OXFORD

Policing Global Hubs: Balancing the Imperatives of Security and Trade

Martin Nøkleberg[*]

*NORCE Norwegian Research Centre, Nygårdsgaten 112, 5008 Bergen, Norway; marn@norceresearch.no.

Global hubs such as airports and maritime ports are geographical centers where immense flows converge, and are characterized by speed, time and efficiency in linking local markets and global economic trade networks. Being symbolic infrastructures of capitalism, global hubs may attract criminal exploitation and be exposed to security risks. Drawing on extensive interview material from those involved in Norwegian airport and port security, this article explores how policing agencies experience the balancing of the imperatives of security and trade. It reveals how policing agencies are affected by, and seek to adapt to, the demands for efficiency and speed intrinsic to the trade regime, thereby highlighting the importance of the temporal dimension to understanding the complexities of contemporary security governance.

KEY WORDS: global hubs, security, temporality, policing, airports and ports

The aviation and maritime industries play a crucial role in the networked global economy—an economy dependent on a 'world in motion' (Inda and Rosaldo 2002). The flow of people, things, capital and information has long been fundamental to economic prosperity and social life (Cowen 2014). In recent decades, there has been a rise in air passenger numbers from 1.467 billion in 1998 to 4.233 billion in 2018 (ICAO 2018), while maritime trade has grown from 4 billion tons in 1990 to 11 billion tons in 2018 (UNCTAD 2019). Inspired by the notion of 'global cities' (Sassen 2001), one can think of airports and seaports as *global hubs* (Leese and Wittendorp 2018), which are critical crossroads where immense flows of people and things converge and are facilitated. Contemporary societies are often characterized by acceleration and high speed (Eriksen 2001; Wajcman 2008), in which processes of transport, communication and economic production have witnessed an unprecedented speed-up (Rosa 2010). Being considered essential points of passage, global hubs are in many ways dependent on efficiency, speed and high circulation rates to function optimally. It is argued that their effectiveness is largely dependent on open, frictionless and reliable transportation systems (OECD 2003).

As critical infrastructures and symbolic locations of capitalism, commerce and mobility (Adey 2004), however, global hubs may attract criminal exploitation and be exposed to numerous risks (e.g. illegal border crossings, terrorism, smuggling, piracy, theft) (Salter 2008*b*;

Eski 2011; Brewer 2014; Cowen 2014; Eski and Buijt 2017; Sergi 2021). Any of the threats routinely faced by global hubs may have significant implications, both locally and globally. As a result of the interdependencies between vital functions in society and global hubs, many activities can be slowed down or even brought to a complete halt, seriously impacting the everyday life of businesses and individuals. With the dependence on smooth, speedy and efficient flows in mind, it has been suggested that the disruption of flows has itself become a security risk (Hoijtink 2017). The Covid-19 global pandemic shows how disrupting flows can affect the role of global hubs and how they operate, with travel restrictions and temporary border controls effectively shutting down the aviation industry and shipping services and causing serious losses. It is estimated that the economic impact of Covid-19 on civil aviation in the operating year of 2020 was approximately a US$391bn loss of gross passenger operating revenues (ICAO 2020). These shut-downs, implemented for the sake of preserving public health, demonstrate how security concerns can become major impediments to the global economy.

The present article examines the tension between trade and security in the global hubs constituted by airports and ports, whose security, as several observers have noted, involves pluralized and networked policing (Brewer 2014; Eski 2016), in which multiple interests flourish and sometimes collide (Nøkleberg 2020). Due to the centrality of economic drivers such as efficiency, time and speed, airports and ports are assumed to be distinct institutional environments in terms of policing and security, quite unlike policing efforts in static and area-bound neighbourhoods.

In their efforts to secure smooth and speedy flows, security agencies must cope with the possibility of acting as barriers, particularly as the fear of disruption stands strong. Drawing on empirically grounded research in Norway, this article analyses how various agencies in ports and airports perceive the imperatives of security and trade in their everyday life. The article looks at how they experience the balancing involved and examines agencies' strategies for facing the tension that arises when seemingly contradictory logics converge. The empirical findings suggest that global hubs can reveal how policing agencies are enmeshed in, and seek to adapt to, the commercial demand for efficiency and speed. The article argues for the need to consider temporal aspects when assessing the policing of global hubs. By examining the temporal imaginaries of global hubs, the article adds empirical evidence to existing accounts while also contributing new knowledge about how contemporary security governance both shapes, and is affected by, the imperatives of trade. In particular, the article reveals two temporal orientations intrinsic to the trade regime, one related to the immediate execution of tasks to maintain the speedy and seamless flows and the other connected to future-oriented thinking and ambitions of commercial expansion.

As this article's empirical findings are drawn from Norwegian airport and port security governance raises a crucial question, namely if and how context matters. It has previously been argued that contemporary Nordic policing constitutes a distinctive system (Devroe *et al.* 2017), even to the extent that some have labelled it as 'Nordic policing exceptionalism' (Ugelvik 2016). Thus, the observation in this article may be specific to the Nordic context. Yet, airports and ports in Norway, as elsewhere, are entangled in a complex web of international treaties and regulations (Salter 2008*b*; Lindøe and Kringen 2015), seeking to establish standardized responses and operations across jurisdictions. The concluding discussion addresses these issues and asks whether global hubs can be seen as generic or localized spaces regarding policing and security.

THE POLITICS OF TIME AND SPEED AT GLOBAL HUBS

Being crucial crossroads of flows, airports and ports are sites of intensified securitization (Salter 2008*c*) and has since 9/11 received considerable scholarly attention (Brewer 2014;

Leese 2016; Eski 2020). The effort to control and police the circulation of people, things, information and capital has been framed through the analytical category of 'policing of flows' (Aas 2007; Amicelle *et al.* 2017; Hufnagel and Moiseienko 2020). Airports and ports are archetypical examples of the organizing principles of the 'space of flows' since they operate as passages and facilitators of flows (Castells 1996). When vast flows of people and things intersect at global hubs, they become grounded and control and security can be imposed. The 'policing of flows' perspective encompasses action agencies take to counter illegal movements that might cross (international) boundaries. Studies of border control have revealed mechanisms and logics for differentiating mobile bodies, with border controls used as tools to determine inclusion and exclusion (Pickering and Weber 2006; Aas 2011). Similarly, airports and ports have been characterized as 'difference machine[s]' and sites for 'the filtering of friends and foes' (Adey 2008; Lyon 2008). Current scholarship on flows seems to be 'anthropocentric' (Salter 2015), with a strong focus on human actions and flow structures rather than on the importance of the commercial flow of things (but see Hübschle 2017; Runhovde 2017).

However, despite considerable interest in the security of global flows, relatively little attention has been paid to the role of time and speed at global hubs. This may be surprising since speed is perennial issues in policing (Cihan *et al.* 2012). Where studies have addressed the relationship between police response time and arrest and crime clearance rates (Coupe and Blake 2005; Blanes i Vidal and Kirchmaier 2018) and how rapid response time is crucial in evaluating police performance and citizens' satisfaction (Lee *et al.* 2017). In other contexts, temporality has been shown relevant to unpacking restorative justice in the sense that such processes seek to govern the future in the present and through the past (Crawford 2015: 472). Similarly, in prison studies, different aspects of prisoners' and detainees' lives are affected by the experience of time and various coping techniques emerge (O'Donnell 2014; Gashi *et al.* 2021).

