2024-09-26

Atmospheric geographies of (counter)terrorism

Sara Fregonese *University of Birmingham*

Paul Simpson *School of Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences*

Damien Masson *CY Cergy Paris Université*

Simon Runkel *Friedrich Schiller University Jena*

Carrie Benjamin *CY Cergy Paris Université*

et al. *See next page for additional authors*

Atmospheric geographies of (counter)terrorism

Fregonese, Sara; Simpson, Paul; Masson, Damien; Runkel, Simon; Benjamin, Carrie; Berlin, Sam; Ciax, katha; Drongiti, Angeliki

Published in:
Progress in Human Geography

DOI:
10.1177/03091325241268951

Publication date:
2024

Document version:
Peer reviewed version

Atmospheric geographies of (counter)terrorism

Key Words: terrorism; counterterrorism; atmosphere; urban space; crowds; difference.

Abstract

How are terror threats and counterterrorism measures experienced in everyday urban spaces? We argue that thinking atmospherically about the spaces of urban encounters with (counter)terrorism is important, firstly, to identify and question feelings and dispositions shaped by discourses, practices, and infrastructures of (counter)terrorism; secondly, to contribute spatial perspectives of felt experience to literatures on security and (counter)terrorism in geography and beyond; thirdly, to connect official understandings of (counter)terrorism with its everyday felt experiences and materialities. We highlight two conceptual and empirical arenas - the crowd and the question of difference - where atmospheric approaches to urban (counter)terrorism can be developed.

Introduction

How does (counter)terrorism register in the shared experience of cities? What atmospheres are shaped when diverse urban publics encounter urban landscapes shaped by terror threat and by consequent counterterrorism measures? This paper joins literatures in human geography, security and terrorism studies, and International Relations (IR) to develop an atmospheric approach to studying everyday urban spaces of (counter)terrorism. We think with cities in Western Europe, but draw on and project towards other urban spaces and histories. Terror attacks are less frequent in Western Europe compared to other regions, and spaces and histories of (counter)terrorism involving urban securitization and militarization are not the sole preserve of the Global North[1]. However, in Western Europe (counter)terrorism has translated into a particularly articulate and professionalised array of counterterrorism measures including defence and deterrence, policing, surveillance, and public awareness and sensibilisation. This articulation is part of at least three spatial dynamics. Firstly, cities in Western Europe are nodes in political and infrastructural networks that facilitate the transnational mobility of terror organizations and individuals (Aydinli 2007), whether 'home-grown' or based abroad. Secondly, cities in Western Europe and especially in the EU have increasingly coordinated and shared efforts and knowledge in the name of "collective securitization" (Kaunert and Léonard 2018). Thirdly, this coordination responds to global changes in terrorist *modus operandi* and targets choices. With lone actors becoming "primary perpetrators of violent extremist and terrorist attacks in Europe" (EU Agency for Law Enforcement Cooperation 2022), and using

[1] For example, see Colak and Pearce (2015) on shifting models of urban security in Colombia; Fawaz et al. (2012) on security zones in Beirut; and Boyle (2020) on the postcolonial genealogies of counterterrorism in Indonesia.

unsophisticated and easily sourced weaponry and techniques[2], the spatiality of attacks in Western Europe has changed from high-profile sites (financially significant buildings, or transport networks) to so-called 'soft targets' (Davis 2007). These are publicly accessible ordinary spaces (pavements, business premises, squares) that are difficult to protect. Due to their mundane nature often tightly embedded in the urban fabric, it has been argued that the protection of soft targets cannot always be achieved via perimeter and infrastructure hardening without also altering what would be deemed as an acceptable experience of public space (Coaffee 2017). For example, the suite of physical security measures that, in the UK, go under the banner of *Hostile Vehicle Mitigation* include relatively transparent interventions like bollards, turnstiles, blocking planters, and crowd guards. Despite their transparency, however, these are obdurate objects that, even if carefully designed and placed, are hard to remove and shift, thus become threaded into a socio-material network of justification and maintenance (de Goede et al. 2014; Trandberg and Jensen 2021).

