceptions of reality' (Delaney and Leitner, 1997: 94-95); but how such framings are constructed and mobilised have both rhetorical and material consequences. We could ask, for example, why spaces of reproduction, embodiment and affect, such as the household or the body, are consistently overlooked as scalar entities within broader geographies of crime, risk, fear and insecurities; as Pain notes in her reframing of domestic violence as everyday terrorism:

> `(W)e have had a role in the fetishizing and distancing of different forms of violence that comes with separating out terrorisms along a scaled system with its implied judgements of magnitude and importance. This itself is a spatial practice built on certain imaginaries, ironically clearest in the pattern of geographical work on violence' (2014: 544).

That said, criminology and policing scholarship is, for the most part, remarkably silent on its scalar terminology. A good case in point is Bowling's and Sheptycki's (2012) recent and timely study of `global policing' which opens with a very comprehensive account of policing in relation to theories of governance, social contract, law, colonialism, international relations and globalisation. Yet, at no point is `the global' similarly unpacked, theoretically positioned or empirically grounded; rather it is located unproblematically at the apex of a presupposed socio-spatial scale of policing which follows a conventional descent from the global, the regional, the national, `down to' the local – or, to be faithful to the original text, `the glocal' (*ibid*: 25), more about this below. Though by no means unique to Bowling and Sheptycki, once this scalar scaffolding is erected, it is difficult not to think in terms of policing relations and organisational arrangements which somehow fit its ready-made (hierarchically-stratified) contours. So, for example, research studies into, say, the centralising effects of police performance-management regimes assume, in advance, their materialisation and manifestation at the national scale (McLaughlin, 2007; Savage, 2007); while work which traces relationships of cooperation across national policing systems presuppose *a priori* regional scales such as the European Union (den Boer, 2014), the Southern African Development Community (Van der Spuy, 2009), and the South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation (Jabeen and Choudhry, 2013). However, and to be fair, some have questioned the ontological status of particular spatial scales, with the literature on transnational organised crime being exemplary here. Indeed, Bowling's and Sheptycki's reference to `the glocal' (2012: 25) draws inspiration from a number of scholars who eschew the metaphorical language of transnationalism and regard the notion of `the global' as a fiction in the context of networked, criminal markets (Edwards and Gill, 2002; Hobbs, 1998a,b); as Hobbs notes, `(o)rganised crime is not experienced globally or transnationally, for these are abstract fields devoid of social relations' (1998a: 419).

While I am sympathetic to Hobbs's (and others') analysis, I am not persuaded by it as a rejoinder to scalar reasoning for two main reasons. Firstly, he retains the kinds of thinking which envision scale as a vertical nesting of spatial units; that is, he follows a number of human geographers (Brenner, 2005; Swyngedouw, 2004) in proposing a structurationist response to the local-global paradigm which, while introducing numerous neologisms to capture the relationalities of scale – such as `glocalization, glurbanization …. scaled places, virtual regions, polynucleated cities …. global city hierarchies'(Jessop *et al*, 2008: 392) – still hold onto the notion that the local can be `transcended' (Hobbs, 1998a: 419), or that the global (the regional, national) `touches down' into the local (Marston *et al*, 2005: 421). Secondly, while the notion of `the glocal' as a space of scalar intersection is welcome, it is the local which nonetheless remains the privileged site of relational convergence. Policing, it appears, is `local at all points' (Hobbs, 1998a: 419) which not only implies that localised experiences and encounters are those which `really matter' - an issue which is further explored below – but also sustains a spatial version of the macro-micro or structure-agency divide, where the former is seen as abstract, remote, objective, holistic, causal

and structuring; and the latter as lived, experiential, authentic, subjective, embedded and concrete.

Kearns (2004 found in Marston *et al*, 2005: 420) has argued to retain the language of scalar hierarchy, recognising that how events or processes are spatially framed has specific power effects. Jones (1998) makes a similar point, suggesting that to represent our perspectives as being national (global, regional, local, neighbourhood) in scope, can enhance (or, at least, alter) the political purchase of our argument. In this sense, the predominance of the local as the organising scale of policing studies, fits its political investments in localism as a primary route to engendering policing styles and practices which are democratically accountable to, and grounded in the communities served. For example, the historical geography of policing in the UK, consistently references and values its pre-modern traditions of parochialised, community-centred policing practices, such as the hue and cry, and systems of frankpledge (Rawlings, 2002). Moreover, a discourse of localism is traced across the emergence in the 19th century of metropolitan and provincial policing which, as Brogden points out, was `structured .... and formulated according to local designs' (1982: 39), through to contemporary models of neighbourhood policing which seek to facilitate greater public involvement in defining local policing needs, and reconnecting the police and the people (Gilling, 2014; Home Office, 2010). In these accounts, the local is implied as a valorised political space in which relations of proximity foster modes of policing which are knowledgeable of, visible to, and embedded within the communities and populations being policed. Notwithstanding that communities are neither stable nor homogenous, the local is nonetheless assumed as the appropriate scalar level at which (and within which) meaningful police-public encounters, interactions and experiences can be nurtured.