Given the commercial imperatives of global hubs, it is suggested that 'there is no better symbol than the airport [and ports] to make clear the twin and apparently contradictory claims of our time: to maximise but to regulate flows' (Amicelle *et al.* 2017: 166). Policing actors, therefore, seek strategies to achieve secure and seamless and efficient systems to govern flows. The notion of efficiency is critical to understanding these processes, along with the demands of passengers, customers and supply-chain and just-in-time production systems, where speed is paramount (Cowen 2014). Several scholars have thus pointed out that the security governance of airports and ports is bound up with the 'government of time' (Salter 2008*c*: 10). There is a fixation on measuring and reducing waiting time in security screening. Queues are often seen as a security risk in need of mitigation, and speed is claimed to be an important 'factor in practices of critical infrastructure protection' (Forman 2018: 234). Moreover, time spent in queues may cause delays that are detrimental to businesses relying on the smooth flow of people and things (Hainen *et al.* 2013). The logic of speed has yet another commercial dimension, that of improving dwell-time to boost profit and consumption (Lloyd 2003; Salter 2008*c*). Time, then, has been commodified and 'when time is money faster is better. Speed is valorized as an unquestioned and unquestionable goal' (Adam 2006: 124). The increasing importance of time and speed has consequences for how global hubs organize and structure their operations, as attention also needs to be directed towards the commercialization and marketization of their spaces. It is argued that 'time affects and informs (…) our understanding of regulatory practices in diverse ways' (Crawford 2015: 472), and following the importance of time and speed, policing agencies at global hubs are routinely confronted and affected by various aspects of temporality.

Valverde (2011; 2014) has argued that temporality is crucial to all security projects and shown the scalar nature of temporality. Similarly, Shearing and colleagues have developed the 'nodal governance' approach to theorize contemporary security governance (Johnston and Shearing 2003; Wood and Shearing 2007), which to some extent is also concerned with

temporal dimensions. In the nodal governance literature, it is assumed that the practices of security actors are influenced by their mentalities, which is understood as the mental framework that shapes how we think about and see the world (Froestad *et al.* 2015). Some observers have identified two important governing mentalities—reactive strategies based on punishment and future-oriented strategies based on risk (Johnston and Shearing, 2003; Zedner 2009). Previous studies have illustrated how preemptive and risk-based strategies thrive in aviation and maritime security (Salter 2007; 2008*a*; Eski and Carpenter 2013), where instrumental calculations and techniques seek to predict future risks and threats. However, in line with the scalar nature, it has also been shown that different temporalities can coexist and security agencies associate working methods and practices not only with unknown future risks, but also with 'a disavowed but lingering past to a sometimes tense everydayness' (Côté-Boucher 2018: 160). This suggests responses to security issues can be immersed in, and affected by, different social times.

While past, present or future influences have previously received attention and shown to be significant aspects of security governance, the temporal scale typical of global hubs, with its emphasis on time, speed and efficiency, has dimensions that scholars have yet to fully unpack. Policing global hubs may involve considerable tension, as agencies can be trapped between contradictory impulses, when practices designed to promote efficiency and speedy flows come up against security measures. However, we know little about how this tension is experienced by those tasked with performing security. Thus, examining how security agencies experience, perceive and give meaning to their actions (Côté-Boucher *et al.* 2014), can help shed light on the interaction between security and trade, and how controversies arise and affect outcomes, fostering novel ways of understanding contemporary security governance.

CONTEXTUALIZING AND RESEARCHING NORWEGIAN AVIATION AND MARITIME SECURITY

Based on a larger project examining security governance at ports and airports in Norway, this article draws empirical materials from semi-structured interviews with representatives of organizations that police three important global hubs: Oslo airport, the Port of Stavanger and the Port of Kristiansand. The cases included are pivotal to the overall transport network of Norway and significant gateways to the national and regional economy by connecting Norwegian commerce to the European and world markets. In 2019, Oslo airport, one of the busiest in the Nordic region, handled over 28 million passengers. Activities in the two ports have long been considerable and crucial to the economic growth of their surrounding regions and nationally. The two ports have also been given the status of designated ports by the Ministry of Transport, meaning they are particularly important for the development of safe and efficient transport of people and goods by sea.

Seventy-six interviews were conducted between 2015 and 2017; respondents represent the full spectrum of agencies, including the police, governmental bodies (e.g. the Ministry of Transport and Communications), regulatory authorities (e.g. the Civil Aviation Authority), customs, publicly-owned companies, private security companies and business or industry stakeholders (e.g. airlines, shipping companies). Security was the primary concern of some of these (e.g. police), while for others (e.g. customs, industry stakeholders) it was one concern among others. Interviewing both management and frontline workers ensured a thorough mapping of agencies' experience and perception of the imperatives of trade and security.

The semi-structured interviews covered topics including participants' experience of working with securing and policing global hubs. There were also questions concerning collaborative work, and perceptions of the activities involved. Questions were open-ended, enabling

respondents to go into detail about what they deemed significant. Interviews generally lasted between one and two hours, and were recorded and transcribed.

The interview transcripts were coded and analysed using the principles of thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke 2006). To increase my familiarity with their content and develop initial codes, all transcripts were read and re-read. Following the initial phase of analysis, analytical categories and themes were identified inductively from the data. The codes were undoubtedly influenced by my familiarity with security and policing literature. To counterbalance this, themes were revised in the light of the conceptual framework set out above. The analysis aimed to identify overarching themes capturing how different agencies experienced and perceived the interaction between security, trade and efficiency, and to provide rich descriptions of them.

While security was considered paramount for most of the interviewees, the analysis also revealed that several pointed out that it conflicted with commercial concerns, which emphasized seamless and efficient flows. One interviewee noted:

> Many perceive security to be a pain in the neck as it may be seen as an impediment to the efficient flow that we depend on. So, there has to be a balance, right? To make sure we follow security regulations and measures, but still achieve a seamless and efficient flow, making it sustainable to do business. (Private business 76)

This quote is illustrative of the tensions and dilemmas policing and security agencies may face when confronted by different logics following from the interaction of trade and security. How these tensions are experienced by the agencies at global hubs is this article's point of departure. Analysis of the empirical materials identified three overarching themes, which are addressed below: (1) adapting to efficiency and speed, (2) security as service, and (3) responsibilization, privatization and the quality of security. By examining how the policing and security actors perceive, experience and respond to the interaction of trade and security, reveals how commercial interests, with its distinctive temporal elements, play a crucial role in recasting actors' perceptions of security.