What remains to be known, however, is: *how* do these understandings of and actions upon soft targets change how cities are experienced in everyday life by their diverse publics in the long term? More critically, it remains to be known what atmospheric politics are entailed by such responses, in terms of what dispositions are being shaped by security officials, whose dispositions to these landscapes matter more or less, and – importantly – what embodied and felt experiences are produced in cities where threat is understood to be ubiquitous. How do we make sense of the landscapes that we are left with in the aftermath of and in response to (the threat of) terrorist attacks? How will this sense-making differ amongst diverse publics that are both together and/or set apart within these landscapes in their everyday, visceral, and spatial experience? What conceptual tools do we need to think through these everyday landscapes and ecologies? While there is abundant design-oriented and representational literature on urban securitization, military urbanism (Coaffee 2022; Graham 2004), and framings of threat (Stevens and Vaughan-Williams 2016; Jarvis and Lister 2013; Oldra 2021), the *experiential* aspects of (counter)terrorism remains underexplored of late (though see Adey 2014; Adey et al 2013; Anderson 2015). There is more to know about how urban public spaces change in terms of the shared and individualised – and often even contradictory and contested – affective resonances that they become part of in the context of changing terrorism threat and counterterrorism responses.

We define atmosphere as the spatial expression of collective felt and affective experiences comprising human and nonhuman agencies. Broadly, atmosphere refers to a processual, immersive, and shared felt quality of a situation which emerges from, and is shaped by, a host of human and nonhuman agencies (Anderson 2009). Atmospheres are increasingly becoming the 'object target' of various powers (Anderson 2014), from commercial marketing to policing (Adey 2014; Wall 2019), and so constitute an important part of attempts to shape behavior in different contexts, including counterterrorism.

The terms terrorism[3] and counterterrorism – henceforth (counter)terrorism – are as contested as they are closely linked. Flint (2003:161) identified several areas where geographers should explore the "spatial manifestations of power that intertwine to cause contexts of action and reaction, and the means to commit terrorism and enact counterterrorism". These include spatialities meshing

[2] Bladed weapons, vehicles, and Improvised Incendiary or Explosive Devices constituted the majority of methodologies in jihadi, rightwing, and leftwing/anarchist completed and foiled attacks in the EU. Locations included commuter trains and restaurant terraces, small scale events, urban power grids, and communication infrastructure.

[3] The Dictionary of Human Geography broadly defines terrorism as "organized violence that deliberately targets civilians and that is intended to sow fear among a population for political purposes" (Gregory 2009: 747)

different geographical scales of analysis. In more recent political geography work, different but related points of emphases in the areas of (counter)terrorism have flourished, including critiques of the impact of the war on terror on sovereignty practices and regimes (Mountz 2013); the hegemony of US spatial imaginations of terror threat and responses (Pain 2009); and geo-historical accounts of local (in)securities and their ties with multiple other scalings (Pain 2014; Sidaway 2009; Ó Tuathail 2009). These, however, constitute mainly discursive approaches centred around construction of meanings of (counter)terrorism (although see Pain 2009), and have been more recently accompanied by a number of scholarly developments, including around affective governance of emergencies, the impact on the built form, and historical accounts of geopolitical atmospheres/atmospherics. These present openings and opportunities for developing accounts of how felt everyday experiences of (counter)terrorism are spatalised in cities.