Away from policy-focused scholarship, the local - and related concepts such as `place', `locale', `inner-city', neighbourhood, community, district, and street - has been a key unit of spatial analysis for in-depth, case study research into the policing of particular, bounded spaces. Indicative contemporary examples of place-centred analyses are found in studies which address racialized patterns of policing practices in relation to stop and search (Bowling and Phillips, 2007), traffic violations (Capers, 2009), and drug law enforcement (Geller and Fagan, 2010). Indeed, Lynch *et al* have argued for a `robust framework of 'place'' (2013: 335) as a way of capturing `(t)he unique and historically contingent features of a given locale .... and the differential deployment of proactive law enforcement by block, street, neighbourhood and/or police `beat'' (*ibid*: 338). In a highly textured analysis of the local geography of drugs-related policing practices in San Francisco, they construct `the local' from a multi-layered reading of San Francisco as a `consumer city' (*ibid*: 340), tracking its renaissance in the wake of deindustrialization; its shifting demographic profile and population densities; the changing landscape of its built environment through gentrification, housing redevelopment and investments in civic and lifestyle amenities; and its patterns of crime and law enforcement practices. The key point is that in providing what they describe as `the specificities of place' (*ibid*: 337), Lynch *et al* identify the `*distinct* features of (the) micro-locales' (*ibid*: 341: *my emphasis*) of San Francisco, and demonstrate very persuasively how these locales expose qualitatively different policing deployments, manifest in racialized and segregative practices. In short, we can certainly agree that `place matters' (Dorling, 2001) as a political proposition; but as an endpoint of scale, it locks `the local' into an ontology of contextualised uniqueness, historicity, rootedness, identity and spatial difference.

Networked imaginaries

For many, the spatial geometries of territory, border and scale have already been unsettled by the language of networks and flows. Mark Bevir (2013) talks of a contemporary shift to decentred modes of security and governance, while others refer to the emergence of `plural', `nodal', `dispersed', `dsitributed', `multi-lateral', `post-regulatory', and `networked' policing – see, for example, Johnston and Shearing, 2003; Jones and Newburn, 2006; Loader, 2000; O'Malley and Palmer. 1996. Marked by its organisational fragmentation, networked policing, it is argued, has

reconfigured the security landscape and altered the power dynamics of the provision, delivery and regulation of policing services, moving from centralised, hierarchical, command and control models of public policing, to decentralised, non-hierarchical, multi-sited and multi-sectoral approaches where decision-making and operational practices are developed through collaborations, partnerships and interdependencies. For all that, the emergence of networked policing has been primarily represented as an institutional and administrative phenomenon born of wider processes of socio-political and geopolitical transformation such as marketization, globalization, civilianisation, neoliberalism, digitalization, and deregulation. What we are less clear about, and have barely discussed, are the geographical morphologies and spatial dynamics of the shift to decentralised modes of policing and security. When such issues are broached, policing spatialities are somewhat amorphously described as horizontal, hybridised, extensive, rhizomatic, transversal, web-like, nodal, and mediated `by a complex set of interactions linking the nodes together' (Dupont, 2004: 84). Such terms construct a spatial imaginary which not only maps networked policing across a deterriorialised, planar surface, but also aligns it with spaces of flow and movement - of people, commodities, resources, communication and information. As Smith notes, `the consequence of that ontology - where all that is solid melts into air – is a rejection of scales and boundaries altogether as globalization and world cities are too intermingled through scattered lines of humans and non-humans to be delimited in any meaningful sense' (2003: 570).

This begs the question of how `flowsters and other globetrotters' (Marston *et al*, 2005: 423) engage conceptually with, and make sense of policing spaces when there is no ontological recourse to territorialised police jurisdictions or fixed operational areas. A prominent strategy has been to jettison all reference to the areal and material qualities of space, in favour of its social and associational attributes. For example, in their reworking of citizenship in conditions of nodal governance, Shearing and Wood (2003) introduce the idea of `communal space' where the blurring of any distinction between public (state) and private (non-state and supra-state) space gives way to hybridised milieux in which affiliations, duties, expectations, rights, access, and modes of inclusion and exclusion are contingently experienced and accomplished. Preferring the notion of `denizenship' to citizenship, they talk of the spatialities of governance as `networks of trust and obligation that link individuals, collectivities, and agencies within a regulatory environment' (2003: 408). While these authors make only fleeting reference to the social capital literature (*ibid*: 408), Dupont's (2004) work is more explicitly positioned within a framework of the different forms of capital (economic, political, cultural, social and symbolic) which circulate and are mobilised within networked spaces. Networks, Dupont argues, are `infused with collaborative values, (but) they can also be construed .... as spaces of conflict and competition' (2004: 84) in which a diversity of capitals are drawn on as strategic assets and resources in ongoing interactions and continuingly shifting relationships of power. A second response has been to regard networked geographies in more metaphorical terms, as spaces of potential and opportunity in which the possibilities for realising different styles and modes of policing can be nurtured, developed and rendered `more thinkable' (Shearing and Johnston, 2005: 160). I am thinking especially here of Shearing's and Wood's (2003) advocacy of local capacity policing exemplified by the Zwelethemba model; widely reported across several publications (Johnston and Shearing, 2003; Wood and Shearing, 2007), Zwelethemba promotes security governance and community dispute resolution through local capacity-building which not only harnesses `the values of democracy as well as features of contemporary governing sensibilities such as the importance of local knowledges and capacities' (Shearing and Wood, 2003: 416), but also foregrounds `a focus on the future rather than the past in resolving problems' (*ibid*: 416). Indeed, Jennifer Wood borrows from Parker and Braithwaite (2003: 144 cited in Wood, 2004: 40) to neatly capture the promise of networked spaces as sites of `democratic experimentalism' (*ibid*: 42) which encourage us to ask how best to `make a better tomorrow' (*ibid*: 42).

For all that, the networked policing scholarship has difficulty in proceeding without the safety net of conventional topographical bearings. As Loader and Walker note, despite the fanfare and language of flows, transnationalism, multi-lateralization and horizontality, networked accounts remain `focused on security governance within the boundaries of nation-states and (have) next to

nothing of detail to say about the spread of networks across national frontiers' (2004: 223). Similarly, Shearing has argued for a `conceptual framework which (is) not tied exclusively to any particular time-space period' (2004: 6). Yet, the spatialities of national jurisdictions (in particular) continue to organise our understanding of the variegated manifestations of networked approaches across the globe. So, for example, in their edited volume on plural policing in `comparative perspective', Jones and Newburn (2006) have collated contributing papers in terms of discrete national frameworks such as the Netherlands, France, UK, Brazil, Greece, Japan, and Australia. I make this point not as criticism of this important and highly nuanced research, but to highlight the paradoxes and pitfalls of navigating a horizontal landscape using vertical coordinates. However, holding onto the handrail of `inherited territorial, place-based and scalar formations' (Jessop *et al*, 2008: 391) reflects, for me, not solely the failure of ontology but also a lack of political imagination. Dupont has rightly observed that how we engage with traditional political questions of accountability, performance management, responsiveness, effectiveness, and procedural propriety, is not yet `adapted to the morphology of security networks' (2004: 83). As he points out, in the absence of a regulatory framework which is attuned to the fluidities of deterritorialised policing practices, we are reliant on `the pervasion of a hierarchical vertical mentality among evaluators' (*ibid*: 83).