SECURITY AND TRADE IN GLOBAL HUBS: ADAPTING TO EFFICIENCY AND SPEED

One of the key features of global hubs is the way they are affected by their commercial 'attractiveness' as destinations. This insight was shared across the variety of private and public agencies responsible for security provision. Also the police acknowledged that they must take it into account 'because that's what truly drives the economy and development' at global hubs (Police 14). Generally, interviewees emphasized the importance of being aware of the co-existence of differences, so that collisions of interests could be avoided. Previous observers of airport and port policing have illustrated how such collisions can give rise to conflicts and frustration in collaborative processes (Eski 2016; Nøkleberg 2020). As the focus on trade and commercial growth increases, the importance of this awareness becomes ever greater in the field of security. Thus this police officer, speaking about the role of commercial perspective in border control said:

> It's important to acknowledge that we're actually part of something bigger than just the police mandate. Many organizations in the port are dependent on and make their living off the movement and flow, and it's important to the whole region, for the economy. We have a societal responsibility that goes beyond just checking people travelling to or from Denmark or wherever. The port is considered a critical transportation hub for both freight and passengers, so you cannot just shut everything down and lock the door (Police 20).

What this indicates is that police officers understand the importance of keeping an eye on their surroundings. More specifically, they must pay attention to other organizations' interests, which are often motivated by a desire for economic growth and attracting a greater flow. In a sense, they must be sensitive to the governing mentalities that exist (Johnston and Shearing 2003), which often are embedded in different temporalities. This suggests there is a distinct institutional security structure where the logics of trade and commercialization, involving flows, time and speed, have consequences for how the governing of security is experienced, performed and organized. Pointing to the importance of understanding different temporalities following from commercial interest, an interviewee from the police said:

> The time spent in [security and passport] queues is one of the criteria the success of Oslo airport is measured. If waiting time was not important to the police, it would show that we haven't realised that it would be a nail in the coffin of an airport that wants to grow and expand its brand by becoming a major hub (Police 16).

In a sense, then, in global hubs, the police operate in environments whose terms and conditions are mainly determined by the temporal understandings of other (public or private) organizations, and therefore not under their control. From these descriptions, it is possible to differentiate between two temporal orientations implicated in the trade imperative at global hubs. The first is connected to the immediate execution of tasks on the ground, exemplified by the focus on waiting time and reduction of queues at security checks in the above quote. As will be explored in more detail below, this temporal dimension also captures the connection between security and service rhetoric and consumer satisfaction. The second temporal orientation present at global hubs is concerned with future-oriented thinking, which may resemble the risk-mentality presented by the nodal governance scholars. Yet, it seems to differ in some distinct ways as the ambitions for commercial expansion and growth are instrumental. In describing how the police become implicated in and affected by other organizations' temporal orientations, this interviewee captures the essence of the second type of temporality:

> You get involved in future-oriented thinking. We've received help from them [Avinor[1]] to look into the future. They're very good at it, after all, their business is dependent on being concerned with the future and thinking about what market to target. I mention this because it affects our work. If they decide to target the Asian market, it would affect us differently than Europe, as you need to expand the non-Schengen area of border control. Maybe we need to develop and improve border control. The point is that we need to be aware of and think about what the airport will be like in the future, and then try to adjust to that reality. (Police 14).

This account, which was shared among many of the police interviewees, makes very clear the interaction between the twin imperatives of security and trade. It also raises questions about policing in the future. Future-oriented perspectives are not new as such to the Norwegian police at global hubs, as it has been shown that the police increasingly rely on preemptive strategies and risk analysis in the post-9/11 security environment to identify and predict changes in crime and threats level, and to make more targeted responses (Nøkleberg 2022). Yet, the future-oriented thinking of businesses obeying imperative of trade seems to both differ from the risk-based strategies and create tension for the police. Whereas preemptive strategies generally seek to forestall future risks and threats before they occur by relying on instrumental calculations and techniques (McCulloch and Wilson 2016), the commercial logic makes businesses seek

---

1 Avinor is a state-owned limited company that operates most of the civil airports in Norway.

after new market opportunities to position themselves better for the future and strengthen their economic growth.

Many businesses (e.g. airport owner, port authorities and operators and shipping companies) said they aspire to become the main hub in their region, with ambitions to increase their market shares through greater flows. Although they understood the importance of paying attention to others' interests, several police interviewees expressed concerns about such ambitions pointing out that growth in the movement of passengers could affect the quality of services. One police manager explained:

> What's clear is that explosive growth comes at a cost. Locally, security won't suffer, we'll manage fine. The issues are to do with border control, as it will struggle if there is development. Quality will suffer, or even if it's not worse, the likelihood that we'll be able to carry out effective control, and detect and stop people crossing the border when they shouldn't, will be significantly less. Today, we don't have enough resources to keep up with developments. You can just imagine how easy it is to lose control when there are demands for throughput and efficiency, and then there's an explosive increase in the flow (Police 19).

The dominance of trade, favouring the acceleration of time and future-oriented thinking, thus makes navigating the policing environment at global hubs increasingly demanding. The interviews with the police revealed that their wish to maintain quality were often confronted with differing temporal imaginaries, that were not always compatible with their perspectives and governing mentalities. As seen in the above accounts, several officers felt this could lead to considerable tension, particularly as they experienced being put under pressure by companies' desire to maximize throughput and efficiency.

Businesses, however, consider police control efforts obstacles to smooth and efficient flows. In late 2015, following the massive influx of irregular migrants throughout Europe and the heightened threat of terrorism, several Schengen member states introduced temporary internal border controls. In Norway, these controls have been renewed several times, with the latest in renewal in November 2021, because of assessments indicating continuing threats in the inbound flows.[2] As a response to the global Covid-19 pandemic, many Schengen member states also based their reintroduction of border control on public health concerns. It has been suggested that the securitization of internal borders may threaten one of the defining features of the EU and its Single market ambitions, namely the free movement of people, goods and services (van der Woude 2019). The reintroduction of border controls at ferry ports complicated operations and reduced efficiency, as one port facility security officer (PFSO) explained:

> The main challenge is related to logistics, on arrival we want to empty the ferry as quickly as possible and re-load it with passengers and cars and cargo. But now, with the extra control, in addition to those from the ISPS[3], we lose precious time as queues build-up while we're unloading, especially cars, since they're checked individually. And we can't start loading either, right, before it's all cleared. We try to do the best we can, but it is demanding, and we're afraid we'll become less attractive and lose customers (Private business 68).

Although recognizing the need to protect borders at times of uncontrolled movement of migrants and terrorist threats, industry stakeholders had obvious concerns related to the temporal dimension connected to the immediate execution of tasks, as queues can cause delays

---

2   Council Doc. ST 12843 2021 INIT Prolongation of the temporary reintroduction of border controls at the Norwegian internal borders.

3   The International Ship and Port Facility code (ISPS-code) sets requirements for security checks.

with potentially huge economic impact. Considering this temporal orientation, the companies, in their everyday effort to secure flows, fear disruptions and the loss of customers they may cause—and this fear is increased by the increasing demand for efficiency.

