

Writing Methods

Encountering Secrecy and 'Mess' in Security Research

EISA Early Career Researchers Workshop for PhDs and post-docs

10 September 2019

Sofia University, Sveti Kliment Ohridski - Bulevard Tsar Osvoboditel, 15



Convened by

Tasniem Anwar (T.Anwar@uva.nl)

Esmé Bosma (Esmé.Bosma@uva.nl)

Pieter Lagerwaard (P.Lagerwaard@uva.nl)

University of Amsterdam, Department of Political Science.

<https://www.projectfollow.org/>



Contents

Aims and objectives	3
Outline of the workshop	5
Programme	7
Abstracts	10
Panel 1: Any Road Will (Not?) Take You There	10
Panel 2: After Mess	13
Panel 3: Writing Credible Research Accounts.....	17
Biographies	20



Aims and objectives

In recent years, there has been a considerable interest in research methods in (critical) security studies.¹ Security researchers often operate in secretive or sensitive environments in which research may be subjected to rapid changes as well as to mundane challenges such as bureaucratic delay.² Although the literature offers creative, experimental and reflexive method(ologie)s to deal with the challenges of doing security research, limited attention has so far been given to the writing of methodology. How can we deal with research dilemmas, challenging methodological questions and what should we include in the writing of our methodology sections, when the research entailed unpredictable and ‘messy’ circumstances?³

The workshop aims to make these challenging methodological questions visible and up for discussion. We invite participants to share their (personal) research and writing experiences, including those that might *not* have worked well, and to reflect

¹ Aradau, C. et al. (eds.) (2014). *Critical Security Methods: New Frameworks for Analysis*. New York: Routledge; De Goede, M., Bosma, E. Pallister-Wilkins, P. (eds.) (2019). *Secrecy and Methods in Security Research. A Guide to Qualitative Fieldwork*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge; Salter, M.B. & Mutlu, C. B. (eds.) (2013) *Research Methods in Critical Security Studies: An Introduction*. New York: Routledge.

² Belcher, O. & Martin, L.L. (2013) “Ethnographies of closed doors: Conceptualising openness and closure in US immigration and military institutions”, *Area*, 45(4), 403-410.

³ Law, J. (2004). *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*. New York: Routledge; Squire, V. (2013) “Attuning to Mess” in Mark B. & Can E. Mutlu (Eds.) *Research Methods in Critical Security Studies: An Introduction*. Abingdon: Routledge.



and discuss which experiences may or may not end up in their written accounts. In writing about and *with* secrecy, Brian Rappert addresses the issue of encountering secrecy in security research and explores the (ethical) limitations of auto-ethnography and what is revealed or concealed. In order to “convey the lived experience” he proposes an “overall strategy of exemplifying the negotiation of revelation and concealment experienced by researchers”.⁴ Which strategies, dilemmas and encounters we actually write up depends on confidentiality, research ethics and integrity, but may also differ between academic disciplines, research topic and personal writing preferences.

Going beyond sharing experiences, the crucial point is to explore how early career researchers can practically capture in methodological writing the secrecy, unpredictability and messiness that is part and parcel of security research. We ask participants to pay attention to the (dis)continuities of doing security research: the moments where access is denied or endlessly delayed; the issue of secrecy, confidentiality and obscured data; and the ethical and political dilemmas that researchers face during data collection and after. When can we make ‘disrupting’ moments explicit and productive in our analysis and when should we leave them out?

⁴ Rappert, B. (2010) “Revealing and concealing secrets in research: the potential for the absent”, *Qualitative Research*, 10(5), 571–587; see also Rappert, B. (2019) “Writing Secrecy” and De Goede, M. “Secrecy Vignettes” in Marieke de Goede, Esmé Bosma & Polly Pallister-Wilkins (eds.) *Secrecy and Methods in Security Research. A Guide to Qualitative Fieldwork*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.



Outline of the workshop

The workshop commences with a keynote by Claudia Aradau, Professor of International Politics at King's College London, who conducts research in the areas of critical security studies, international political sociology, (non)knowledge, (Big) Data, algorithms and digital devices. She is co-editor of *Critical Security Methods: New Frameworks for Analysis*.