In the next sections, we first critically review literature from political geography, IR, and security and terrorism studies around the presence and role (or lack thereof) of lived experience in scholarship on (counter)terrorism. We then consider the questions of how atmospheres are produced, and what diverse and shifting agencies are involved in that production. Subsequently, we turn to two concerns – urban crowds and difference – as thematic areas where atmospheric approaches into everyday experiences of (counter)terrorism can be fruitfully pursued. We argue that developing an atmospheric geography of urban (counter)terrorism is important for three reasons. First, it allows us to question the background implications of the manifest 'fabrics' (discourses, practices, and infrastructures) of counterterrorism – implications occurring at the limit of detectability: the invisible/unspeakable sensoriums of (in)security they can bring about. Second, it offers conceptual and methodological orientations in studying the diverse attunements and felt experiences that take place between the exceptionality of terrorist attacks and the 'business as usual' mantras of urban resilience agendas. Third, it allows us to explore the connections between understandings, mappings, and calibrations of experiences of public space by official actors; the diffuse and everyday responses and felt experiences by users; and the material agency of (counter)terrorism in cities.

(Counter)Terrorism scholarship and the realm of felt experience.

A gap in accounting for emotions and felt experience has long been acknowledged and conceptualised by critical IR (Crawford 2000). Here, established scholarship has often downgraded emotions as "contrary to reason and rationality, and […] relegated to the private, feminine sphere, or seen as some kind of bodily aberration that needs to be subdued or overcome" (Crawford 2000, cited in Åhäll and Gregory 2015: 2). When emotions are considered in IR, they have tended to be "stuck in the brain" (Åhäll and Gregory 2015: XIX), limited to neuroscientific methods exploring cerebral mechanisms in political decision-making and voting attitudes. Additionally, there has been a tendency to adopt social psychology approaches conceiving emotions as distinct containers of experience or state-led institutional discourses (Zevnik 2021; Head 2016). This translates into recent studies employing text- and image-based psychological and cognitive tests to measure emotional responses to exposure to terrorist threat and correlate perceptions of terrorist events (Baucum and John 2020; Quirin et al. 2021; Vasilopoulos and Brouard 2020). Only more recently, and inspired by feminist debates on the cultural politics of emotions (Ahmed 2000; Butler 2009), have IR called for deeper reflection around strategies for researching emotions (Åhäll and Gregory 2013). These voices focus on the political landscapes of war, peace, danger and threat, militarism, and political violence

as something that a focus on everyday emotions and away from constructivist approaches around the discourse of the War on Terror (Brown and Penttinen 2013; Hall and Ross 2015) can bring more clearly into view.

In political geography, early feminist approaches (Hyndman 2001; Dowler and Sharp 2001; Smith 2001; Staeheli, Kofman, and Peake 2004) have developed into a more recent and diverse critical scholarship into the reproductions of geopolitics in the realms of the everyday, affective (Woon, 2013; Militz and Schurr 2016), corporeal (Fluri 2011) and intimate (Barabantseva et al. 2021; Laketa and Fregonese 2022). There has also been substantial engagement with emotions in relation to global politics (Pain and Smith 2008; Woon 2013; Dodds and Kirby 2013). Ó Tuathail (2003: 858-859) argues that the "affective tsunami" of the War on Terror (WoT) "mixes the cultural into the corporeal" and turns emotions into factors in the diplomatic discourses, performances, calculations, and actions underpinning the invasion of Iraq. This point is reinforced by Saurette (2005), who argues that feelings of, and responses to, humiliation underpin the US counterterrorism strategy after 9/11. What Ó Tuathail (2003: 868) distinctively highlights, however, is the corporeal and everyday economy undergirding the emotions surrounding WoT decision making – an economy, he argues, made of "burgeoning new contracts in 'homeland security', military supplies, and 'reconstruction'" that impact materially on lives on ground. While drawing attention on emotions, the above contributions remain grounded in social constructivism, textual analyses and studies of "the mind and its operations as a precondition for action" (Vannini 2015: 8), rather than focusing on practices, performances, actions, and intuitions.