Numerous interviewees described that remembering security while trying to maintain the speedy and reliable circulation of goods could be challenging, as security measures, from the business perspective, are considered a hassle. One PFSO noted:

> We spend lots of energy trying to optimise logistics, I mean how we can get the flow as smooth as possible. The number of actions you have per cargo, that's the number of handlings, whether it's loading or unloading from trucks or ships, it's the same for us, but the number of actions affects our margins on the bottom line. So, when you work with and promote security, like me, and also have to remember the idea of flows, well, let's put it like this: Security does not always fit smooth logistics like a glove, although you have all this talk about supply-chain security. The reason is that you feel control and security measures are a hassle, they are obstacles, especially timewise, to our operations, and delays are not exactly something we want in our business, and our customers don't want them or like them either. So figuring out best security and logistics practices in relation to flows of goods is something we work on a lot (private business 63).

The interviewees from the business sector perceived the commercial imperatives, with its focus on speed and efficiency, to predominate in the environments of ports and airports. Many of them spoke of how they experienced tension if security measures were obstructing and disrupting the speedy flows deemed necessary for business purposes. Consequently, the above descriptions clearly illustrate the view that the temporal orientations of trade and security were not always considered compatible with each other and could lead to tensions and frustration—an understanding that was shared across the variety of private businesses and public agencies responsible for security and policing. In the following sections, the focus turns to exploring how 'security as service' and responsibilization emerge as responses to these tensions and pressures.

SECURITY AS SERVICE IN POLICING GLOBAL HUBS

The aviation and maritime sectors have elaborate security regimes, which include checks and screening designed to prevent prohibited articles from getting into restricted areas or onto planes or ships. As pointed out above, the focus on efficiency and speed necessitated by massive growth in flows, means that queues at checkpoints are a crucial aspect of the interaction of security and trade. A security manager said:

> Nobody wants queues. Any gathering of people is a potential target. So, for that reason, we want a good flow. But the most important thing is that the flow is cost-effective, that we optimise throughput in the security check. The fewer security staff we use to process a certain number of passengers, the cheaper it is for us – it's expensive to use humans to perform the security check. (Publicly owned company 8)

This underscores the importance of commercial criteria in governing flow and performing security, and points to dilemmas of time and speed when delivering it. While queues are viewed as risks that need to be mitigated by governing flows efficiently, reducing costs by improved handling of the immense flows that result from security checks is even more important. Similarly, another interviewee argued:

> If we look at it just from a purely security perspective, then yes, queues could be as long as they want, we wouldn't mind. But from a customer point of view and with our service goals in mind, it's not acceptable and not at all desirable. (…) So, in recent years, the average waiting time at the airport has been two minutes. And I don't think any other European airports are that good. That is incredibly good. So, we see the benefits of thinking about throughput and optimization, even when carrying out security. (Publicly owned company 5)

The narratives present in the above quotes reveal a particular way of thinking about security; agencies responsible for governing and securing flows adopt a 'customer is king' attitude to security (Eski 2016; 2020), which is heavily implicated in the temporal orientation of the trade regime. Global benchmarks have even been developed to measure passengers' satisfaction when travelling through airports. The Airport Service Quality (ASQ) survey, which Oslo airport use, evaluates four aspects of passengers' experience of security screenings: the courtesy and helpfulness of staff, thoroughness of inspection, waiting time and feeling of being safe and secure. The airport operator, Avinor, uses the results to guide other agencies at the airport, as this interviewee from the private security company described:

> It's part of how they govern and steer, and they use the survey to direct attention to things that they feel need to be improved. (…) The scale ranges from 1-5 and their goal is to have an average of 4 on security matters, that's stated in our contract with them, so we need to deliver, focusing on the experiences of passengers. (Private security 73)

It has been argued that, to make sense of security, attention needs to be directed to what people (or organizations) do in its name, emphasizing the practices of governance that appeal to security (Valverde 2011). In policing and securing global hubs, governing practices seem to result from an understanding of *security as service*, in that agencies seek to satisfy their customers' demands. This brings to mind the seminal work on private security by Shearing and Stenning (1981), who characterize it as an endeavour shaped by whose interests are being served and where the objectives originate from contractual relationships. However, security as a service is distinguished by the fact that it is not concerned only with serving the interests of an employer. As is made clear by many interviewees, the aim of policing and security agencies at global hubs is to have satisfied customers (in this case passengers), as satisfying their needs and ensuring they do not experience security as something negative, is good for business:

> The purpose of all this is to cause as little hassle as possible to the passengers, security checks should be a seamless and hardly noticeable experience. (…) So, if you have confident, motivated, and happy staff in the security checks, who greet you with a smile and perform security in a professional and fairly uniform way, it increases the chances that it will be a great start to your journey. (Publicly owned company 6)

The connection between security and service is clear when commercial considerations are uppermost, and seems to become integral to organizations' business strategy and part of the total experience of travel. Delivering security at global hubs is not just transporting passengers (and cargo) safely from A to B, but also involves creating a good experience for the traveller. One interviewee said: 'Security and service go hand in hand (…) and the commercial aspects are expanded all the way, right, it's important to have the best selection of stores. That's what airports have become now, the experience is not just flying!' (Private security 72). Security checks are seen as key factors in improving, or reducing, customer satisfaction. Indeed, security checks at airports may be the only place where passengers have human interaction, until staff greets

them when they board the aircraft. Many interviewees said they are an essential element in growing a company, as having a good experience can make the passenger more likely to choose it again. One interviewee noted:

> I think everyone understands that if one gets a bad reputation on security, it will affect us all. You risk losing passengers and income, and airlines might close routes, or even worse, go elsewhere. And it's the passengers we make our living off, facilitating the flow of people, so everyone needs to be on the same level, and understand the connection between reputation and security (Publicly owned company 11)

Nonetheless, some interviewees from the police felt that an over-emphasis on efficiency could threaten the quality of security, and concerns were raised that the actual purpose of airport and port security could be forgotten. This fear was connected to the focus on cost-cutting forced on agencies by commercial considerations, and the increasing volume of traffic. Moreover, numerous interviewees made clear that they experience increasing pressure in the face of the contradictory aims of providing security and achieving the efficiency and speedy flows required for commercial success, and felt the need to make adjustments. Part of this adjustment involves processes of responsibilization and privatization.

RESPONSIBILIZATION, PRIVATIZATION AND THE QUALITY OF SECURITY

Heightened focus on (in)security in global hubs has led to stricter security regulations, and agencies are bound by international, national and local treaties. Several interviewees from the aviation and port sectors emphasized that stringent security requirements place substantial responsibilities on private agencies, which indicates the complex tension between trade and security. One airline security manager noted how the pressure to comply with requirements could conflict with their commercial interests and focus on keeping efficient flows:

> I understand the purpose and the need for control, but I think sometimes it gets a little… sometimes it's too demanding for the airlines, too much responsibility is put on us. It's layer upon layer of requirements. You start questioning if this is the best way to do it. We are expected to have the shortest possible turnaround time at the gate, passengers can show up very late and, still, we're expected not to be delayed. But the responsibility for what to check just increases. I feel there's a lack of correspondence, and I think it's gone far enough (…) We've reached the limit of the responsibilities that can be forced on airlines and of the knowledge expected about handling documents and ID (Private business 75).

