# HARMFUL POLICING

## ROTTERDAM SYMPOSIUM DUTCH SURVEILLANCE STUDIES

## 10 NOVEMBER 2026

**Symposium organized by**
**Jair Schalkwijk, Merel Driessen**
**& Marc Schuilenburg**
**Erasmus School of Law, Rotterdam**

Programme Symposium

# Harmful Policing

Symposium organized by
Jair Schalkwijk, Merel Driessen & Marc Schuilenburg
Erasmus School of Law, Rotterdam

The lethal violence being perpetrated by ICE in the United States and the death of a migrant worker in French police custody have caused widespread outrage and reinvigorated concerns about harmful policing and disproportionate uses of force. Whilst police violence is often viewed as a physical force, the increased digitization of policing produces new forms of harm. By connecting both dimensions, this symposium aims to contribute to the interplay between technology, policing and harm.

Research into 'traditional' forms of police violence tend to focus on physical force, less-than-lethal weaponry, crowd control and fatal incidents. The digitization of policing brings about the potential for a new range of harms, such as through facial and speech recognition software, algorithmic decision-making, risk-profiling and online surveillance. Moreover, the usage of digital technologies can influence discriminatory practices such as stop-and-searches and other traditional forms of police violence.

Harmful policing manifests itself in a wide range of lived experiences and employs a diverse, increasingly digitalizing, set of methods and applications. In this symposium we explore the interactions between digital policing and physical manifestations of police violence, and ask if our algorithmic society calls for redefining police violence and the use of force. How are people impacted by digital police violence? Does digital policing influence and intertwine with traditional modes of police violence and, if so, how? But also: which tools can foster police transparency and accountability that earn public trust and reduce harmful policing?

This event is supported by AI Maps, the small grants scheme of the Erasmus Centre of Law and Digitalization, and the Erasmus School of Law.

**Location and Public Transportation:**
The Symposium is at the Erasmus School of Law, Sanders Building, in room 0-07 (Moot Court), which is located on the ground floor. Drinks are at the Pavilion, next to the pond. The nearest tram stop to the university is Woudestein, which is just a 4-minute walk away, while the closest metro stop is Kralingse Zoom, approximately a 10-minute walk. For check-in, you can conveniently use your bank pass or Apple Pay, but please don't forget to check out as well! A map of Erasmus campus can be found here.

Accommodation: We suggest considering accommodation in Kralingen, a peaceful and quiet neighborhood near the university. For hotels, Novotel (next to the university), The Social Hub and Inntel Hotel are our recommended choices.

Emergency contact: driessen@law.eur.nl

# TUESDAY 10 NOVEMBER 2026

**Campus Erasmus University Rotterdam**
**Sanders building room 0-07 (Moot Court)**

**8:30 – 9:00** **Arrival and Registration**
**9:00 – 9:15** **Welcome Address • Marc Schuilenburg (ERASMUS UNIVERSITY)**

**9:15 – 10:15** **Keynote: Tessa Diphoorn (UTRECHT UNIVERSITY)**
*Seeing Violence, Governing Policing: Oversight, Legitimacy, and Police Violence in Kenya*

As policing becomes increasingly digitalized, questions of accountability, transparency, and harm have become more urgent than ever. Drawing on ethnographic research with police officers, oversight institutions, and civil society organizations in Kenya, I will discuss how policing and its oversight can only be understood by examining the everyday social and political worlds in which they are embedded. Rather than treating policing and oversight as separate domains, I show how both are constituted through the same relationships of trust, loyalty, bureaucracy, and political negotiation. This relational perspective reveals that oversight is not simply a mechanism for addressing police violence, but is itself a contested and politicized practice that can produce new forms of exclusion, uncertainty, and harm while simultaneously legitimizing policing institutions. By bringing an ethnographic lens to debates on harmful policing, I argue that understanding police violence requires equal attention to the everyday practices through which accountability itself is enacted, contested, and lived, offering broader insights into both conventional and increasingly digital forms of policing.

**10:15 – 10:30** **Coffee Break**

**10:30 – 11:30** **Session A: Physical harms (chair: Merel Driessen)**
When thinking of harmful policing, physical police violence is one of the first phenomena that comes to mind. How do violent arrests, forceful crackdowns and discriminatory practices continue to shape policing? Has the physical dimension of police violence changed in a digitalized social sphere? Should we worry about politics gearing towards the expansion of police weaponry?