The burgeoning scholarship on networked security signals the complexities of policing's socio-spatial alignments, but the thorny issue of how we account for policing's spatialities which are, on the one hand, regarded as motile and deterritorialised within flowing, horizontal, web-like formations and, on the other, constructed as bounded, emplaced and territorialised within a nested scalar hierarchy, is not resolved. Moreover, as discussed above, simply falling back on the familiar ground of territories, borders, scales and places, which are fraught with their own ontological and political shortcomings, is not really an option if we are to take policing's spatial imaginaries seriously. There is, then, a strong case for being more spatially curious in our analyses of contemporary policing arrangements. Two-hundred and fifty years ago, Beccaria warned us that `(i)t is not possible to reduce the turbulent activity of men (*sic*) to a geometric order devoid of irregularity and confusion' (Beccaria, 2008[1764]: 79). If nothing else, the foregoing discussion would suggest that Beccaria's point is well made, but this does also depend on the form of geometry he had in mind. What we can say is that criminological allegiances to Euclidian geometries, which cohere around questions of distance, area, volume, perimeters, vertices, lines, planes, grids and scales, may be misplaced when they so manifestly fail to make sense of the complex geographies of policing landscapes. So, what if we invested in a different kind of geometry, one which gave us the epistemological and conceptual wherewithal to think and talk about policing spaces as folded, twisted, stretched, continuous and entangled? In the remainder of the paper, I take stock of a range of insights generated by the `spatial turn' within human geography, and use this firstly, to identify and explore a framework for spatial analysis premised on post-Euclidian principles; and secondly, to delineate an alternative ontological framework to signal the difference that a relational reading of policing spatialities can make.

Policing and the topological imagination

In contrast to criminologists, human geographers take space very seriously and have `turned' from absolutist, to relative, to relational understandings of space in an ever-changing and ongoing quest to capture both theoretically and empirically, the complexities and ambiguities of spatial life – see Jessop *et al* (2008: 390-392) for a summary. Relational perspectives are not homogenous – any more than they are universally welcomed (Elden, 2011) – and neither are they cut from the same theoretical cloth, with structuration (Swyngedouw, 2004; Brenner, 2005), dialectical materialist/Lefebvrian (Merrifield, 1993), assemblage (McFarlane, 2011), and actor-network (Smith, 2003) theories all making an appearance within differently inflected frameworks. Here, I want to focus on those accounts which are inspired by topological approaches to space and the non-Euclidian (or post-Euclidian) geometries upon which they rest. This, then, aligns the discussion

with the growing number of relational geographies inspired by Deleuze, DeLanda, Schatzki, and Latour, amongst others.

Leibniz's work in non-Euclidean geometry and calculus – *Monadology* (1714) - is frequently cited as the originary inspiration for the `topological turn' in the social sciences, and in human geography in particular (Allen, 2011a,b; Dainton, 2001; Jones, 2009; Massey, 2005). Others refer to a mathematical lineage of topological thinking traced through the 19th century studies of Gauss (1777-1855), Reimann (1826-1866), Poincaré (1854-1912), and Klein (1849-1925) (Martin and Secor, 2013; Merzbach and Boyer, 2011). The key point here is not to reconstruct the provenance of what Allen describes `as a form of qualitative geometry' (2011b: 316) , so much as explore what this branch of mathematics has to say on the nature of space and, more importantly, how topological thinking has informed the development of poststructuralist (relational) notions of space and spatialities. In their account of the history of mathematics, Merzbach and Boyer define topology as `the study of (the) intrinsic qualitative aspects of spatial configurations that remain invariant under continuous one-to-one transformations' (2011: 553). There are numerous figural metaphors in circulation which attempt to capture this definition in material form – from the Möbius strip and the Klein bottle, to coffee cups, doughnuts, handkerchiefs, rubber sheets, and elastic bands. To explain: if we consider a handkerchief as a neatly ironed, flat surface, this represents a geometric landscape of fixed corners, clearly defined edges, and measurable coordinates of proximity and distance; once crumpled in a pocket, this same handkerchief loses its calculability – corners meet, edges are lost, distance and proximity collapse as cotton threads, previously arranged in a symmetrical, linear weave, are now traced through the peaks and troughs, and loose folds of undulating irregularities. Think also of an elastic band which can be infinitely twisted and stretched, changing its size and shape with each manipulation; the point here is that no matter how many times it is contorted, its constituent hydrocarbons `hold together', and the elastic band retains its integrity as a discrete object. Handkerchiefs and elastic bands illustrate two key topological ideas: the first allows for the possibility of thinking of space in non-linear, non-metric terms; and the second encourages us to recognise that measuring the distances between objects, or calculating their volume and area, is less important than understanding *how* things hold together in a singular space. As Martin and Secor put it:

> `Topologists thus treat figures as manifolds – spaces whose coordinates are not extrinsic, as in a line embedded within a Cartesian grid, but rather intrinsic to the surface itself – and focus on what aspects of a figure remain constant …… when the surface is bent, stretched, or rotated, but not cut or augmented' (2013: 423).

