Comments by Mareile Kaufman on:

Panel 1: Surveillance and Resilience, Relationships, Dynamics and Consequences (with Richard Jones, Charles Raab & Iván Székely)

RESILIENCE – SURVEILLANCE

- Thank you for a bold, thought-provoking approach and concrete suggestions about Resilience and surveillance. Your project is clearly very ambitious – since you work with a lot of contested and highly normative notions. I am very impressed with your case studies. We need more of those! I think if such research feeds into responsible innovation we can all be happy.

You have talked quite a bit about THE NOTION OF RESILIENCE

- First, I am very sympathetic to the idea of the continuous back-and-forth or struggle, that I think you want to capture with surveillance.
- I see that you have carefully looked at how Resilience is being discussed in different domains and you much reflect about that it is a contested term. Nonetheless, you choose to go objective about resilience and admittedly security policy projects don't give you much of a choice, but you are also political scientists and criminologists, that are allowed to ask a few more questions about the concept.
- (Not clear in empirical article) Duality: You take resilience as a given *value-neutral* notion / capacity and surveillance as the challenging aspect. At the same time you the rest of your papers are outspokenly normative and you reflect about that. For example, you (normatively) define "normalcy", you define surveillance etc.
- I am a bit surprised that resilience gets away with being "neutral", especially since you are otherwise so aware about all the dynamics and social relationships!
- In addition: You know the discourse and you choose to simply make it objective.
- → All this needs complication & context

  RATHER: THE MANY NOTIONS OF RESILIENCE/RESILIENCE IN CONTEXT

- Local discourses use resilience in various ways (Joseph).
- Since you agree that increasing the amount of resilience is a very powerful policy making tool, isn't the question then less how exactly you define resilience, **but rather in what way each notion of resilience is productive in society**? OR is you want to be more critical: why not using the inventory of the notion of resilience to check how each of them works with, but also erodes certain public goods, such as solidarity etc.?

MODELING RESILIENCE & THE SYSTEMS APPROACH

- One result from choosing resilience to be value neutral or objective is that you render such a social circumstance very scientific: you have diagrams and tables etc. What are the promises and the pitfalls of a systems approach to try and grasp something as complex as democratic values, surveillance and resilience? Differently: Is the idea of modelling and measuring resilience compatible with the ambiguity and multiplicity of social processes?
- If modelling is the aim of this exercise, emergence as a concept may be more useful, meaning that developments are in constant dialogue – back and forth. Meaning also - a bit like what Eric Rigaud has already asked: are we bouncing "back" from events or continuously developing sth new? → this is also more descriptive of the back-and-forth/struggle that you describe in relation to surveillance and how it is reacted to

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESILIENCE & SURVEILLANCE

- What you not expand upon (and merely mention) is how surveillance also feeds into resilience: the surveillance that happens in order to engender resilience. This is missing in your model and is not explorable when resilience is to be taken as a "positive" form of bouncing back alone.

- To what extent is the surveillance you describe rather one that feeds into classic discourses of prevention and protection/pre-emption/robustness (and not resilience, ex post facto)? → needs cleaning up in the term of usage

- If you want to explore the relationship between power and interrogating power, of concepts that are being eroded and that withstand this erosion – do you even need resilience (especially since it is a contested concept)? If you want to use resilience, why not use more the aspect of "self-organization" or response/feedback in relation to surveillance? But that needs careful distinction from resistance or counter-cultures etc. that have a developed literature (unlike they claim, "resilience" to surveillance has been researched)
- I like the aspects they discuss in relation to migration, but why have they not consulted literature on dataveillance and how that is being countered (i.e. Brunton and Nissenbaum, Hacking)?
- Are you maybe more talking about **withstanding** and not "Bouncing back" here? OR the constant back-and-forth I mentioned before...