This perspective is by no means unique, there seems to be consensus that the increased responsibilities falling on businesses are onerous and often require investment in resources. The frustration voiced in the quote above shows the difficulty of navigating in environments where security and trade interests meet.

The introduction of carrier liability in many European countries in the 1990s and early 2000s (Gammeltoft-Hansen 2013), implies that governments want private transportation companies to carry out immigration control for them, it is a responsibilization of private businesses in border control. Many interviewees explained that they occasionally had cases where passengers were considered inadmissible (e.g. a person not in possession of proper documentation), in which the carrier liability hit them quite hard. In cases of 'denied entry' in the aviation sector, the company is obliged to transport the person back and cover the cost. It was expressed that

this could often complicate the operation and was attributed to the temporal orientation of the trade regime, as they wanted to spend as little time on the ground as possible and maintain efficiency. In addition to having to bear the cost of returning people and the potential loss in efficiency, transportation companies may also be penalized for facilitating the travel of undocumented or inadequately documented passengers. One interviewee stated, highlighting frustration with the current system:

> If we fly from Norway to the UK, departing passengers must go through police passport control in Oslo. If someone travels using a lookalike passport or falsified documents, and it's discovered by UK border control, then it's our fault! It's a joke! The funniest part of this regime is that when the authorities in charge of passport control, the government, the police, let someone go through without being discovered, it's our fault and we get fined (Private business 76).

Checking documents is nothing new for private actors, as carriers have long conducted such checks to serve their own commercial and security interests (Scholten and Terlouw 2014). However, carrier liability and the attendant sanctions, do not just encourage, but force, private companies to take on responsibilities and contribute to the state's effort to stop unwanted flows. This has also been characterized as the externalization and privatization of (im)migration control (Lavenex 2006; Scholten and Minderhoud 2008). The co-option of private actors is experienced as an anomaly, since control responsibilities conflict with the core business imperative of carriers, whose profits depend on the smooth transportation of passengers and goods, not from performing immigration control.

In addition to penalties, border control also brings indirect costs. Carrier liability has necessitated investment in training, and sometimes in hiring additional staff to meet the requirement to check documentation. Private businesses are effectively required to develop expertise in areas such as ID and detecting false documents. This is not part of their core business, as one security manager pointed out:

> Our employees have lots of tasks, we've even set up our own unit to deal with documents, which has "specialists" who double-check passports or ID if they were unsure at the check-in or the gate. But this is not where our real expertise is, so from time to time we make mistakes (Private business 74).

It is perceived as burdensome to have to deal with ever-increasing requirements and to develop new skills. The marked improvement in the quality of falsified documents is a further challenge, as was pointed out by several police interviewees.

Similar arrangements involving responsibilization are also seen in the maritime sector, where the processes are even more directly connected with the temporal dimension of trade and the focus on maintaining speedy and seamless flows. The introduction of the ISPS code in 2004 effectively fenced off ports (Eski 2016), although many port businesses were dependent on transportation to and from the waterfront. Solutions were needed to maintain the efficient movement of goods through the port and to reduce waiting times at point of entry/exit. It was decided that checking all 'the containers entering the port is not possible; it would be desirable to search them all, but it takes too long and we are already at the limit' (Private business 64). In Norwegian ports, therefore, businesses are allowed, or even encouraged, to enter into a security contract whereby they are responsible for performing security checks before they enter port facilities. For example, through the security contract the transport company is considered a secure carrier, which allows goods to be loaded on a pre-approved and security sealed truck that can enter the port without stopping for additional checks. Seamless and efficient flow is

thus sought by reducing the number of control points in the port. Similar practices have been observed elsewhere, where several programs have been introduced to ensure both secure and efficient trade (Bradbury 2010; Côté-Boucher 2020).

The logic of speed and efficiency thus leads to an expansion of actors responsible for maintaining and providing security at global hubs. In this way, the temporal orientation of commerce influences how security on the waterfront is practised; what used to happen within the port environment has been taken over by private companies, which may deal with it elsewhere.

Although recognizing the advantages of these agreements (e.g. more efficient and seamless flows, shorter waiting times), numerous interviewees questioned the wisdom of delegating responsibility for security in this manner. Security agreements, according to one interviewee from the business sector in the port, are 'almost the same as if I come to an airport with my suitcase and say "this is fine, because I have signed the form stating that I was at home with the door locked when I packed my suitcase, so you don't need check this one"' (Private business 63). Similar views were expressed by representatives of the port authority, along the lines of 'what if this is just a signature on a piece of paper for the sake of simplicity, to make it easier to do trade, you don't know, since this is mainly based on trust?' (Port authority 58). Thus, some interviewees have reservations about delegating responsibility, which makes performing security checks outside the port problematic. It is considered to put considerable strain on the port environment, where trust is paramount and is felt to increase the chances of security being compromised.

Since there is no proper (national) system of auditing businesses with security contracts in the maritime sector, port authorities are left with the responsibility to ensure compliance. As resources are limited and the number of contracts is high, the port authorities have been relying on the trustworthiness of the companies by encouraging them to self-regulate. The notions of self-regulation or self-governing connect to the Foucauldian-inspired concept of responsibilization developed in the governmentality literature on risk (Garland 2001; Mythen and Walklate 2008), in that businesses (and individuals) are pushed to become self-regulating subjects adhering to the rules of the game. The opinions of interviewees, however, indicate that port security agencies fear that the delegation of responsibility is too fragile and risky. Specifically, it was expressed that the businesses guided by the imperative of trade, which gained increasing responsibilities for security through the systems of security contracts, did not necessarily possess the required expertise and knowledge, and it was therefore feared this could go at the expense of security.

It should be noted that similar arrangements of delegating responsibility exist in the aviation sector. Yet, the systems developed here seem to be more advanced than those found in the maritime sector, with national legislation detailing the requirements for becoming regulated agents and known consignors. Moreover, the Civil Aviation Authority Norway is responsible for both approving applications and inspecting the authorized agents to ensure that appropriate security measures are invoked and that the secure supply chain is maintained. As the regulatory system is more detailed and involves auditing processes, less tension concerning the delegation of security responsibility is observed among the security agencies at the airport.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS: TEMPORALITY OF SECURITY AT GLOBAL HUBS

The findings of this article demonstrate that, when facing the vast volume of flows that pass through global hubs such as airports and ports, policing agencies must adapt to the commercial views of efficiency, speed and time. Thus, the temporalization of security (Valverde 2011, 2014) is a central perspective for addressing the understanding of security at global hubs. As is made

clear by nodal governance scholars, governing mentalities inform understandings of security governance (Johnston and Shearing 2003), and there seems to be a connection between the notion of time and the mentalities of security agencies. Thus, it is well-established that the temporal imaginaries that dominate the literature are concerned with risk and pre-crime (Zedner 2007; Mythen and Walklate 2008). It has been noted that 'our current sense of security is to some considerable degree predicated upon forecasts about future security' (Crawford 2015: 472). Following the nodal governance perspective, policing in global hubs undoubtedly sets out to prevent loss and manage future risks (Salter 2007; Eski and Carpenter 2013; Nøkleberg 2022). Security in the sectors of aviation and maritime, however, has traditionally been reactive, with the implementation of measures following events and less future-oriented (Olsvik 2015; Price and Forrest 2016). Security professionals on borders decide their practice so as to preempt but are also influenced by the past and the present (Côté-Boucher 2018), which has meant discussion of the temporal orientation of security has moved beyond the preoccupation with future risks and concerns. This article explicitly considers the here and now orientation of temporality, directing attention to the interrelation of security and trade, speed and movements and customer satisfaction.