The panels (roughly) follow the course of doing research. The first panel reflects on the many challenges of finding access to the security field; the second on the question of how to deal with the 'mess' that is part and parcel to data collection; and the third on the consequences of secretive and messy contexts for the "truthfulness" of our data(publications).

Panel 1: Any Road Will (Not?) Take You There.

Sites of security research are often secretive, obscure, and difficult to access. During this panel we will focus on the (non)linearity of access and power relations in the field. How do we as researchers negotiate the various power relations of getting into high places, and write this into our research? How do we attune our strategies to specific security fields? During the panel there is also explicit room to discuss how we can reflect and write about the moments of rejection, uncertainty and confusion in the process of getting access.



Panel 2: After Mess

In his work 'After Method' John Law raises questions about the 'mess, confusion and relative disorder' that are part of social science research. This panel pushes further by also thinking about what happens 'after mess'. Panellists are invited to bring to the floor a fieldwork experience seemingly defying any kind of structure, coherence, or logic. What kind of mess is revealed or concealed during the research process, and what parts do you take into account while writing the methodology? Did one consider novel ways for research and writing, or ignored the mess and chucked it in the bin, where mess belongs?

Panel 3: Writing Credible Research Accounts

When we acknowledge that security research often takes place in a messy, secretive or ambiguous context; how can we make sense of our research experiences and write 'truthful' research accounts? This panel invites participants to reflect on the way in which they communicate their research strategies, experiences and findings. What is a credible and/or convincing research account and how to write one?

This Early Career Workshop is part of PEC19 in Sofia and will take place the day before the general conference. The workshop is made possible through funding of the EISA PEC and with additional funding of European Research Council (ERC) project FOLLOW: Following the Money from Transaction to Trial (CoG—682317) led by Prof. dr. Marieke de Goede. For more information, see www.projectfollow.org and on twitter @FOLLOW_ERC.



Programme

- 8:30-8:45 Coffee and welcome
- 8:45-9:00 **Welcome/ Room 255**
Jef Huysmans, EISA (Queen Mary University of London)
- 09:00-10:30 **Keynote lecture: Neither secret nor black-boxed? 'Methods of the surface' in critical security studies / Room 243**
Claudia Aradau (King's College London)
- Studies of security practices often problematise methods in relation to the challenges of secrecy and black boxing. This talk proposes to problematize secrecy and black-boxing by developing 'methods of the surface'. It asks what the methodological orientation to the 'surface' entails for how we research and write about security practices.
- 10:30-11:00 Coffee break
- 11:00-12:30 **Panel 1: Any Road Will (Not?) Take You There / Room 243**
Chair/discussant: Tasniem Anwar (University of Amsterdam)



The Process of Getting Access

Lilly Pijnenburg Muller (Kings College London)

Attuning to Secrecy through Surface Appearances

Jasper van der Kist (University of Manchester)

Power Hierarchies from Below – Access Limitations at the Subaltern Level of Security

Marco Krüger (University of Tübingen)

12:30-13:30 Lunch

13:30-15:30 **Panel 2: After Mess / Room 243**

Chair/discussant: Pieter Lagerwaard
(University of Amsterdam)

Embracing the Messiness: Reflections on Researching Security and Sexual Violence through Diaries.

Sofia Doyle (University of Manchester)

Research “under surveillance” - reflections from ethnographic research in Polish migrant detention centres

Maciej Stepka (Jagiellonian University)

How to Make Sense of the Cloud?