The recent importation of topological thinking into social science in general, and human geography in particular, is reflected in the proliferation of special issues dedicated to this innovative strand of inquiry. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* (2004, 22[1]), *Dialogues in Human Geography* (2011, 1[3]), *Theory, Culture and Society* (2012, 29[4-5]), and *Space and Culture* (2013, 16[2]), have all hosted collected papers which make sense of the world through topological frameworks, with sociology, philosophy, psychology, computer science, cultural studies, science and technology studies, human geography, and urban studies all represented in this scholarship. Moreover, the pre-war work of Lewin (1936) and Lundberg (1939) suggests that for psychology and sociology (respectively), there is an even longer trajectory of topologically-inspired analyses. In its post-mathematical iterations, topological approaches certainly introduce `promising vocabularies' (Allen, 2011b: 317) which change the way we talk about space, but this understates how this kind of relational thinking can (re)ignite our critical imaginations and refocus our analytical attention in innovative and productive ways. Criminology and policing studies have been slow to take space seriously and have not yet dipped any conceptual toes into (the now) swirling topological waters; to paraphrase Massumi (2002: 21), the point is not that criminologists should now become geographers and mathematicians, but to borrow from these disciplines in order to make a difference in ways we are unaccustomed to.

With remarkable insight (and foresight) Foucault's reflections on the relationalities of space, originally expressed in the 1960s[2], prefigure the `topological turn' in spatial analyses, more frequently aligned with Deleuzian thought; as Foucault notes:

> `The space in which we live, which draws us out of ourselves, in which the erosion of our lives, our time and our history occurs, the space that claws and knaws at us, is also, in itself, a heterogeneous space. In other words, we do not live in a kind of void, inside of which we could place individuals and things. We do not live inside a void that could be colored with diverse shades of light, we live inside a set of relations that delineates sites which are irreducible to one another and absolutely not superimposable on one another' (Foucault, 1986: 23).

Foucault's words capture very neatly a way of spatial thinking which recasts territories, borders, scales and networks as `spatial formations of continuously changing composition, character and reach …. summoned up as temporary placements of ever moving material and immanent geographies …. as situated moments' (Amin, 2004: 34).  The notion of relational space as a meeting point, as `articulated moments in networks of social relations and understandings' (Massey, 1994: 154) is not to be confused with a place on the map – it does not equate to a cartographic reference at a point of linear intersection. Rather, as Thrift reminds us, `every space is shot through with other spaces' (2006: 140); spaces are porous so there are no boundaries; every space is in constant motion – `process is all in that it is all that there is' (*ibid*: 141); and there is no singular kind of space - `(s)pace comes in many guises: points, planes, parabolas; blots, blurs, blackouts' (*ibid*: 141).  In Deleuzian terms, space is always-already `becoming', it is a multiplicity and is immanent in the folding and hybridisation of bodies, affects, knowledges and things;[3] as Colebrook notes, `(e)ach located observer is the opening of a fold, a world folded around its contemplations and rhythms.  There are as many spaces or folds as there are styles of perception' (2005: 190).  Delanda talks of spaces as `zones of intensity' (2005: 80) which are indivisible but whose differences are productive of change and transformation in our apprehension of `extensive space'.  He explains: `*intensive differences are productive* …. wherever one finds an extensive frontier (for example, the skin which defines the extensive boundary of our bodies) there is always a process driven by intensive differences which produced such a boundary (for example, the embryological process which creates our bodies, driven by differences in chemical concentration, among other things' (*ibid*: 81: *original emphasis*). This way of thinking foregrounds space as continually in-the-making, assembled and disassembled as `an experimental matrix of heterogeneous elements, techniques and concepts' (Rabinow, 2003: 56); and it signals an object-centred approach to analysis which, in line with Latourian actor-network theory,[4] acknowledges agential symmetry across human/non-human, corporeal/material, natural/artificial, cultural/technological actors and actants. Topological accounts, then, emphasise multiplicities, movement, foldings, relationalities, intensities, hybridisation and immanence. Even so, Marston *et al* caution that the world is not `simply awash in fluidities' (2005: 423) and note that generative flows of bodies and matter (sooner or later) encounter blockages, assemblages and coagulations that `congeal in space and social life' (*ibid*: 423). These authors make use of Deleuze's (2004) concept of `the cliché' to capture emergence, or the opening out of a fold in the midst of force relations which cluster, constrain, stabilise and normativise practice.  Similarly, Jones talks of `phase space', and concedes that spatial immanence will inevitably encounter `bounded spaces …. institutionalized through particular struggles' (2009: 501); while Chettiparamb (2013) introduces the notion of `fractal space' to signify that even given the potential for endless variations, spatial relations may nonetheless cohere and assemble in repetitive ways. As Deleuze and Guattari put it, `(n)ever believe that smooth space will suffice to save us' (1987: 500).

---

[2] `Of other spaces' (1986), was first published in French,`Des espaces autres', in October, 1984, in the French journal, *Architecture-Mouvement-Continuité*; the essay was originally the basis of a lecture given by Foucault in March, 1967. See Foucault, 1986: n1.

[3] See, for example, Deleuze and Guattari, 1987; Deleuze, 1994.

[4] See, for example, Latour, 2005.