Efficiency and speed go along with the immense volume of flows needed for commercial success. The temporal dimension of airports and ports involves temporalization of a quite different kind than that which is concerned with the past, present and future of security measures and crime control. In the empirical context analysed, the experience and understanding of security are highly sensitive to commercial interests and the temporal orientations implicated in the trade regime. By examining the interaction between security and trade, this article reveals how subjectivities of policing agencies are affected by the ambitions, actions and decisions of others. That is, everyday practices of the agencies are influenced by the different governing mentalities that exists within the security environment at global hubs. But more importantly, these mentalities are also embedded in different social times. This is, for instance, shown in the way border police experience the ever-greater passenger flows caused by commercial interests. The empirical assessment illustrates how the police adapt to meet the demands of others whose interests are based upon different temporal understandings, leading to concern that the influence of others could challenge security and damage the quality of border control services.

The empirical contextualization of policing global hubs also reveals how pivotal the logics of trade are in reconfiguring our understanding of contemporary security; it speaks to the debate on expanding conceptualizations of security (Bourbeau 2015). The findings show the salient position of *security as service* in policing global hubs. The 'customer is king' attitude (Eski 2020), makes the service aspect of security particularly prominent for private actors, and can be seen in their contract and business strategy; it is thus vital for guiding their experience of security. The connection between security and service becomes particularly apparent when actors recognize the importance of satisfying customers' needs by making security part of the total experience of travel, and understanding how this can satisfy trade imperatives and companies' desires for increased flows. Although public policing agencies are generally concerned with the 'public good' of security (Loader and Walker 2007), the analysis suggests they are increasingly becoming part of a commercialized security order, obeying the imperatives of trade and adopting its distinctive temporal orientation towards vast volumes of flows, speed and efficiency.

This article shows that responsibilization is a prominent feature of the policing of global hubs: governmental agencies put increasing pressure on private actors to help control migratory flows, constraining them to develop skills not required for their core business. Such trends have been framed by others as the 'privatization' and 'commercialization' of immigration control (Gammeltoft-Hansen and Sørensen 2013; Scholten 2015). The practice of 'enrolling' or 'mobilizing' private actors' capacities and resources (Wood and Shearing 2007) clearly show

that policing and security agencies are involved in power relations, which previous studies have shown can be problematic for collaborative responses to policing and security (Crawford 1997). In this case, private actors are frustrated by the contrast between control responsibilities and their core business imperatives and by the challenge to their temporal perceptions, which revolve around the values of speedy flows and their ambition to increase the volume of flows. Governing flows is vital to ensuring a secure and seamless trade system, yet the fear of disruptions (Cowen 2010; Hoijtink 2017) looms large in the everyday government of security in global hubs. Various actors have deemed it necessary to amend their security practices to meet the imperative of trade. This demonstrates how policing agencies are confronted by contradictory interests, many feeling pressured to satisfy the demand of commerce for efficient and speedy flows, while at the same time maintaining proper security standards. Since security and trade logics are not always considered compatible, the tension agencies can experience when policing global hubs, arises from what has been described in policing studies as differences in guiding rationalities (White and Gill 2013). In the face of these seemingly conflicting interests and priorities there is a need for collaborative approaches (Nøkleberg 2020). To establish effective relations, it is necessary to be aware of the different interests involved and to prevent them from colliding. Interviewees assume that recognizing these differences can make it easier to negotiate them, and achieve a symbiotic relationship between the imperatives of trade and security. To accomplish this seems, however, to be challenging.

Given that this article explores the Norwegian context of airport and port security, raises questions about how this might influence the empirical observations that are presented. More specifically, a question arises in relation to whether global hubs can be understood as generic or localized spaces. Several observers have pointed out that attention should be paid to historical, cultural and political dimensions to help explain convergences and differences in policing and security governance (van Stokkom and Terpstra 2018). In comparative policing research, the Nordic model is considered to constitute a distinctive system, with the strong position of the welfare state, where the public police is the main provider of policing and security and generally enjoy a high level of trust among citizens (Holmberg 2014; Thomassen and Kääriäinen 2016; Devroe *et al.* 2017; Virta and Taponen 2017). Moreover, the Nordic policing model has been more reluctant to accept neoliberal discourses, which is assumed to have implications for how security governance arrangements are organized. Following these features, it has even been suggested that the contemporary landscape of security governance should be understood through the lens of Nordic policing exceptionalism (Ugelvik 2016). Thinking in terms of exceptionalism might therefore help reveal important nuances in the governing of security in the Nordic region.

However, one crucial feature of the aviation and maritime sectors is their international dimension. That is, airports and ports are national spaces, with strong connections to international space, since aircraft and ships often traverse national jurisdictions; making global hubs 'glocal' spaces. In terms of security, airports and ports are governed and organized by comprehensive international regulatory regimes (e.g. ICAO's Annex 17, the ISPS-code, and EU-regulation). In essence, the shared frameworks suggest that the security environment will be largely uniform, particularly as the frameworks seek to establish harmonization across countries. Although the empirical observations presented in this article are drawn from the Norwegian context, with its distinctive policing model, the practices of policing and securing Norwegian airports and ports are also incorporated in and affected by international regulatory systems.

Bearing in mind the standards set out by the international organizations and the European Union, it can be expected that the Norwegian policing and security agencies' efforts to govern and experiences of security in global hubs will resemble those of agencies operating in other countries and contexts, particularly those within the EU. There will, of course, be some differences in terms of local threat and risk assessments, but the regulations place restrictions on how

far local adjustments can go. In fact, it has previously been illustrated that security and policing in maritime ports share some similarities concerning the operation, precisely because many ports are seeking to comply with the ISPS-Code (Eski 2016). In European aviation, the principle of 'One-Stop Security'—involving the recognition of the equivalence of security measures in different countries—has been important to both facilitate harmonization in security and smooth flows. Moreover, the carrier sanctions, which shown above lead to responsibilization of private businesses at global hubs, are applicable in numerous countries (Scholten and Minderhoud 2008). This points to tendencies for global hubs to be viewed as generic spaces, suggesting that this study's findings of how policing and security agencies experience and respond to the imperatives of security and trade may be revealing more general trends.

By mapping how agencies experience and make sense of the interaction between trade and security, this article adds empirical evidence and expands our thinking about security governance. The ever-increasing volume of flows that move through the infrastructure of global hubs makes it likely that new practices, strategies, and technologies of policing will emerge. In line with the nodal governance approach, how security agencies respond and adapt to these developments and how it will influence the configuration of security governance at global hubs will be open to empirical investigation, rather than something to be assumed a priori. In the study of policing and security, connecting the imperatives of trade with security makes clear the importance of adopting temporal dimensions that are not restricted to preemptive logics and risk mentalities, and this can foster novel ways to shed light on these processes, and thus move contemporary debates forward.