Anna Pivaty and Yinthe Feys: *Conceptualising Algorithmic Fairness In Criminal Justice: An Interdisciplinary Scoping Review*

Vincenzo Scalia: *Eyes On Brutalities: Preventive Repression And Resistance From Below*

Jair Schalkwijk: *Defining Police Violence In The Context of Deaths At The Hands Of The Police*

David Lydon: *Imaginatively Conceptualising And Scaling The Notion Of Harmful Policing: The Global Harms Of The Digitization Of Local Policing*

**11:30 – 12:30** **Session B: Digital harms (chair: Amr Marzouk)**
Digitalization has transformed how police understand, investigate and address criminalised behaviour. How does the use of advanced technologies, such as facial recognition and biometric algorithms, affect civil liberties? Do predictive and automatic decision-making tools prioritize effectiveness over fairness? What to make of the police infiltration of online spaces?

Alice Dejean de la Bâtie and Sharon Okunrobo Perez: *Digital Policing And The Securitisation Of Peaceful Protest In Europe*

Tatiana Lysova: *"They Told Me They Can Check The Footage From The Cameras By The Entrance To My Building And Know If I'm Inside": The Chilling Effect Of Digital- And AI-Enabled Surveillance On Protest Activity In Russia*

Markus Naarttijärvi and Ingvild Bruce: *The Weberian Monopoly In The Digital Age: Police Hacking As Digital Force*

Anne Sofie Gregersen and Vasilis Galis: *Arenas Of Control: Facial Recognition Camera's In Danish Football Stadiums*

# TUESDAY 10 NOVEMBER 2026

**Campus Erasmus University Rotterdam**
**Sanders building room 0-07 (Moot Court)**

## 12:30 - 13:30 Lunch

**13:30 – 14:30 Keynote: Pete Fussey (UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON)**
*Protest in the age of advanced surveillance: Evidencing chilling effects and complex human rights harm in digital societies*

The surveillance of protests today relies on a blend of novel and more traditional approaches, of visible and invisible, remote and proximate remote techniques. The heightened intrusion contrasts with the reduced visibility of surveillance, extending asymmetries between observed and observer, and bringing complex implications for those subjected to this form of monitoring. Drawing on extensive fieldwork cultivated as part of a UN human rights project, documenting the experiences of protests organisers, legal observers and activists in over 80 countries, this paper identifies and analyses the complex and interconnected harms generated by the surveillance of protests in the digital age.

**14:30 - 15:15 Session C: Accountability for harm (chair: Martijn Wessels)**
The legitimacy of policing relies upon accountability as a mechanisms for procedural and retributive justice. The way in which accountability does (not) take shape within policing practices (re)produces power relations. What is the role of accountability infrastructures in police violence? Should we look at accountability as a potential violence tool?

Hon Bor So: *Transparant But Not Traceable: Reconstructability Gaps In Voluntary AI Transparency Record For UK Policing*

Jonathan Allen: *Who's Watching? Harm, Accountability, And Oversight of Predictive Policing*

Julia Rootenberg: *"Nobody Likes Oversight": The Performance of Police Accountability In New York City*

**15:15 - 15:45 Interview with Extinction Rebellion (chair: Merel Driessen)**
Human rights watchdogs signal an increasingly repressive and punitive policing of social movements. In this live interview, an activist from the Dutch Extinction Rebellion reflects on how protest policing forms a continuum of harmful practices across physical, digital, spatial and procedural dimensions.

## 15:45 – 16:00 Coffee Break

**16:00 – 17.00 Session D: Spatial harms (chair: Jair Schalkwijk)**
Policing dictates the politics and social relations of public space. How does this spatial and territorial dimension of policing perpetuate harmful practices? In what way do cityscapes provide opportunities for increased surveillance and repression?