Rejecting disembodied and universalist views of fear, Pain (2009: 484) called for embodying, grounding, and locating geopolitical processes to identify how the global/geopolitical and the intimate/quotidian intersect and to capture how emotions "stimulate action and affect the practices, progress and shape of politics at different. Similarly, Åhäll and Gregory (2013: 118) have later argued for "mov[ing] beyond emotions as feelings and focus instead on how emotions are producing discernible effects" and politics through their performative power (Butler 2009). Additionally, while valuable research has begun to explore the embodied experiences of armed conflict and accounting for the exceptional trauma of war and terrorism, including the atmospherics and affective dimensions of geopolitical conflict and weaponry (Ruppert 2022; Slesinger 2022), work remains to be done when it comes to ordinary contexts outside warzones, which are also affectively and materially shaped by national security considerations, terrorist threats, and counterterrorism responses. We argue that research is needed to bring into view these ordinary felt experiences among urban residents and their daily encounters with (counter)terrorism in public space. Setting the conceptual stage for this, we identify three openings that appear from bringing into proximity interdisciplinary literature around the themes of 1) elite, exceptional and everyday standpoints; 2) techno-centrism and feeling bodies; and 3) diffuse and bounded approaches. Here, we develop these openings critically, to offer an account of urban (counter)terrorism that foregrounds ordinary felt experiences and intensities.

Elite, exceptionality and the everyday

The study of (counter)terrorism in geography and beyond has grappled with the issue of representation on two related levels. First, a body of work has critiqued established scholarship based on its philosophical attachment to constructivist ideas of "securitisation". Here, the critique relates to the framing of particular issues as threats through understanding them as speech-acts (Wæver 2011), and to the focus on official discourses and knowledges and their binary logics of 'us v. them' (See also O' Tuathail 1996; O' Tuathail and Agnew 1992). Second, drawing on interpretive methods such as the analysis of a range of academic, popular, policy, and media discourses, and

discussions with implicated communities, research has studied the politics and impacts of counterterrorism responses that include framing specific communities as suspect or susceptible to violent extremism (Fadil, Koning and Ragazzi 2019; Hickman et al. 2012; Hillyard 1993; Nguyen, 2019), and the racialized and gendered impacts of counterterrorism operations and campaigns on individuals and communities (Isakjee 2016; Isakjee and Allen 2013; Awan 2018; Geisser et al.2017).

On both levels, there have been calls to bridge representational gaps by both going beyond elite (and state-centred) discursive understandings of (counter)terrorism, and by engaging the everyday. For example, drawing on focus groups with diverse publics as well as a large-scale questionnaire, Stevens and Vaughan-Williams (2016: 1) argue that national security policies have not "engage[d] the views and experiences of diverse publics in the assessment and prioritisation of issues presented as security threats and risks" and a consequent 'citizens gap' has been produced in (UK) national security policy. There is little knowledge of how diverse publics experience security in their lives, and it is argued that "a more consultative approach" is needed by governments to engage local publics and bring "marginalised voices into national debates around security" (Stevens and Vaughan-Williams 2016: 165-166; see also Jarvis and Lister 2013).

While valuable, these calls not only miss out aspects of the diversity of publics that (counter)terrorism involve, but also risk reifying or even moralising distinctions between elite/lay and official/ordinary. Moreover, they risk normalising and universalising 'the everyday' as an ordinary experience that is the same for all, purging it of the unequal spatial politics of (counter)terrorism (Laketa and Fregonese 2022; Pain 2009; 2014). While more ethnographic and participatory methods have recently tackled everyday interpretations of threat (Gillespie and O'Loughlin 2009), these again adopt (media) texts as research objects and a primarily interpretative approach, resulting in the grounded "everyday life of security" remaining underexplored (Nyman 2021).