Andreas Baur (University of Tübingen)



***Navigating in Cyberspace: Secrecy,
Materiality and Expertise in Cybersecurity***

Clare Stevens (University of Bristol)

15:30-16:00 Coffee break

16:00-17:30 **Panel 3: Writing Credible Research Accounts
/ Room 243**

Chair/discussant: Esmé Bosma (University of Amsterdam)

***Researching the EU Maritime Security
Policies: Gaining Access and Collecting Data***

Ruxandra-Laura Boşilcă (Inland Norway
University of Applied Sciences)

***Rumour has it... Writing About Secretive
Practices of Refugee Selection under the EU-
Turkey Deal***

Natalie Welfens (University of Amsterdam)

***Building Memory in Colombian War Zones:
how collective workshops can enable
reflection about memory to reconstruct
communities wartime experiences.***

Daniel Gómez Uribe (University of
Amsterdam)

17:30-18:00 **Disrupting conclusions / Room 243**

Rune Saugman (Tampere University)

18:30 **Dinner @ Aksakov Str. 18 (www.motto-bg.com/en)**



Abstracts

Panel 1: Any Road Will (Not?) Take You There

The Process of Getting Access

Lilly Pijnenburg Muller (Kings College London)

In Kafka's *The castle*, the protagonist K, is summoned by the King of a village far far away to measure a piece of land. From the moment of his arrival to the end of the book - K is never able to get access to the King - the only one that knows the details of the assignment he has been summoned for. Through K's quest to reach the castle, Kafka tells a bizarre story of an outlandish village, its construction around the secrecy of the castle, and its mysterious ruler. Based on the challenges of conducting ethnographically inspired field work in a cybersecurity firm, this paper draws inspiration from *the castle* to contribute to the debate on the methodological challenges of doing research on 'the secret'. The paper questions if the process and struggle of getting access to the research object can in a similar vein as K's experience tell us something about the larger object we aim to research, and secondly how to build this into a methodology. With challenges in researching the secret varying from access being endlessly postponed, contract delays, negotiations, the process of getting and losing access, regulations, the role of trust vs. legality, ethical considerations, issues of secrecy, confidentiality and obscured data, the paper reflects on how to make these occurrences a part of the analysis of security practice. Instead of letting the challenges alter the research question, can the hindrances met be used as material? Can it be as in the castle, that it is not K's access to the Castle and the seemingly non existing King, but the dead ends and searching that together paints a picture of the village, and K's task?



Attuning to Secrecy through Surface Appearances

Jasper van der Kist (University of Manchester)

This paper deals with strategies of attuning to secrecy and unpredictability. Taking my own research on country information practices in asylum determination procedures as an example, it reflects on how we often start our projects with simultaneous curiosity and suspicion, only to find out later that the lid of the black box remains firmly closed. How do we anticipate and deal with these apparent ‘failures’? Can we build research strategies other than ‘knocking on doors hoping someone will open’? Building on insights from of William Walters and Andrew Barry, I will discuss what happens to the study of security when remaining on the ‘surface’ of things.

The paper argues that turning to the public strategies of agencies offers a viable alternative to issues of secrecy, obscurity and difficult access. In Erving Goffman’s terms, the institutions specific to security fields are often experts in self presentation. While these public presentations (reports, handbooks, press releases) can give us limited clues about what is happening inside, it may also tell us something about how these individuals and agencies relate to the outside world. The paper describes how the field of asylum often offers an ‘action-packed’ setting with many parallel and intersecting trails to follow. For instance, it is through outward accountability-mechanisms that what lies beneath the surface is raised in practice. This will be illustrated with a mapping of a public knowledge controversy that led to broader study narrating the role of civil society organisations and their strategies of countering governmental knowledge claims.



Power Hierarchies from Below – Access Limitations at the Subaltern Level of Security

Marco Krüger (University of Tübingen)

If we deal with issues of access in the security field, we mostly talk about high politics as well as intelligence or police circles. And this is for a good reason, since secrecy and confidentiality are guiding principles for security practitioners and thus relevant for research on the powerful, the high politics side. However, secrecy is equally a strategy of the subaltern. Secrecy and confidentiality are preconditions for upholding resistance against (repressive) security routines.

During my fieldwork in the context of organised football supporters (ultra-groups), I was perceived as a security threat since my research was funded by the German Ministry of Education and Research. Despite my critical approach, the suspicion resulting from the vulnerability of the supporter groups led to a refusal to cooperate.

In another research project, access limitation was caused by precarity. I experienced difficulties in approaching care-recipients and their care-giving social environment due to capacity constraints. The precarious situation of this subaltern societal groups renders it extremely hard to do empirical research on/with them.