Site ontology

In their rejection of transcendent, topographical imaginaries, topological schema invite `an analytics of composition and decomposition …… of differential relations actualized as temporary – often mobile - `sites' in which the `social' unfolds' (Marston *et al*, 2005: 423). Indeed, Sallie Marston and colleagues (Jones *et al*, 2007; Marston *et al*, 2005; Woodward *et al*, 2010) have been at the forefront of delineating the contours of a `site ontology' informed by Schatzki's (2002) work on the topological social. They propose four methodological orientations which collectively provide an entry point for exploring `the terrain of situated practices enmeshed in and unfolding through sites' (Woodward *et al*, 2010: 271). Here, I can only signal the difference which a site ontology of policing spaces might entail. Firstly, rather than set out with a set of abstract spatial categories, such as neighbourhood policing, crime scene investigation, or national jurisdiction, analyses should `start with (an) unfolding state of affairs' (Woodward *et al*, 2010: 274) and the situatedness of bodies, events, doings, sayings and things which, in complex and fluid movements, converge, jostle, disassemble and reassemble to `carve out a specific materiality' (*ibid*: 274, *original emphasis*). Importantly, this is not about shifting epistemological gears from deduction to induction but is more about an openness to the contingencies of spatial formation, and a speculative eye for how policing spaces emerge from the dynamics of a relational field. In other words, site ontology does not presuppose that policing and security practices control, protect, investigate and partition spaces which are already `in the world' but, rather, lie at the heart of the *production of space*. For example, urban geographers have been particularly critical of the confluence of the militarisation, privatisation, urbanisation and marketization of security practices, and note how urban spaces have become newly forged as `battlespaces' (Graham, 2009), as `cities under siege' (Graham, 2010), and as `the `home front' of new testing grounds for military weaponry and tactics of war' (Kitchen and Rygiel, 2014: 212). At the same time, topologically-oriented political theorists have reflected on the way that the securitisation of mega-events – such as the Olympics, FIFA World Cups, G8 and G20 summits – provide opportunities to refashion `the city' as a showcase site which weaves together the demands of security and surveillance with those of business investment, economic development, cultural enterprise, and cosmopolitanism – see, for example, Boyle and Haggerty 2009; Kitchen and Rygiel 2014. Put another way, in our specification of the site and the production of space, we should keep in mind, as Mezzadra and Neilson note, that `(t)he calculus of these relations is (always) played out against a political edge' (2012: 60).

Secondly, if we reject the transcendental abstractions of territorialised, bordered, scaled and networked policing spaces, then we should also resist the lure of populating such spaces with precoded policing subjects and technologies, such as `police decision-maker', `investigating officer', `white (IC1) male', `European arrest warrant', `stop and search', `interagency partnerships', and `shared databases'. As Woodward *et al* (2010) comment, such categories encode bodies and things with a specific politicality (political potential) with the result that `nothing is `surprising' when 'politics' takes place' (2008: np, cited in 2010: 275). In contrast, a close specification of the site remains open to the grounded materialities, fluid subjectivities and political actualities of all manner of unfolding relations which cannot be known in advance. A good example of how a topologically-informed site ontology is put to work as an analytics alive to political complexities, is found in Mezzadra's and Neilson's (2012) migration research. Developing an approach which they refer to as `border as method', Mezzadra and Neilson question the inclusionary/exclusionary binary of bordering practices and the politics of citizenship which are conventionally mapped by a nation-state logic of political membership and identity – see also McNevin (2014). Here, rights-bearing subjectivities of belonging are jettisoned in favour of what they describe as `differential inclusion' facilitated by a mixed economy of filtering and selection technologies – household registration; clandestine labour mobilities; points-based entry systems; offshore, outsourced detention facilities; cooperation in deportation procedures; visa policing; and surveillance of migratory routes - operating `beyond the territorial edges of formally unified political spaces' (2012: 68). As they powerfully argue, this results in the `disarticulation of the space of citizenship' (*ibid*: 70) and `a certain folding of space which brings remote and forgotten locations – islands, deserts, metropolitan peripheries, hidden parts of airports and ports – into topological

proximity with the conspicuous and visible heartlands of nation-states and political regions' (*ibid*: 68-69).

A third methodological orientation focuses our attention to the practicalities of data collection and what counts as data. Woodward *et al* talk of `methodological bricolage' which works with `what is at hand' (2010: 276); they encourage an open and experimental approach which is alert not only to the immanent processes and multiple textures of spatial composition, but also the varying conditions under which `hardenings and blockages' (*ibid*: 276) can stabilise and routinize the relational dynamics of spatial assemblages. None of this calls for a suite of new methods but it does require that researchers `think methodologically from the inside, following the intensities that enroll events and objects as well as the researcher her/himself' (*ibid*: 276). With considerable choice across a panoply of hermeneutic, interpretative methods, thinking from the inside reflects Deleuze's focus on the `middle regions' (1994: 38) where the intensive labour of spatial production is traced through dense webs of entangled and stretched capillary networks – through, for example, the narratives which are told, the feelings which are generated, and the objects which are used. Kitchen's and Rygiel's (2014) text-based research is exemplary in this respect, combining analysis of news reports, briefing notes, emails, police training manuals, and the reports of public inquiries to demonstrate how governments are implicated in the making of the `securitized city'. Similarly, Deborah Cowen's (2010) topological exploration of maritime security at the intersections of supply logistics and geopolitics, makes use of conference speeches, Department of Homeland Security reports, the programme documents of *inter alia* the Container Security Initiative (2006), the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (2002), and the International Ship and Port-Facility Security Code (2004), to show how `security recasts the border from an endpoint to a critical zone of flows – from a borderline to a `seam' space (*ibid*: 602) ..... a liminal zone between inside and outside space, where old divisions no longer hold' (*ibid*: 603)[5].