Birte Lenaers: *Spatial Justice Under Police Surveillance: Rethinking Urban Police Surveillance Harm As Situated Spatial Harm*

Paul le Derff: *Where Does the Police Kill? Analysis Of Fatal Police Intervention at the Municipal level In France*

Dirim Dinçer and Grazia Tona: *Policing By Sheltering, An Architectural Spectrum of Risk*

Zoha Waseem: *From Colonial Surveillance To Algorithmic Governance: Harmful Policing In the Era of Smart Cities*

## 17:00 – 18.30 Drinks & Bites at Erasmus Paviljoen

# Abstracts

## Session A: Physical harms

### Conceptualising Algorithmic Fairness in Criminal Justice: An Interdisciplinary Scoping Review

**Anna Pivaty (Radboud University)**
**Yinthe Feys (Radboud University)**

This presentation presents preliminary findings from a scoping review on definitions of algorithmic fairness in criminal justice (39 journal articles published since 2016). The review examines how fairness is conceptualised across recent legal, computer science, philosophical/ethical, and social sciences scholarship, and which forms of harm are recognised within these definitions. Although most surveyed literature concerns algorithmic risk assessment systems rather than predictive policing narrowly defined, it is analytically relevant to policing and data-driven security governance, because all these systems rely on similar logics of risk classification, surveillance, and intervention.

The preliminary analysis suggests that, despite increased interdisciplinary engagement, fairness is still frequently framed in terms of measurable disparities, predictive accuracy, error distribution, bias mitigation, or procedural safeguards, often through the language of technical optimisation and ethical trade-offs. While valuable, these approaches tend to privilege harms that can be quantified or linked to discrete decision points. As a result, relational, institutional, and epistemic harms connected to surveillance, suspicion, intensified police attention, and cumulative intervention remain more difficult to articulate within prevailing fairness vocabularies. Despite a clear trend towards broadening the definition beyond statistical fairness, the review further identifies relatively limited engagement with how algorithmic systems reshape institutional practices (including those of policing and security governance), redistribute authority between human and machine judgement, and affect the ability of affected persons and communities to contest or explain, or resist the relevant risks. The presentation argues that prevailing fairness definitions remain too narrow when fairness is treated primarily as a technical, distributive, ethical, or regulatory problem. These omissions may constrain the development of predictive policing scholarship. Instead, it calls for an interdisciplinary understanding of fairness as relational and institutional, attentive to questions of recognition, voice, contestability, and institutional power.

### Eyes on brutalities: Preventive repression and resistance from below

**Vincenzo Scalia (University of Florence)**

Pro-Palestine protest has result into the reawakening of Italian opposition forces. Plenty of demonstrations in all the main cities, have combined the stance for Palestine with the opposition against the current extreme right government led by Giorgia Meloni, and its authoritarian and neoliberal policies. The reaction of the ruling coalition has resulted in the approval of two security decrees that enforce preventive repression: it is possible to hold in custody suspected extremist militant while demonstrations go on, sit ins and flat occupations have become a crime, like blocking streets. On the other hands, police forces have been provided with a “penal shield”: they are not accountable for the brutalities they commit while on duty. In case they are convicted of the crime, the government provides them with financial support.

During demonstrations, cities are more and more patrolled by police forces in anti-riot gears. Violent repression has been more and more common. On the 2nd of October 2025, in Bologna, during a demonstration, police forces fired tear gas riots against demonstrators. One of the gas cylinders hit Lince, a demonstrator, in her face, causing her to suffer a permanent blindness in one eye. A network of activists and NGOs has been supporting Lince in her battle for making the police accountable and rising awareness on authoritarianism. This paper will analyse the dialectic of criminalization and resistance, drawing on the works of Stanley Cohen, Mark Neocleous, Michel Foucault.

### Defining police violence in research on deaths at the hands of the police

**Jair Schalkwijk (Erasmus University Rotterdam)**

In France, England, the Netherlands, and the United States, grassroots organisations have documented deaths following police contact for many years. In the United States, this work is carried out by Mapping Police Violence. In France, Basta! and Désarmons-les!, in England and Wales Inquest, and in the Netherlands Controle Alt Delete also provide support to bereaved families. They offer legal assistance, organise commemorations, and campaign against police brutality and institutional racism.

To compare the number of deaths across countries, I relate the number of fatalities to each country's population size. This makes it possible to compare the number of deaths following police contact per 10 million inhabitants per year. To examine disproportionality, I then relate the number of victims to relevant subpopulations within each country. For example, in the United States I ask: how often do Black Americans die following police contact relative to the total Black population in the United States, and how does this compare with White Americans? I apply the same analysis in the other countries, allowing for cross-national comparisons.

However, the datasets from the four countries differ. The Mapping Police Violence dataset includes only deaths resulting from police use of force. The French and Dutch datasets also include fatal traffic incidents occurring during police pursuits. The dataset from England and Wales additionally includes suicides occurring within two days of release from police custody. The bias introduced by these differences in dataset composition can be addressed by applying a common definition of police violence. This makes it possible to compare only those deaths that fall within the same definition, thereby improving the comparability of findings across countries.