Another strand of literature concerns how the governing of terrorist threat by the State is embodied, sensed, and performed in practice. This literature shifts the focus from banality and routinization to the wider range of sensible experiences enrolled in counterterror preparedness among police forces, security guards, and in counterterrorism trainings. This includes the employment of situational awareness to train affective labourers to detect threats (Ritchie 2015). These approaches often bear racialised tones in that they train sections of the public to "experienc[e] certain bodies as out of place, so as to encourage state action to police or detain them" (Ritchie 2015: 193; see also Krasmann and Hentschel 2019). Despite the affective economies of state-led governing preparedness being recognised by geographic scholarship as profoundly unequal (Anderson 2016b; 2016a), we echo Leff (2021: 5) in recognizing that, while government counterterrorism agendas "impact the day-to-day experiences of people, the actual mechanism by which it enters these spaces and the materiality of this phenomenon are often neglected". More research is needed in gauging how different dispositions to and experiences of (counter)terrorism threats and measures coexist amidst diverse urban publics in Western Europe.

Infrastructures and lived perspectives

Anglophone geography and planning literatures have extensively analysed infrastructures, technologies, and governing of urban securitisation (Coaffee 2022; Graham 2004; Graham and Wood 2003). Urban geopolitics as the study of the "intersections of urbanism, terrorism, and warfare" (Graham 2004: 191) have heavily influenced these debates. However, this approach has been critiqued for its limiting triple focus on 1) the technological aspects of late-modern warfare and terrorism; 2) a limited array of case studies within the global north and Israel/Palestine; and 3) areas of open armed conflict.

This is where the second opening appears: a techno-centric focus, while engaging a substantive aspect of securitisation, lacks accounts of the ordinary, embodied, and sentient aspects of counterterrorism (Fregonese and Laketa 2022). This conceptual and methodological gap parallels calls to study "the significance of place to individual and collective emotional topographies" of geopolitical events (Pain 2009: 17), and how militarisation and political change are "experienced and made present to the lives that live them" (Adey 2013: 52-53; see also Fregonese 2017). Recent work has partly addressed these concerns by considering the material-affective aspects of surveillance in public urban space (Adey et al. 2013), the governance of terrorism emergencies (Anderson 2016), and the intimate and experiential implications of terrorism threat and counterterrorism (Laketa et al. 2021). This work becomes important when considering how present counterterrorism physical measures respond to the shift of terrorist acts towards everyday spaces and so-called "soft targets". Protective measures around ordinary public space such as markets, pavements, squares or restaurants terraces, can even intensify and reinforce perceptions of siege or vulnerability heighten a sense of anticipation of danger (Grosskopf 2006; Ciax and Runkel 2024). In response, security suppliers have become concerned with the aesthetic and attractiveness (or not) of such measures.[4] The governance of urban security is also increasingly splintered and decentred from the state and its anticipatory logics of prevention towards community resilience and collective vigilance (Coaffee 2013). Users of public space are considered as "alive and moving cameras" (Castagnino, 2016: 49) that would report any suspicious activity in a logic of "participatory surveillance" (Larsen and Piché, 2009: 188). Similarly, in the French counterterror emergency plan *Vigipirate* and the UK's *ACT* campaign, we witness the enrolment of individual "good reflexes" and feelings in a shared struggle against terror (Fregonese and Laketa 2022).

Bounded/diffused approaches

Terrorism's emotional effects are felt diffusely over time and through space, influencing communities' everyday dispositions, political attitudes, and their resistance to state-driven resilience agendas (Clément 2021) well beyond the distinct terrorist event. This is where a third opening shows itself. Despite calls for an epistemological shift in terrorism studies towards the (non-state) affective workings of (counter)terrorism, and despite ideas around atmosphere – which we discuss in more detail in the next section – informing this research, engagement with (counter)terrorism remains circumscribed in terms of the bounded space-times considered. This includes sensory and atmospheric explorations of various confined and enclosed (often interior) spaces connected to political elites, or specific spatial categories like public transport (Kazig and Masson 2015; Shaker 2021; Power et al. 2016). Conversely, work has emerged in critical geopolitics with regards to the daily 'atmospheric doings' of global politics and diplomacy (Jones 2020a, 2020b; McConnell 2020), international summits (Legg 2020), and other events where international relations are shaped by both meteorological/elemental atmospherics and affective atmospheres. Often derived from historical work "to tease out the more-than-human from the archive" (Legg 2020: 789), the focus here is on the circulations between material and human agencies and on the production of affective atmospheres in and through diplomatic environments and decision making (Dittmer 2016; Lin 2021), and on how these atmospheres are "experienced in different ways according to cultural attitudes, values, and personal life stories and backgrounds" (Jones 2020b: 1383). This scholarship remains