These three orientations are complemented by a fourth which cautions us away from `political commitment as a test of the practical value and applicability of social theory' (Woodward *et al*, 2010: 277). This sits uneasily in a context where the need for a `public criminology' enjoins the discipline to engage more meaningfully with both the public and policy-makers (Loader and Sparks, 2010; Turner, 2013). Yet, on closer reading, this orientation is less about being apolitical, and more concerned with tempering the scope of our political ambition. That is, Woodward *et al* question the conventional inclination to address macro-political issues which have spatially generic relevance, such as injustice, inequalities, racism, and neo-liberalism, and argue that `the political can become calcified when pre-treated with a calculus of defined-in-advance geographies of thought and action' (2010: 277). In its place, and borrowing from the Collectif Malgré Tout (CMT)[6], they advocate site over world, specific materialities over `universal processes', and a situated activist politics which is `always about chipping away at the dynamic conditions of production that circulate within the very social sites where political situations present themselves' (*ibid*: 277-278). Take, for example, research into stop and search practices, typically positioned within the politics of human rights, police discretionary power, procedural propriety, the precautionary principle, police legitimacy, and statutory frameworks – see, especially, Lennon, 2013. Moreover, as noted above, Lynch *et al* have argued persuasively for a racialized geography of discriminatory law enforcement which takes due account not only of localised patterns of stop and search but also of `the historically and culturally embedded processes that give rise to racially disparate arrest outcomes' (2013: 338). While this scholarship remains important and valuable, its `situatedness' nonetheless relies on `the macro' (discrimination, the politics of suspicion) as either a point of

---

[5] It is worth noting that critical security studies has a strong portfolio of research oriented to `methodological bricolage'. I am thinking here of recent work on security as everyday practices. Though this scholarship does not foreground the spatialising (and spatialised) relations of quotidian security, they nonetheless offer detailed analyses of how security is assembled and enacted through an *in situ* enrolment of heterogeneous actors, materialities, discourses and technologies. See, for example, Schouten, 2014; and *Security Dialogue* (2014) Special Issue on Border Security as Practice 45(1).

[6] A radical activist group founded in Paris in 1988. See: http://malgretout.collectifs.net/ , accessed 4 November 2015.

departure or an organising frame of reference; lost from view are the specific materialities of stop and search – the (mis)recognition of bodies; the (mis)interpretation of gestures, clothing, accessories, deportment and disposition; the management of personal embodied space; the interpersonal negotiation of identities; the emotionalities of social interaction; and/or the (de)stabilisation of social relations. As the CMT note:

> `It is the `world' that reduces any political action to impotence, because it removes it from concrete action …. The `world' as a totality of facts is a media illusion. There is only a multiplicity of situations each of which relates to a problem, to a concrete universal that radically distinguishes itself from the world as arbitrary totality' (1995: np, cited in Woodward *et al*, 2010: 277).[7]

Conclusion

Topological thinking opens up fruitful ways of engaging with policing spatialities in a way which not only unsettles criminology's ontological commitments to territories, borders, scales and networks, but also re-energises and redirects its critical, political efforts. Yet, in many ways, the turn to relationality in spatial analysis is not so much a novel departure as a rekindling of the criminological imagination in respect of space. That is to say, topology reminds us of the well-established notion that space emerges from the relation between things; and that continuity and change, repetition and difference are spatially accomplished. In today's more spatially ambiguous world, a re-acquaintance with this core premise has the potential to overcome the limits of topographical thinking which regards forms of policing space – the police cell, the border patrol, the airport, the city centre, and the red-light district – as pre-fabricated spatial frames, rather than as sites in which space is twisted, stretched, continuous and folded, blurring distinctions between inside/outside, proximity/distance and above/below. Schatzki's `site ontology' offers an entry point for topological work, and though Woodward *et al*'s exposition of a `site methodology' is not intended to be prescriptive, it nonetheless directs us to modes of analysis which remain alert to the immanent, generative dynamics of the `situated moments' of policing spatialities. The sites of policing are `dense event-spaces of pervasive relations in which we find ourselves constantly immersed' (Woodward et al, 2010: 278). Such sites may (appear to) be mundane and prosaic – giving directions, holding a press conference, sending an email; or extraordinary and spectacular – aerial search, dawn raids, hostage negotiation. In either case, they can be the site of potentially transformative and disruptive relations, which challenge, subvert or renegotiate the constantly shifting spatial composition of injustices, discrimination, and conflict, as well as those of trust, accountability and fairness. Enmeshed in the specific materialities and intensive interplay of bodies, knowledges, affects and things, policing spaces are continually `in the making', reconfiguring in (sometimes) remarkable ways the complex geographies of (geo)political landscapes.

References

Aas KF (2011) `Crimmigrant' bodies and bona fide travellers: surveillance, citizenship and global governance. *Theoretical Criminology* 15(3): 331-346.

Adey P (2010) Vertical security in the megacity: legibility, mobility and aerial politics. *Theory, Culture and Society* 27(6): 51-67.

Albert M and Brock L (1996) Debordering the world of states: new spaces in international relations. *New Political Science* 18(1): 69-106.

---

[7] *Manifeste du Collectif Malgré Tout* (*Manifesto of the Malgré Tout Collective*), 1995, can be found here: http://malgretout.collectifs.net/spip.php?article20 Original in French. Accessed 6 November 2015.

Allen J (2011a) Topological twists: power's shifting geographies. *Dialogues in Human Geography* 1(3): 283-298.

Allen J (2011b) Making space for topology. *Dialogues in Human Geography* 1(3): 316-318.

Amin A (2004) Regions unbound: towards a new politics of place. *Geografiska Annaler, Series B* 86: 33-44.

Amoore L (2006) Biometric borders: governing mobilities in the war on terror. *Political Geography* 25: 336-351.

Bayley D and Shearing C (2001) *The New Structure of Policing: Description, Conceptualization, and Research Agenda*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Beccaria C (2008[1764]) *On Crimes and Punishments and Other Writings*. Translated by Aaron Thomas and Jeremy Parzen. Edited by Aaron Thomas. Totonto: University of Toronto Press.

Bevir M (2013) *A Theory of Governance*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bowling B and Phillips C (2007) Disproportionate and discriminatory: reviewing the evidence on police stop and search. *Modern Law Review* 70: 936-961.

Bowling B and Sheptycki JWE (2012) *Global Policing*. London: Sage.

Boyle P and Haggerty KD (2009) Spectacular security: mega-events and the security complex. *International Political Sociology* 3(3): 257-274.

Brenner N (2005) *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Brogden M (1982) *The Police: Autonomy and Consent*. London: Academic Press.