However, cases excluded from the comparison are, by definition, not classified as police violence. This may conflict with the perspectives of bereaved families who claim that police violence did play a role in the death of their loved one. It may also place grassroots organisations in a difficult position. These organisations grant researchers access to datasets they have built over many years, only for researchers to conclude that some of the very cases in which the organisations support bereaved families do not constitute police violence.

In my presentation, I will discuss the extent to which researchers should take the perspectives and considerations of grassroots organisations into account when selecting and applying a definition of police violence.

### Imaginatively conceptualising and scaling the notion of harmful policing: the global harms of the digitization of local policing

David Lydon (Canterbury Christ Church University)

'Harmful policing' involving digital technology is often understood in the context of local applications and activities, inter alia, facial recognition and biometrics, predictive analytics, profiling, surveillance, and 'data-led' targeting of individuals and communities. Yet the digitization of local policing engages types of harm that are not confined to the immediacy of community encounters and contexts, nor the geographic localities in which it occurs. The harms of police use of technology travel more widely across global infrastructures, institutions, and populations, and the impacts are not equal. This paper extends the concept of 'harmful policing' to highlight how expansive police digitization involves forms of violence (broadly conceived) far beyond direct physical force and coercion, towards wider social, environmental, economic, democratic, and infrastructural harms outside local jurisdictional boundaries. Conceptually, the paper presents 'harmful policing' as a phenomenon in which neighbourhood-level police practices are unavoidably linked with global systems and consequences. It argues that digitized policing harms are simultaneously local and global, immediate and enduring, visible and concealed, involving resource extraction and depletion, labour rights, ecological damage, and socio-economic inequity. In this conceptualisation, the notion of 'harmful policing' then becomes a distributed 'architecture of harm.'

The presentation applies an interdisciplinary approach to the symposium's themes, including original artwork depicting the global harms of digitized policing, supplemented by a poem exploring them through the eyes of a child. Specially created for this symposium, the artwork and poetry represent how the harms radiate across structures of control, human and ecological vulnerabilities, and exclusion; intended to provoke attendees' reflection and engagement with global dimensions of police 'violence.'

# Session B: Digital harms

### Digital Policing and the Securitisation of Peaceful Protest in Europe

Alice Dejean de la Bâtie (Tilburg university)
Sharon Okunrobo Perez (University of Liège)

This paper examines how the securitization of peaceful protest in Europe expands harmful policing beyond physical force into the digital sphere. Across several jurisdictions, activists are increasingly framed as extremists, radicals, or potential terrorists. This discursive shift does more than stigmatize dissent: it helps legitimize intrusive policing practices, including biometric identification, protest surveillance, intelligence databases, watchlists, and forms of pre-emptive profiling originally associated with counterterrorism. Drawing on European human rights law, EU data protection law, and targeted examples from France, Germany, Spain, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Switzerland, the paper argues that digital policing can itself constitute a form of harm. It exposes activists to opaque data collection, political categorization, and chilling effects that undermine privacy, data protection, freedom of expression, and freedom of assembly. At the same time, these digital practices interact with more traditional forms of protest policing by lowering thresholds for suspicion, intervention, and coercion. The paper therefore asks whether contemporary understandings of police violence and use of force are too narrowly tied to bodily injury. It concludes that harmful policing in an algorithmic society must be understood as both material and informational, and that European legal safeguards, transparency duties, and oversight mechanisms must be strengthened to precent the normalisation of surveillance-driven repression of democratic dissent.

### The chilling effect of digital- and AI-enabled surveillance on protest activity in Russia

Tatiana Lysova (University of Milan-Bicocca)

The proliferation of digital- and AI-enabled surveillance technologies within authoritarian policing raises concerns about the intensification of state control and surveillance (Liu, 2023). This paper, relying on the concepts of authoritarian surveillant assemblage (ASA) and chilling effect, examines how Russia's digital- and AI-enabled ASA contributes to digital police violence, conceptualised as the systematic use of surveillance technologies to intimidate and suppress political dissent.