Drawing on these two cases, my contribution discusses various access limitations at the vulnerable and precarious side of the societal power hierarchy. Security politics and security routines take place in a broader social context. This should urge scholars to seek access not only to high-level security but equally to look at the marginalised for studying security as a social relation. Thus, I seek to propose and discuss ways of approaching marginalised groups either directly or via proxies (advocacy groups, social workers etc.).



Panel 2: After Mess

Embracing the Messiness: Reflections on Researching Security and Sexual Violence through Diaries.

Sofia Doyle (University of Manchester)

Whilst the existence of sexual violence within the academy is pervasive, little to no attention has been paid to this within International Relations. This paper offers reflections on the theoretical and methodological messiness of researching staff-to-student sexual violence in UK Higher Education (HE) as an everyday (in)security practice. I argue that within this project there is no such thing as after mess. In order to do so, this paper centers upon attempting to include the writing of an everyday research diary as part of my methodology, within which the intention is to capture stories of everyday misogyny, reflections on institutional silencing and resistance, as well as the personal difficulties as a researcher in this context. Conducting this research is inherently messy; boundaries between being 'on' or 'off' fieldwork are non-existent, as my own everyday environment is also the object of my research. Distinctions between the professional/personal also disintegrate here, as researching my own everyday has resulted in multiple and complex processes of entanglement. And within this research what constitutes 'the academy' has extended beyond institutional walls, and professional and personal relationships are continuously subjected to critical scrutiny. Thus, within my PhD research mess is constant; there was no time before the mess, and there is no prospect for after; messiness here is only contained by the staples of my diary. As such, this paper argues that the only way forward is to embrace the messiness.



Research “under surveillance” - reflections from ethnographic research in Polish migrant detention centres.

Maciej Stepka (Jagiellonian University)

The proposed paper builds on experiences gained during fieldwork conducted in 2018 and 2019 within the project entitled “Security landscapes, practices and technologies in the Polish migrant detention centres”. The discussed project is based on ethnographic research in six detention centres and focuses on gathering data through observations, interviews with security personnel (Polish Border Guards), collection of textual and visual material. The main part of the fieldwork was divided into six trips, lasting from 10-14 days each, with researchers living either in the centres or in their close proximity. The paper aims to discuss and reflect upon challenges related to conducting fieldwork under conditions of extreme distrust and constant surveillance in sites of security such as detention centres. By analysing specific cases from the field, the paper discusses the main issues with ethnographic research from a position of a “surveilled observer” – a situation in which a researcher is subjected to persistent surveillance and control by the object of study. Under such conditions a researcher is often treated as a disrupting factor, a risk or even a threat to the desired status quo of the researched site of security. In this vein, the paper discusses techniques which allow to mitigate this situation and negotiate access to closed spaces and distrustful security personnel reluctant to divulge the “secrets of the trade”. In doing so, it reflects upon the uncertainty, unpredictability and (dis)continuity that are often written into the ethnographic security research.



How to Make Sense of the Cloud?

Andreas Baur (University of Tübingen)

The development of the “cloud” has become one of the most important trends of changing IT and data infrastructures. One of the driving arguments is ‘security’: it is often argued that because of amount of risks, more centralised professional cloud environments are needed to allow for a secure storage and processing of information. But the metaphor of the cloud hides also many of the changes and material transformations that lie behind it. In my research, I analyse what social effects these material and technological changes of the internet infrastructure have and argue, for instance, that we can observe a process of centralisation. For the workshop, I want to problematise different methods on how to study something as obscure and as diffuse as the cloud. The cloud is not only a nebulous concept which has to be analysed with regard to its technical specificities, but it is also locked up in data centres behind (business or government) secrecies. I aim to explore and discuss ideas on how one can scrutinise environments like the cloud in a meaningful way, e.g. by interviews, ethnographic research, textbook analysis and others. Therefore, I would like to discuss these two problems further: Where is the Cloud? And: how to study the cloud?



Assembling cybersecurity: an approach for tracing secrecy, materiality and expertise.