[4] For example, Crowdguard stresses the importance for its products to be "aesthetically pleasing" and allow "pedestrians [to] walk though […] easily, without feeling caged in" (https://www.crowdguard.co.uk/what-we-offer/). Similarly, at Christmas markets in Denmark Mobile Gate Security installed "attractive and inexpensive" temporary barriers gift-wrapped in festive bows (https://mobilegatesecurity.com/products/commercial-barrier-barrier-with-advertising-potential/).

mainly elite- and state-centred, accounting for atmosphere as a staging of international politics through the lens of official events in bounded spaces.

However, we want to build on this third opening, and link geographical literature on atmosphere with critical terrorism studies, to develop an atmospheric approach to studying (counter)terrorism. This approach goes beyond specific terror events, bounded sites or specific counterterrorism measures (be it discursive or material) and instead studies (counter)terrorism as a wider array of "practices and experiences of envelopment" beyond a distinct event (McCormack 2018: 4). We consider the diffuse, felt distributions and modulations that, while relating to a terrorist event or counterterror measure, "exceed [its] category of entity" and become sensed differentially, but not discontinuously from that event (McCormack 2018: 12). We argue for an atmospheric approach to counterterrorism that accounts for, but is not limited to, attack and commemoration (Gensburger, 2017; Bazin, 2018; Closs Stephens et al., 2017, Meroueh, 2020), but that instead follows the envelopments and everyday dispositions diffused across space and time and affecting diverse urban communities in the long run. In so doing, we attempt to bring into view the felt experiences of (counterterrorism) away from the bounded and elite, and into the diffuse and quotidian. We ask, echoing Pain (2009: 471): who claims counterterrorism? "Who actually feels it? How is it experienced, and what do people do with it? How is it shaped and differentiated by varied lives, communities and places?"

Atmospheric thinking and the composition of lived experience

In arguing for an atmospheric approach that navigates these openings and foregrounds the lived, diffuse, and everyday realities of (counter)terrorism, it is important to clarify what we mean by 'atmosphere'. Studies of shared felt experiences include varied conceptual underpinnings and points of emphasis. Such differences are influenced by varied national traditions of European thought spanning aesthetics (Böhme 2018; Griffero 2019), architectural theory (DeMatteis 2019), phenomenology (Anderson 2009; Schmitz 2014; Di Croce 2020; Thibaud 2015), and affective/new materialisms (McCormack 2008; Philippopoulos-Mihalopolous 2016). Notably, the anglophone turn towards atmospheres emerged out of conceptual work on affect and emotions, in response to the question of how we think about shared experiences (Trigg 2022). It is also shaped by French and German traditions in philosophy and aesthetics on atmospheres and architecture (Böhme 1993), and by a longstanding tradition of work on architectural and urban *ambiances (*Augoyard 1995, Thibaud 2002). Thibaud (2011: 203) defines an ambiance as "a space-time qualified from a sensory perspective", meaning that ambiance research "involves a socio-aesthetic approach that attunes the researcher to everyday urban atmospheres". Here, ordinary urban experiences are considered by emphasizing the relationship between social interaction, material environment, and sensory phenomena (Amphoux et al 2004).