REFERENCES

Aas, K. F. (2007), 'Analysing a World in Motion: Global Flows Meet "Criminology of the Other"', *Theoretical Criminology*, 11: 283–303.

Aas, K. F. (2011), '"Crimmigrant" Bodies and Bona Fide Travelers: Surveillance, Citizenship and Global Governance', *Theoretical Criminology*, 15: 331–46. doi:10.1177/1362480610396643.

Adam, B. (2006), 'Time', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 23/2–3: 119–26.

Adey, P. (2004), 'Secured and Sorted Mobilities: Examples from the Airport', *Surveillance and Society*, 1: 4.

Adey, P. (2008), 'Mobilities and Modulations: The Airport as a Difference Machine', in M. B. Salter, ed., *Politics at the Airport*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Amicelle, A., Côté-Boucher, K., Dupont, B., Mulone, M., Shearing, C. and Tanner, S. (2017), 'Criminology in the Face of Flows: Reflections on Contemporary Policing and Security', *Global Crime*, 18/3: 165–75. doi:10.1080/17440572.2017.1350427.

Blanesi Vidal, J. and Kirchmaier, T. (2018), 'The Effect of Police Response Time on Crime Clearance Rates', *The Review of Economic Studies*, 85: 855–91.

Bourbeau, P. (2015), *Security: Dialogue Across Disciplines*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bradbury, S. L. (2010), 'An Assessment of the Free and Secure Trade (FAST) Program Along the Canada–US Border', *Transport Policy*, 17/6: 367–80. doi:10.1016/j.tranpol.2010.04.003.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006), 'Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology', *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3: 77–101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa.

Brewer, R. (2014), *Policing the Waterfront: Networks, Partnerships and the Governance of Port Security*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Castells, M. (1996), *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture, Vol. I: The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Cihan, A., Zhang, Y. and Hoover, L. (2012), 'Police Response Time to In-Progress Burglary: A Multilevel Analysis', *Police Quarterly*, 15/3: 308–27. doi:10.1177/1098611112447753.

Côté-Boucher, K. (2018), 'Of "Old" and "New" Ways: Generations, Border Control and the Temporality of Security', *Theoretical Criminology*, 22/2: 149–68.

Côté-Boucher, K. (2020), *Border Frictions: Gender, Generation and Technology on the Frontline*. London: Routledge.

Côté-Boucher, K., Infantino, F. and Salter, M. B. (2014), 'Border Security as Practice: An AGENDA for research', *Security Dialogue*, 45/3: 195–208. doi:10.1177/0967010614533243.

Coupe, R. T. and Blake, L. (2005), 'The Effects of Patrol Workloads and Response Strength on Arrests at Burglary Emergencies', *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33/3: 239–55.

Cowen, D. (2010), 'A Geography of Logistics: Market Authority and the Security of Supply Chains', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 100/3: 600–20. doi:10.1080/00045601003794908.

Cowen, D. (2014), *The Deadly Life of Logistics: Mapping Violence in Global Trade*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Crawford, A. (1997), *The Local Governance of Crime: Appeals to Community and Partnerships*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Crawford, A. (2015), 'Temporality in Restorative Justice: On Time, Timing and Time-Consciousness', *Theoretical Criminology*, 19/4: 470–90. doi:10.1177/1362480615575804.

Devroe, E., Edwards, A. and Ponsaers, P. (2017), *Policing European Metropolises: The Politics of Security in City-Regions*. London: Routledge.

Eriksen, T. H. (2001), *Tyranny of the Moment: Fast and Slow Time in the Information Age*, 192 p. London: Pluto Press.

Eski, Y. (2011), '"Port of Call": Towards a Criminology of Port Security', *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 11/5: 415–31.

Eski, Y. (2016), *Policing, Port Security and Crime Control: An Ethnography of the Port Securityscape*. London: Routledge.

Eski, Y. (2020), 'Customer is King: Promoting Port Policing, Supporting Hypercommercialism', *Policing and Society*, 30: 153–68.

Eski, Y. and Buijt, R. (2017), 'Dockers in Drugs: Policing the Illegal Drug Trade and Port Employee Corruption in the Port of Rotterdam', *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 11: 371–86.

Eski, Y. and Carpenter, A. (2013), 'Policing in EU Seaports: Impact of the ISPS Code on Port Security Post 9/11', in M. O'Neill, K. Swinton and A. Winter, eds., *New Challenges for the EU Internal Security Strategy*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Forman, P. J. (2018), 'Circulations Beyond Nodes: (In)securities Along the Pipeline', *Mobilities*, 13: 231–45.

Froestad, J., Grimwood, S., Herbstein, T. and Shearing, C. (2015), 'Policy Design and Nodal Governance: A Comparative Analysis of Determinants of Environmental Policy Change in a South African City', *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 17/2: 174–91.

Gammeltoft-Hansen, T. (2013), 'The Rise of the Private Border Guard: Governance and Accountability in the Involvement of Non-State Actors in Migration Management', in T. Gammeltoft-Hansen and N. N. Sørensen, eds., *The Migration Industry and the Commercialization of International Migration*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Gammeltoft-Hansen, T. and Sørensen, N. N. (2013), *The Migration Industry and the Commercialization of International Migration*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Garland, D. (2001), *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gashi, L., Pedersen, W. and Ugelvik, T. (2021), 'The Pains of Detainment: Experience of Time and Coping Strategies at Immigration Detention Centres', *Theoretical Criminology*, 25/1: 88–106.

Hainen, A. M., Remias, S. M., Bullock, D. M. and Mannering, F. L. (2013), 'A Hazard-based Analysis of Airport Security Transit Times', *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 32: 32–8. doi:10.1016/j.jairtraman.2013.06.002.

Hoijtink, M. (2017), 'Governing in the Space of the "Seam": Airport Security after the Liquid Bomb Plot', *International Political Sociology*, 11: 308–26. doi:10.1093/ips/olx010.

Holmberg, L. (2014), 'Scandinavian Police Reforms: Can You Have Your Cake and Eat It, Too?', *Police Practice and Research*, 15: 447–60.

Hübschle, A. (2017), 'Fluid Interfaces Between Flows of Rhino Horn', *Global Crime*, 18: 198–217. doi:10.1080/17440572.2017.1345680.

Hufnagel, S. and Moiseienko, A. (2020), *Policing Transnational Crime: Law Enforcement of Criminal Flows*. Abingdon: Routledge.

ICAO. (2018), *Annual Report of the Council*. Montréal: International Civil Aviation Organization.

ICAO. (2020), *Effects of Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19) on Civil Aviation: Economic Impact Analysis*. Montréal: International Civil Aviation Organization.

Inda, J. X. and Rosaldo, R. (2002), 'Introduction: A World in Motion', in J. X. Inda and R. Rosaldo, eds., *The Anthropology of Globalization: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Johnston, L. and Shearing, C. (2003), *Governing Security: Explorations in Policing and Justice*, 177 p. New York: Routledge.