Capers B (2009) Policing, race and place. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review* 44: 43-78.

Chettiparamb A (2013) Fractal spatialities. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 31: 680-692.

Colebrook C (2005) The space of man: on the specificity of affect in Deleuze and Guattari. In Buchanan I and Lambert G (eds.) *Deleuze and Space*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 189-206.

Cowen D (2010) A geography of logistics: market authority and the security of supply chains. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 100(3): 600-620.

Crampton J (2010) Cartographic calculations of territory. *Progress in Human Geography* 35(1): 92-103.

Dainton B (2001) *Time and Space*. Chesham: Acumen.

Delanda M (2005) Space: extensive and intensive, actual and virtual. In Buchanan I and Lambert G (eds.) *Deleuze and Space*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 80-88.

Delaney D and Leitner H (1997) The political construction of scale. *Political Geography* 16: 93-97.

Deleuze G (1994) *Difference and Repetition*. Translated by Paul Patton. London: Athlone.

Deleuze G (2004) *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation*. Translated by DW Smith. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze G and Guattari F (1987) *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Den Boer M (2014) Police, policy and politics in Brussels: scenarios for the shift from sovereignty to solidarity. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 27(1): 48-65.

Dorling D (2001) How much does place matter? *Environment and Planning A* 33: 1335-1340.

Dupont B (2004) Security in the age of networks. *Policing and Society* 14(1): 76-91.

Edwards A and Gill P (2002) The politics of `transnational organized crime': discourse, reflexivity and the narration of `threat'. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 4(2): 245-270.

Elden S (2011) What's shifting? *Dialogues in Human Geography* 1(3): 304-307.

Elden S (2013) Secure the volume: vertical geopolitics and the depth of power. *Political Geography* 34: 35-51.

England M (2008) When `good neighbours' go bad: territorial geographies of neighbourhood associations. *Environment and Planning A* 40: 2879-2894.

Foucault M (1986) Of other spaces. *Diacritics* 16(1): 22-27.

Geller A and Fagan J (2010) Pot as pretext: marijuana, race and the new disorder in New York City street policing. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies* 7: 591-633.

Giddens A (1985) *The Nation State and Violence*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gilling D (2014) Reforming police governance in England and Wales: managerialisation and the politics of organisational regime change. *Policing and Society* 24(1): 81-101.

Graham S (2009) The Urban `Battlespace'. *Theory, Culture and Society* 26(7-8): 278-288.

Graham S (ed.)(2010) *Cities Under Siege: The New Military Urbanism*. London: Verso.

Hayward K (2004) *City Limits: Crime, Consumer Culture and the Urban Experience*. London: Glasshouse Press.

Hayward K (2012) Five spaces of criminology. *British Journal of Criminology* 52(3): 441-462.

HMIC (2005) *Closing the Gap: A Review of the `Fitness for Purpose' of the Current Structure of Policing in England and Wales*. London: Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary.

Hobbs D (1998a) Going down the glocal: the local context of organised crime. *Howard Journal* 37(4): 407-422.

Hobbs D (1998b) Debate: there is not a global crime problem. *International Journal of Risk, Security and Crime Prevention* 3(2): 139-146.

Holdaway S (1983) *Inside the British Police: A Force at Work*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Home Office (2010) *Policing in the 21st Century: Reconnecting Police and People*. London: Home Office.

Howitt R (2002) Scale and the other: Levinas and geography. *Geoforum* 33: 299-313.

Jabeen M and Choudhry IA (2013) Role of SAARC for countering terrorism in South Asia. *South Asian Studies* 28(2): 389-403.

Jessop B, Brenner N and Jones M (2008) Theorizing sociospatial relations. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26: 389-401.

Johnston L and Shearing C (2003) *Governing Security: Explanations in Policing and Justice*. London: Routledge.

Jones T and Newburn T (eds)(2006) *Plural Policing: A Comparative Perspective*. London: Routledge.

Jones III JP, Woodward K and Marston SA (2007) Situating flatness. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers NS* 32: 264-276.

Jones K (1998) Scale as epistemology. *Political Geography* 17: 25-28.

Jones M (2009) Phase space: geography, relational thinking, and beyond. *Progress in Human Geography* 33(4): 487-506.

Kearns G (2004) Personal communication to authors. Found in Marston *et al*, 2005: 420.

Kitchen V and Rygiel K (2014) Privatizing security, securitizing policing: the case of the G20 in Toronto, Canada. *International Political Sociology* 8: 201-217.

Latour B (2005) *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lefebvre H (1995) *Writings on Cities: Henri Lefebvre*. Translated by E Kofman and E Lebas. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lennon G (2013) Precautionary tales: suspicionless counter-terrorism stop and search. *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 15(1): 44-62.

Lewin K (1936) *Principles of Topological Psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Loader I (2000) Plural policing and democratic governance. *Social and Legal Studies* 9(3): 323-345.

Loader I and Sparks R (2010) *Public Criminology*. London: Routledge.

Loader I and Walker N (2004) States of denial? Rethinking the governance of security. *Punishment and Society* 6(2): 221-228.

Loftus B (2015) Border regimes and the sociology of policing. *Policing and Society* 25(1): 115-125.

Loveday B (2006) *Size Isn't Everything: Restructuring Policing in England and Wales.* London: Policy Exchange.

Lundberg G A (1939) *Foundations of Sociology*. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Lussault M (2007) *L'Homme Spatial: La Construction Sociale de L'Espace Humain*. Paris: Seuil.

Lynch M, Omori M, Roussell A and Valasik M (2013) Policing the `progressive' city: the racialized geography of drug law enforcement. *Theoretical Criminology* 17(3): 335-337.

Lyon D (ed.)(2002) *Surveillance as Social Sorting: Privacy, Risk and Digital Discrimination*. London: Routledge.

Marston S and Smith N (2001) States, scales and households, limits to scale? A response to Brenner. *Progress in Human Geography* 25: 615-629.