The paper demonstrates that such technologies as facial recognition and algorithmic social media monitoring generate chilling effects on protest activity, especially against the backdrop of the full-scale invasion of Ukraine and the intensification of dissent suppression in the country. Thus, following the invasion, the police have conducted preemptive detention of known activists in public spaces before anticipated protest events or have harassed activists relying on the extensive network of surveillance cameras in Moscow. Users of a Russian analogue of Facebook, Vkontakte, have faced fines or legal consequences for disseminating "fakes" about and "discrediting" the Russian Army. It is germane to notice that at least two private companies supply their social media monitoring technologies to the Russian police.

These cases, along with others, illustrate how digital and AI technologies become the tools of digital police violence, producing the erosion of democratic processes in the country. Specifically, digital- and AI-enabled Russian ASA contributes to shrinking the space for legitimate dissent and to compelling conformity, or, in extreme cases, to pushing people out of the country through the certainty of being watched.

### The Weberian Monopoly in the Digital Age: Police Hacking as Digital Force

**Markus Naarttijärvi (Umeå university)**
**Ingvild Bruce (Norwegian Police University College)**

Max Weber's concept of the monopoly of violence ("Gewalt") is foundational to the modern state and underpins the police's mandate to use such violence legitimately. Yet, as police power is increasingly exercised through non-physical means, the Weberian monopoly cannot be understood solely in terms of physical violence. Rather, "Gewalt" also encompasses coercion, authority, and control, expanding the notion of police force beyond bodily intervention, toward a wider conception of force.
In this contribution, we develop the concept of *digital force* through an analysis of emerging police hacking mandates in Sweden, Norway, and the Netherlands. We argue that police hacking should be understood not merely as a form of surveillance, but as an expression of coercive state power in the digital domain. Conceptualizing police hacking as digital force opens new avenues for research on sovereignty, jurisdiction, police legitimacy, and state dependency on private technological actors. At the same time, it highlights how hacking mandates may represent attempts to (re)assert a Weberian monopoly of force within a technological environment that simultaneously transforms the meaning, reach, and implications of state coercion.

### Arenas of control: facial recognition cameras in Danish football stadiums

**Anne Sofie Gregersen (IT University of Copenhagen)**
**Vasilis Galis (IT University of Copenhagen)**

Since 2023, supposed rising incidents of organized crime and ignited conflicts among Danish football fans, have received much public attention in Denmark. In response to this alleged national crime crisis (Lorentzen Dehnhardt, 2025), the Danish police and Danish Superliga stadiums have been equipped with facial recognition cameras. Through its implementation, facial recognition – configuring automated suspicion (Fussey & Murray, 2025), access to register data (Justitsministeriet, 2025) and biometrics – has been promoted as a tool to strengthen national security and preventing crime (Justitsministeriet, 2024).

What kind of sociotechnical imaginaries (Schiølin, 2020) are embedded in facial recognition technologies? How does the use of facial recognition influence citizens' democratic rights such as the freedom of assembly? These questions are central to this paper, which examines the evolution of camera surveillance as a policing tool in Danish law enforcement – from the early installations of CCTV (closed-circuit television) to the adoption of live cameras and most recently, the approval of facial recognition. Drawing on concepts from Science and Technology Studies (STS) and Critical Criminology Studies, the paper delves into the historical tendencies of camera surveillance and how it over time has enabled the exertion of police power. Through document analysis and interviews with police officers, security staff, developers and football fans, the project unfolds how facial recognition influence citizens subjected to the technology, while situating these experiences within the broader historical trajectory of societies of control (Deleuze, 1992).

# Session C: Accountability for harm

### Transparent But Not Traceable: Reconstructability Gaps in Voluntary AI Transparency Records for UK Policing

**Hon Bor So (Independent researcher)**

Digital policing harms are usually discussed in terms of surveillance, profiling, privacy loss, discriminatory risk assessment, and the expansion of police power through data infrastructures. This paper examines a narrower accountability mechanism: the loss of contestability when algorithmic policing records disclose tools but do not preserve the decision-event traces needed to challenge specific uses of those tools.
It examines the two UK policing-related records published under the Government's Algorithmic Transparency Recording Standard (ATRS): Hampshire and Thames Valley Police's Domestic Abuse Risk Assessment Tool (DARAT), a pre-deployment tool designed to grade domestic abuse occurrences for future harm risk; and West Midlands Police's exploratory analysis of rape and serious sexual offence investigations, which used statistical modelling to inform Public Protection Unit resource allocation. Both were early, non-mandatory policing submissions within the 2022 ATRS pilot context.