Clare Stevens (University of Bristol)

This is an article about how cybersecurity gets ‘made’. One understudied process in its making is the role of commercial computer security firms in generating knowledge about international ‘cyber’ dynamics, a role which this paper suggests are still largely understudied. This paper will outline a materialist approach derived from Science and Technology Studies as a methodological heuristic that can help researchers move beyond acts of rhetoric and representation to examine the ‘material realities’ that precede and shape threat perceptions and cyber politics more broadly. The argument of this paper is two-fold. First, an examination of Symantec’s analysis of ‘Stuxnet’ will showcase an approach that allows security analyses to trace the situated and contingent nature of emerging cybersecurity expertise. This will show both how the success of complex malware and also the epistemic legitimacy of commercial firms as security actors requires the mobilisation of multiple alliances. Methodologically, malware may be an intangible artefact in some ways, but in other ways its success and its interpretation as malware is deeply interwoven with social, technical and material alliances. Secondly, it will demonstrate that Symantec made profoundly political choices that performatively constituted their authority and expertise on matters of ‘cybersecurity’.



Panel 3: Writing Credible Research Accounts

Researching the EU Maritime Security Policies: Gaining Access and Collecting Data

Ruxandra-Laura Boşilcă (Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences)

There are no definitive prescriptions or universal solutions for coping with secrecy in security research. Instead, this paper outlines several challenges commonly encountered in practice, and illustrates them with ideas and strategies drawn from my doctoral fieldwork. Specifically, my thesis aimed to explain the incremental development of EU maritime security policies, focusing on what it claimed to be the most difficult cases of cooperation, namely the decisions to deploy two naval military operations under the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP): a counter-piracy operation in the Indian Ocean, and a maritime interdiction operation against migrant smuggling in the Mediterranean. I briefly discuss two important and closely interconnected themes in security research: first, gaining access to the field, and second, collecting data.



Rumour has it... Working and Writing with Rumours in Refugee Admission Programmes

Natalie Welfens (University of Amsterdam)

In international refugee resettlement, categorization practices of the different actors involved – refugee hosting states, NGOs, international organizations and resettlement states – remain to large parts obscured or assumed, both for researchers and actors themselves. The secrecy surrounding these practices creates a myriad of rumours, hear-say and contradictory ‘data’, making a researcher’s task to present a ‘robust’ and coherent story challenging. Taking refugee resettlement under the EU-Turkey deal as an example, the paper discusses how to work with rumours and actors’ own speculations and how to give them a place in our written research accounts.

The paper develops three methodological reflections. First, after a brief summary of my research setting, I discuss how to capture and use rumours in the data collection phase. Second, I reflect about ways to analyse and place rumours in research accounts. Third, I line out some of the challenges, when presenting rumour as research. To illustrate these reflections, the article draws on fieldwork material from Germany, Lebanon and Turkey, collected between January 2017 and May 2019.



Building Memory in Colombian War Zones: how collective workshops can enable reflection about memory to reconstruct communities wartime experiences.

Daniel Gómez Uribe (University of Amsterdam)

This paper focuses on the method and process of building data collectively concerning wartime experiences: memory workshops. My research focuses on peasant communities experiences of war and violence during irregular civil wars. One of the most difficult challenges to understand wartime experiences is to capture the stories, narratives, emotions and conflicts emerging from war zones. I conducted memory workshops with four peasant communities in Colombia that lived under insurgent control between 1990 and 1996, and under territorial conquest by paramilitary groups between 1996 and 2003. Memory workshops refer to collective activities to reconstruct localized stories and wartime experiences. Particularly, I focus on the conflicts among peasant communities in relation to land and the emotions attached to them while insurgents and paramilitaries were fighting to control their territory. The memory workshops consisted of three activities. First, the participants reflected on the role of memory, whether it matters and why, and how their community could reconstruct the memory of the violent conflict in their territory. Second, collectively, the community built a detailed timeline of their history and key events of the violent conflict and their own internal conflicts between peasants. Finally, they created a biography of the emotions attached to events and experiences of the conflicts. This was a fascinating exercise that allowed communities to reflect on their own war experiences and to build and gather data on the intersection between emotions, community conflicts, land and violent conflicts in contexts of civil war.