Marston S, Jones III JP and Woodward K (2005) Human geography without scale. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers New Series* 30: 416-432.

Martin L and Secor A (2013) Towards a post-mathematical topology. *Progress in Human Geography* 38(3): 420-438.

Marx GT (2013) Some conceptual issues in the study of borders and surveillance. In Zureik E and Salter M (eds.) *Global Surveillance and Policing*. London: Taylor and Francis, 11-35.

Massey D (1994) *Space, Place and Gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Massey D (2005) *For Space.* London: Sage.

Massumi B (2002) *Parables of the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

McFarlane C (2011) The city as assemblage: dwelling and urban space. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 29: 649-671.

McLaughlin E (2007) *The New Policing*. London: Sage.

McNevin A (2014) Beyond territoriality: rethinking human mobility, border security and geopolitical space from the Indonesian island of Bintan. *Security Dialogue* 45(3): 295-310.

Merrifield A (1993) Place and space: a Lefebvrian reconciliation. *Transactions of the British Institute of Geographers* NS 18: 516-531.

Merzbach U C and Boyer C B (2011) *A History of Mathematics*. Third Edition. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Mezzadra S and Neilson B (2012) Between inclusion and exclusion: on the topology of global space and borders. *Theory, Culture and Society* 29(4-5): 58-75.

Miraftab F (2012) Colonial present: legacies of the past in contemporary urban practices in Cape Town, South Africa. *Journal of Planning History* 11: 283-307.

Ogborn M (1993) Ordering the city: surveillance, public space and the reform of urban policing in England 1835-56. *Political Geography* 12(6): 505-521.

O'Malley P and Palmer D (1996) Post-Keynesian policing. *Economy and Society* 25(2): 137-155.

Paasche TF, Yarwood R and Sidaway JD (2014) Territorial tactics: the socio-spatial significance of private policing strategies in Cape Town. *Urban Studies* 51(8): 1559-1575.

Pain R (2014) Everyday terrorism: connecting domestic violence and global terrorism. *Progress in Human Geography* 38(4): 531-550.

Palmer D and Warren I (2014) The pursuit of exclusion through banning. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology* 47(3): 429-446.

Paperman P (2003) Surveillance underground: the uniform as an interaction device. *Ethnography* 4(3): 397-419.

Parker C and Braithwaite J (2003) Regulation. In Cane P and Tushnet M (eds.) *Oxford Handbook of Legal Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 119-145.

Pickering S and Ham J (2013) Hot pants at the border: sorting sex work from trafficking. *British Journal of Criminology* 54(1): 2-19.

Pratt A (2005) *Securing Borders: Detention and Deportation in Canada*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

Punch M (1979) *Policing the Inner City: A Study of Warmoesstraat*. London: Macmillan.

Rabinow P (2003) *Anthropos Today*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rawlings P (2002) *Policing: A Short History*. Cullompton: Willan.

Savage S (2007) *Police Reform: Forces for Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schatzki T (2002) *The Site of the Social: A Political Account of the Constitution of Social Life and Change*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Schouten P (2014) Security as controversy: reassembling security at Amsterdam Airport. *Security Dialogue* 45(1): 23-42.

Schuilenburg M (2015) *The Securitization of Society: Crime, Risk and Social Order*. Translated by George Hall. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Shearing C (2004) Thoughts on sovereignty. *Policing and Society* 14(1): 5-12.

Shearing C and Wood J (2003) Nodal governance, democracy, and the new `denizens'. *Journal of Law and Society* 30(3): 400-419.

Sloterdijk P (2004) *Sphären III: Schäume, Plurale Sphärologie* Frankfurt Am Main: Suhrkamp.

Sloterdijk P (2011[1998]) *Bubbles: Spheres I: Microspherology*. Translated by Wieland Hoban. Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e).

Sloterdijk P (2014[1999]) *Globes: Spheres II: Macrospherology* . Translated by Wieland Hoban. Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e).

Smith R G (2003) World city topologies. *Progress in Human Geography* 27: 561-582.

Steedman C (1984) *Policing the Victorian Community: The Formation of English Provincial Forces, 1856-1880*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Swyngedouw E (2004) Scaled geographies: nature, place and the politics of scale. In Sheppard E and McMaster RB (eds.) *Scale and Geographic Inquiry*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 129-153.

Thrift N (2006) Space. *Theory, Culture and Society* 23(2-3): 139-155.

Turner E (2013) Beyond `facts' and `values': rethinking some recent debates about the role of public criminology. *British Journal of Criminology* 53(1): 149-166.

Van der Spuy E (2009) Police cooperation in the Southern African region: politics and practicalities. *Crime, Law and Social Change* 51: 243-259.

Wall T and Monahan T (2011) Surveillance and violence from afar: the politics of drones and liminal security scapes. *Theoretical Criminology* 15(3): 239-254.

Weber L and Bowling B (2004) Policing migration: a framework for investigating the regulation of global mobility. *Policing and Society* 14(3): 195-212.

Weber M (1966) *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. New York: Pantheon.

Weizman E (2002) Maps. In *The Politics of Verticality* – a sequence of 11 open access, short articles found at: www.opendemocracy.net/ecology-politicsverticality/article_631.jsp   accessed 25 April 2015.

Wood J (2004) Cultural change in the governance of security. *Policing and Society* 14(1): 31-48.

Wood J and Shearing C (2007) *Imagining Security*. Cullompton: Willan.

Woodward K, Marston SA and Jones III JP (2008) On autonomous spaces. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *Association of American Geographers*, Boston, MA.

Woodward K, Jones III JP and Marston SA (2010) Of eagles and flies: orientations toward the site. *Area* 42(3): 271-280.

Zedner L (2009) *Security*. Oxford: Routledge.

Zureik E and Salter M (eds.)(2013) *Global Surveillance and Policing*. London: Taylor and Francis.