Using a quote-verified six-field reconstructability audit, the paper asks whether public records preserve the minimum conditions for an external party - a victim, defence solicitor, researcher, or court - to reconstruct and contest a specific operational or policy decision shaped by these tools. Both records score 6/12. Institutional ownership and process purpose are visible, but event-level actor identity, decision-point uncertainty, and specific oversight gates are absent.

The contribution is to identify a documentation-architecture mechanism of harmful policing: public disclosure can satisfy transparency expectations while remaining inadequate for practical contestability. The paper concludes with three minimal schema additions: event-level actor trace, uncertainty marker, and oversight-gate specification.

### Who's watching? Harm, accountability, and oversight of predictive policing

Jonathan Allen (University of Surrey)

Predictive policing is often associated with the risk of reinforcing harmful police practices, including violence. The numerous ethical, legal, organisational, and operational challenges linked to using predictive programmes can result in uneven impacts on the public. In this presentation, I examine how police organisations and governance can strengthen oversight and accountability of digital policing tools. I do this by combining and theoretically integrating analysis from a systematic review of 26 operational predictive policing studies published between 2015 and 2024, an investigation of 76 documents from the archive of a police data oversight committee (2019-2025), and 11 semi-structured interviews with police personnel and academics conducted between 2023 and 2025. Applying Wessels' (2024) propositions on algorithmic accountability for provocation, this presentation emphasises the challenges police data oversight committees face in increasing process transparency and accountability, given the limited understandability of algorithms and mixed decision-making. I demonstrate that even when oversight mechanisms (such as data committees, bodycams, and governance) are employed to improve the application of digital tools in policing, the pressure for tangible results can lead to (the potential for) traditional police violence. I explore key issues around ethics washing, transparency, the fragility of oversight, and the utilisation of digital tools, to suggest possible future directions.

### "Nobody Likes Oversight": The Performance of Police Accountability in New York City

Julia Rootenberg (Leiden University)

Accountability has become a defining demand of contemporary policing. Bodyworn cameras, right-to-record legislation, and civilian-led monitoring are increasingly invoked as mechanisms for constraining harmful policing and bolstering relationships between police and the public. Yet the persistence of police violence - and the systematic failure of these tools to address it - raises a troubling question: has accountability itself become a performance?

This presentation draws on ethnographic fieldwork conducted in New York City, comprising participant observation at the NYPD Citizens Police Academy and New York State Civilian Oversight conference, as well as interviews with current and former NYPD officers. Grounded in Foucault's theorization of visibility as a mechanism of power and Goffman's concept of impression management, it argues that the Citizens Police Academy and Civilian Complaint Review Board - New York City's most prominent oversight body - serve a common purpose: producing the appearance of accountability while ultimately preserving police discretion and institutional legitimacy. The Citizens Police Academy invites civilians inside the institution on carefully managed terms. The Civilian Complaint Review Board formally investigates police misconduct, yet remains beholden to the final say of the police commissioner.

So long as police oversight remains structurally subordinate to the institutions it monitors, it will continue to absorb demands for justice without delivering it. The performance of accountability is not a solution to harmful policing - it is one of its most durable features.

# Session D: Spatial Harms

### Spatial justice under police surveillance: Rethinking urban police surveillance harm as situated spatial harm

Birte Lenaers (Vrije Universiteit Brussel)

Across Europe, a surveillance-positive political climate is encouraging police forces to rapidly adopt new digital surveillance tools, often ahead of evidence-based policies. The idea that public space fosters relative anonymity is decreasing as asymmetrical visibility becomes increasingly normalised. Yet, how does intensifying (digital) police surveillance reshape the urban spaces we share, contest and inhabit? And how does this vary across different people and contexts? This presentation will introduce a PhD research proposal that seeks to broaden the zemiological understanding of police surveillance harms by centring the collective values of urban public space. Drawing from Urban Criminology, Surveillance Studies and Critical Urban Theory, the study will explore how police surveillance, as a tool that socially produces and politically organises urban public space, can be a source of spatial injustice (Soja, 2009). The presentation will outline the proposal's objective to study lived experiences of activists in Brussels and London, who claim urban public space to enable political visibility and contest dominant spatial orders. After elaborating upon the objectives and theoretical framework of the proposal, the presentation will reflect upon the envisioned methodological approach. As experiences of police surveillance are proven to be highly dependent on contextual and personal factors, the research methodology centres Haraway's (1988) notion of situated knowledge. Additionally, the research design is participatory in nature, prioritising collaboration, reflexivity, and shared decision-making to more fairly analyse those under study.