Biographies

Claudia Aradau is Professor of International Politics in the Department of War Studies and Co-chair of the Research Centre in International Relations. Claudia joined the Department in 2011, after five years of teaching and research at The Open University. Her work has explored security practices globally and has critically interrogated their political effects. She has published widely on critical security studies and critical International Relations. Her current research focuses on the transformation of knowledge through practices of digital (in)security. Taking her earlier work on governing unknowns into a new direction, it analyses contemporary articulations of security and unknowns, particularly as mediated through data, algorithmic practices and digital devices. Claudia is chair of the Science, Technology and Arts in International Relations (STAIR) section of the International Studies Association (2017-2019). She has spent a decade as associate editor and editor of *Security Dialogue* (until 2018). She is a member of the editorial collective of *Radical Philosophy*. Aradau is the PI of the project SECURITY FLOWS (European Research Council (ERC) Consolidator Grant).

Andreas Baur is research associate at the International Centre for Ethics in the Sciences and Humanities (IZEW), University of Tübingen, Germany, working in research projects on IT-developments for security, privacy and digital technologies and. Andreas is also an external PhD candidate at the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research (AISSR) with a project on the social dimension of the cloud. His research interests lie in the areas of critical security studies, cloud computing, cyber security, privacy and data protection and STS. Andreas studied political science, economics and peace research at the Universities of Tübingen and Guadalajara.



Ruxandra-Laura Boşilcă is affiliated with the Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences and holds a PhD in Political Science from the National University of Political Studies and Public Administration in Bucharest in co-supervision with the ARENA Centre for European Studies, University of Oslo. Previously, she was a Research Fellow at the University of Bologna, Cardiff University and Institut Barcelona d'Estudis Internacionals (IBEI). Her main areas of research include European Union foreign and security policies, research design in EU studies, NATO, transatlantic relations, maritime security and ocean governance. Her recent work includes a chapter on the EU-NATO inter-organizational relations in counter-piracy operations in the edited volume *Multinational Rapid Response Mechanisms: From Institutional Proliferation to Institutional Exploitation* (Routledge, 2019, co-authored with Marianne Riddervold), and a chapter on the 'migration' crisis and the EU border management system in the *Handbook on EU Crises* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2020, forthcoming). For two consecutive years (2018-2019), she has served as a co-chair of the 'Maritime Security' Section at the EISA Pan-European Conference on International Relations.

Sofia Doyle is a doctoral researcher at the University of Manchester (UK), prior to this I studied at the University of Bristol (UK) for a bachelor's degree in Politics and International Relations, and a Master's degree in International Security. Within my doctoral research I argue that everyday sexual violence remains subjugated in the fields of International Relations and Security Studies. In particular, I explore staff-to-student sexual misconduct in UK Higher Education institutions through feminist International Relations and Security Studies lenses. Thematically, my work explores processes of silence, secrecy and resistance within this context.



Daniel Gómez Uribe is a researcher trained in political science, journalism and audio-visual production. My work focuses on understanding how contexts of violence change the way civilians, particularly peasants, relate to each other and to other social groups. In my work, I conduct immersive field research in different warzones in Colombia. I am particularly interested in the conditions and practices through which civilians and combatants establish alliances, and how those alliances change over time. I am also a teacher with experience in qualitative and quantitative research methods, political economy, transnational governance and Latin American politics, and BA theses supervision.

Jasper van der Kist is a PhD Candidate in Politics at the University of Manchester. Before starting his PhD there, he was a student in International Relations and Philosophy at the University of Amsterdam. His current research addresses the increasing reliance of asylum decision-makers on Country of Origin Information (COI). It aims to understand the knowledge practices of experts engaged in country research, as well as the use of country information by stakeholders in the asylum procedure. He does this by tracing the various ways in which information is collected, processed and used as evidence in asylum cases.

Marco Krüger is a research associate in security ethics at the International Centre for Ethics in the Sciences and Humanities at the University of Tübingen. Since 2015 he has been dealing with various research projects in the security realm, e.g., on football policing, smart security at airports, marginalisation in disaster management, police surveillance. His current research focusses on resilience and its meaning for the shaping of security politics. Marco is doing his PhD on the emancipatory potential of resilience. His interest in security ethics covers issues such as representation, marginalisation, justice and



responsibility. Marco is interested in a broad range of qualitative research methods. While he has been dealing with discourse analysis and interview design, he is currently also interested in how we can make systematically use of video interpretation in security studies.