Lavenex, S. (2006), 'Shifting Up and Out: The Foreign Policy of European Immigration Control', *West European Politics*, 29: 329–50. doi:10.1080/01402380500512684.

Lee, J. -S., Lee, J. and Hoover, L. T. (2017), 'What Conditions Affect Police Response Time? Examining Situational and Neighborhood Factors', *Police Quarterly*, 20: 61–80.

Leese, M. (2016), 'Governing Airport Security Between the Market and the Public Good', *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 16/2: 158–75.

Leese, M. and Wittendorp, S. (2018), 'The New Mobilities Paradigm and Critical Security Studies: Exploring Common Ground', *Mobilities*, 13: 171–84. doi:10.1080/17450101.2018.1427016.

Lindøe, P. H. and Kringen, J. (2015), 'Risk Governance of Hazardous Industrial Ports and Areas: A Case Study of Industrial Areas and Harbors in Norway', *Journal of Risk Research*, 18: 931–46. doi:10.1080/13669877.2015.1017829.

Lloyd, J. (2003), 'Airport Technology, Travel, and Consumption', *Space and Culture*, 6: 93–109. doi:10.1177/1206331203251254.

Loader, I. and Walker, N. (2007), *Civilizing Security*, 305 p. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyon, D. (2008), 'Filtering Flows, Friends, and Foes: Global Surveillance', in M. B. Salter, ed., *Politics at the Airport*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

McCulloch, J. and Wilson, D. (2016), *Pre-crime: Pre-emption, Precaution and the Future*. London: Routledge.

Mythen, G. and Walklate, S. (2008), 'Terrorism, Risk and International Security: The Perils of Asking "What If?"', *Security Dialogue*, 39: 221–42. doi:10.1177/0967010608088776.

Nøkleberg, M. (2020), 'The Public-private Divide Revisited: Questioning the Middle Ground of Hybridity in Policing', *Policing and Society*, 30: 601–17.

Nøkleberg, M. (2022), 'Expecting the Exceptional in the Everyday: Policing Global Transportation Hubs', *Security Dialogue*, 53: 164–81.

O'Donnell, I. (2014), *Prisoners, Solitude, and Time*, 352 p. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

OECD. (2003), *Security in Maritime Transport: Risk Factors and Economic Impact*. OECD. Paris: Maritime Transport Committee Report.

Olsvik, E. A. (2015), *Challenges of Aviation Security regulation in Norway post 9/11, Vol. PhD*. University of Stavanger.

Pickering, S. and Weber, L. (2006), *Borders, Mobility and Technologies of Control*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Price, J. and Forrest, J. (2016), *Practical Aviation Security: Predicting and Preventing Future Threats*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Rosa, H. (2010), *Alienation and Acceleration: Towards a Critical Theory of Late-modern Temporality*, 116 p. Malmö: NSU Press.

Runhovde, S. R. (2017), 'Comparing Discourse to Officer Perceptions: The Problems of War and Militarization in Wildlife Crime Enforcement', *Critical Criminology*, 25: 275–91. doi:10.1007/s10612-017-9360-0.

Salter, M. B. (2007), 'SeMS and Sensibility: Security Management Systems and the Management of Risk in the Canadian Air Transport Security Authority', *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 13: 389–98. doi:10.1016/j.jairtraman.2007.07.004.

Salter, M. B. (2008a), 'Imagining Numbers: Risk, Quantification, and Aviation Security', *Security Dialogue*, 39: 243–66. doi:10.1177/0967010608088777.

Salter, M. B. (2008b), *Politics at the Airport*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Salter, M. B. (2008c), 'The Global Airport: Managing Space, Speed, and Security', in M. B. Salter, ed., *Politics at the Airport*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Salter, M. B. (2015), 'Passport Photos', in M. B. Salter, ed., *Making Things International 1: Circuits and Motion*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Sassen, S. (2001), *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*, 2nd edn. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Scholten, S. (2015), *The Privatisation of Immigration Control through Carrier Sanctions: The Role of Private Transport Companies in Dutch and British Immigration Control*. Leiden: Brill Nijhoff.

Scholten, S. and Minderhoud, P. (2008), 'Regulating Immigration Control: Carrier Sanctions in the Netherlands', *European Journal of Migration and Law*, 10: 123–47. doi:10.1163/157181608x317309.

Scholten, S. and Terlouw, A. (2014), 'The Responsibility of Private Carriers in Immigration Control', in M. Ambrus, K. Arts, E. Hey and H. Raulus, eds., *The Role of 'Experts' in International Decision-Making: Advisors, Decision-Makers or Irrelevant?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sergi, A. (2021), 'Policing the Port, Watching the City. Manifestations of Organised Crime in the Port of Genoa'. *Policing and Society*, 31: 639–655. doi:10.1080/10439463.2020.1758103.

Shearing, C. and Stenning, P. (1981), 'Modern Private Security: Its Growth and Implications', *Crime and Justice*, 3: 193–245.

Thomassen, G. and Kääriäinen, J. (2016), 'System Satisfaction, Contact Satisfaction, and Trust in the Police: A Study of Norway', *European Journal of Policing Studies*, 3: 437–448.

Ugelvik, S. (2016), 'Policing High-Trust Societies - Five Pieces to the Puzzle', *Nordisk politiforskning*, 3: 97–110. doi:10.18261/issn.1894-8693-2016-02-03.

UNCTAD. (2019), *Review of Maritime Transport 2019*. New York: United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

Valverde, M. (2011), 'Questions of Security: A Framework for Research', *Theoretical Criminology*, 15: 31–22. doi:10.1177/1362480610382569.

Valverde, M. (2014), 'Studying the Governance of Crime and Security: Space, Time and Jurisdiction', *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 14/4: 379–91.

van der Woude, M. (2019), 'A Patchwork of Intra-Schengen Policing: Border Games over National Identity and National Sovereignty', *Theoretical Criminology*, 24: 110–31. doi:10.1177/1362480619871615.

van Stokkom, B. and Terpstra, J. (2018), 'Plural Policing, the Public Good, and the Constitutional State: An International Comparison of Austria and Canada – Ontario', *Policing and Society*, 28: 415–30.

Virta, S. and Taponen, J. (2017), 'Policing Regime in Transition in the Nordic Countries: Some Critical Notes from the Nordic Reality', in E. Devroe, A. Edwards and P. Ponsaers, eds., *Policing European Metropolises: The Politics of Security in City-Regions*. Routledge.

Wajcman, J. (2008), 'Life in the Fast Lane? Towards a Sociology of Technology and Time', *The British Journal of Sociology*, 59: 59–77. doi:10.1111/j.1468-4446.2007.00182.x.

White, A. and Gill, M. (2013), 'The Transformation of Policing: From Ratios to Rationalities', *British Journal of Criminology*, 53: 74–93.

Wood, J. and Shearing, C. (2007), *Imagining security*, 184 p. Willan.

Zedner, L. (2007), 'Pre-crime and Post-criminology?' *Theoretical Criminology*, 11: 261–81. doi:10.1177/1362480607075851.

Zedner, L. (2009), *Security*, 206 p. Routledge.