### Where does the police kill ? Analysis of fatal police intervention at the municipal-level in France

Paul Le Derff (Aix-Marseille University)

Is there racial bias in police killings? Since the pioneering work of James Fyfe, social scientists have debated this question for nearly sixty years. One perspective argues that the overrepresentation of racial minorities among victims of fatal police encounters does not necessarily reflect racial bias.
Rather, observed disparities can be explained by contextual factors, such as the circumstances of incidents and differential exposure to crime (Goldkamp, 1976; Fryer, 2019; Cesario et al., 2019). In contrast, other scholars contend that the evidence points to racial bias, noting that non-White individuals are disproportionately represented among unarmed people killed by police (Nix et al., 2017; Scott et al., 2017; Siegel et al., 2021).
More recently, a third perspective has shifted attention from the use of lethal force itself to unequal rates of contact with law enforcement (Miller et al., 2017; Ross et al., 2018; Streeter, 2019).
According to this view, some populations are more frequently exposed to police intervention, increasing their likelihood of being involved in encounters that may end in lethal force.
This perspective suggests that studying the social environments in which police killings occur may be more informative than focusing solely on victims' characteristics. While such ecological analyses have been conducted in countries with high rates of police killings, notably the United States (Ross, 2015; Siegel et al., 2021; Clark et al., 2023), they remain rare elsewhere. We therefore examine the geography of fatal police interventions in France between 2016 and 2024, mapping their distribution across municipalities and identifying the social characteristics associated with their occurrence.

## Policing by sheltering, an architectural spectrum of risk

Didim Dinçer (Delft University of Technology)
Grazia Tona (University of Groningen)

How does the policing of selected bodies shape the organization of spaces designed to contain them? The proposed contribution documents the physical and spatial construction of risk and suspicion by observing the interoperability of architectures and technologies in the securitisation of Dutch asylum shelters. The scope of this study is to inquire on architecture's engagement with the normalization of control within asylum regimes and build spatial literacy on what we call "policing-by-sheltering."
The term refers to everyday practices of emergency accommodation that leave selected individuals in the crosshair of surveillance, rendering bodies suspicious and reproducing carceral spaces. Through an open-source investigation of shelters' regulatory documents and conversational interviews with NGOs and human rights advocacy representatives, we map the spatial-material relationships that link shelter-like spaces to policing actions. Focusing on the Ter Apel reception complex —including the Central Reception Location (COL), the Process Reception Location (POL), and the annexed Asylum Seeker Center (AZC)— we aim to make spatial and policing relations intelligible through the elaboration of an "architectural spectrum of risk." While debates and studies on asylum have extensively examined the timeline of asylum procedures, the spectrum highlights how different phases of inspection, with corresponding levels of intensity, are associated not only with the application process but also with specific fields of suspicion and risk, which materialize spatially. In current times of political polarization and increasing violence against asylum seekers and their shelter facilities, we propose this ongoing investigation as a starting point for collective sense-making around asymmetrical policing relations, moving towards a redefinition of sheltering centred on trust, transparency and accountability.

## From Colonial Surveillance to Algorithmic Governance: Harmful Policing in the Era of Smart Cities

Zoha Waseem (University of Warwick)

This paper unpacks the colonial logics of surveillance, policing, and counterinsurgency that shape the contemporary algorithmic transformation and "smartification" of law enforcement and administrative decision-making in postcolonial cities. Considering the rapid deployment of "Safe City" projects in Pakistan, together with varied public and private security initiatives, I explore how the development of new surveillance assemblages and technologies, and their complementing regulatory and legal frameworks, are constructed as "modernization" of law enforcement and security architecture. However, these dynamics risk reproducing harmful policing practices including labelling, lawfare, pacification, and punishment, and sustaining a "governmentality of unease" that remains intertwined with the securitization of urban governance challenges and the construction of "moral panics". In uncovering these harms, this paper further assesses whether regulatory and institutional frameworks for algorithmic law enforcement and police digitalization in these postcolonial contexts can be designed to avoid colonial violence repeating itself in the era of the "smart" city. I draw upon interdisciplinary debates from critical criminology and surveillance studies, as well as fieldwork conducted in the city of Karachi, Pakistan, to connect features of Pakistan's colonial legal origins with its postcolonial policing present, revealing critical intersections between technological advancements, algorithmic authoritarianism, everyday policing and the law.