Lilly Pijnenburg Muller is a PhD candidate in War Studies, King's College London and is affiliated with the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI). She has previously worked as a Research Fellow at the Global Cyber Security Capacity Building Centre at the University of Oxford (GCSCC). Her research focuses on cybersecurity, global security practices, knowledge production, global governance, and risk/threat construction.

Rune Saugmann Andersen is currently an Academy of Finland post-doctoral research fellow at the University of Tampere, working on the role of digital visual media in security politics. His project 'post-human ways of seeing security' is about the use of machine vision in security politics – in surveillance systems and in autonomous weapons systems. Rune's interdisciplinary research has been published in leading peer-reviewed outlets such as *European Journal of International Relations*, *Journalism Practice*, and *Security Dialogue*, and in numerous edited books in media studies and international relations. He has published his academic videos in the peer-reviewed video journal *Audiovisual Thinking*.

Maciej Stepka received his PhD in Security Studies from the University of Warsaw. He also holds Masters degrees in Political Science (University of Amsterdam) and European Studies (Jagiellonian University in Krakow). Maciej is a lecturer at the Institute of European Studies, Jagiellonian University in Kraków, where he teaches courses on European Integration, EU Common Policies, EU Institutions, Security Studies. Maciej's



research interests revolve around critical security and policy studies, especially securitization theory, ethnography of security, security expertise, and EU internal security environment. His doctoral project focused on security logics applied in securitization of the “migration crisis” at the EU level. Recently he has been involved in investigating security practices and technologies in Polish detention centres.

Clare Stevens is based at the SWDTP and the University of Bristol. I am currently writing up a thesis on my research into the strategic use and misuse of cyberspace by state and non-state actors. Using the idea of 'boundary work' as an organising heuristic for my analysis, I investigate the ways that US government actors talk about cybersecurity and cyber operations in ways that are invoking or challenging longstanding notions of social categories and boundaries. The multiple meanings associated with 'cybersecurity' are best understood as the result of an ongoing contest between different actors to characterise and define a dominant vision of what cyberspace is and will be.

Natalie Welfens, MA is a doctoral researcher at the Department of Political Science of the University of Amsterdam. Her research project analyses categorization practices in transnational refugee resettlement programmes to Europe and was awarded a Young Talent research grant by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO). She holds a Double-Master in International Relations and Political Science from Sciences Po Paris and the Free University Berlin, and a Bachelor in European Studies from Sciences Po Paris, Campus Nancy.



Organisers

The workshop is convened by the PhD candidates of project FOLLOW: Following the Money from Transaction to Trial, funded by the European Research Council (ERC) and led by prof. dr. Marieke de Goede – www.projectfollow.org.

Tasniem Anwar is a PhD candidate in the Political Science department of the University of Amsterdam. The dissertation seeks to examine the production of legal knowledge through security practices around preventing and criminalizing terrorist financing. By analysing documents, conducting interviews and observing daily practices she researches how suspicious transactions are investigated and prosecuted. She argues that by researching these practices, we can understand how law, technology, and security interact in the construction of legal knowledge in terrorism financing court cases.

Esmé Bosma is a doctoral candidate at the Department of Political Science of the University of Amsterdam. For her research project she has conducted field research inside and around banks in Europe to analyse counter-terrorism financing practices by banks. She holds a master's degree in Political Science from the University of Amsterdam and is co-editor of *Secrecy and Methods in Security Research. A Guide to Qualitative Fieldwork* published by Routledge in 2019.

Pieter Lagerwaard is a PhD Candidate at the University of Amsterdam (UvA), Department of Political Science. Using participatory methods, he studies the use of financial transaction data for security purposes by Financial Intelligence Units (FIUs). His theoretical interests lie at the intersection of Science and Technology Studies (STS), Critical Security Studies, and the nexus between finance and security.