Atmosphere is commonly used to name an immersive and shared felt quality of a situation which emerges from, and is shaped by, the agency of a host of human and nonhuman participants (Anderson 2009). Atmospheres can be relative ubiquitous backdrops to daily life. They can, though, be interrupted or perturbed by the taking place of particular encounters or events given there is a contingency and dynamism to atmospheres. Some have attributed such atmospheres specific spatial forms, particularly considering Sloterdijk's (2011; 2014; 2016) influential discussions of spheres (see Ernste 2018; Klauser 2010). However, for many geographers writing about atmospheres, atmospheres are not understood to have clearly identifiable spatial or temporal forms or limits, nor do they exist in a distinct, mosaic-like spatiality. Rather, "Ambiances and atmospheres seem to radiate from things and collectives … as a kind of 'voluminosity'" (Adey et al 2013: 304). Different

encounters and events, the shifting constituent elements of the situation of those atmospheres and those interaction with them, and the atmospheres' ephemeral nature leave the spatial limits of atmospheres blurry and overlapping (Anderson and Ash 2015). Atmospheres are, then, "diffused spatially and grasped affectively" (Trigg 2020: 4) as everyday life plays out. As such, we consider atmosphere as a polyvalent sensitizing concept that expands how feelings in the face of terrorist threats or counterterrorism measures might be thought and understood across a range of urban environments and spatio-temporal scales.

Rather than proposing a unified conception of atmosphere to reconcile these diverse academic traditions from which the notion emerged, we use a praxeological approach (Thibaud 2004), a "knowing-through" atmospheres (Sumartojo and Pink 2019). In doing so, we use the full heuristic potential of atmosphere, which is at the same time the object of study, a holistic approach useful for understanding, and a tool for analysis (Kazig and Masson 2015). In developing this, we focus on two lines of enquiry in thinking about the diffuse everyday life of (counter)terrorism. These are: how atmospheres are produced, and how these atmospheres are registered, negotiated, or even resisted on the ground.

Producing Atmospheres

A central scholarly concern has been how atmospheres might be deliberately produced or become an 'object-target' for various forms of manipulation or shaping (Anderson 2014). A diverse terminology has developed to consider such atmospheric production. Architectural and urban scholarship has focused on the production of atmospheres in terms of design and staging (Adey *et al* 2013; Wigley 1998; Kraftl and Adey 2008). This includes research on the staging and designing of atmospheres (Bille et al. 2015; Edensor and Sumartojo 2015), including in (semi-) enclosed spaces of leisure (Escher 2016; Wilhelm 2020), consumption (Brighenti and Kärrholm 2018), and mobility (Bissell 2010; Adey et al 2013; Urry et al 2016). It has been shown how the 'background' character of such spaces – subtle manipulations of a space's temperature, soundscape, lighting, layout, furnishing, and so on – as well as their physical organization, can be worked with to produce a certain 'feel' (Adey *et al* 2013; Edensor 2012; Griffero 2021). Equally, work here has also engaged with less obviously enclosed spaces such as urban markets and squares (Degen and Lewis 2020; Kazig 2008), waterfront areas (Yu 2019), tourist districts (Paiva and Sanchez-Fuarros 2021), and centres of urban night life and entertainment (Di Croce et al. 2022; Duff and Moore 2015).

Such findings have also raised concern with how these design agendas, often aimed at the production of particularly 'comfortable' environments, can lull populations into passive dispositions (Philippopoulos-Mihalopolous 2016; Runkel 2016). For example, Adey *et al* (2013) show how those responsible for security operations in Gare du Nord, Paris try to set such a comfortable tone in the station environment with their public information materials which suggest measures such as CCTV are intended to produce a collective mood of tranquility amongst users. This does, though, appear to be at odds with the at times aggressive practices of armed police seen not far away outside the station building; the demeanor and the materialities of their uniforms and accompanying equipment radiate very different tonalities. As Adey *et al* (2013: 304) note, "Such events…and force-filled materialities sit in tension with the previously mentioned ambition for tranquility through security and surveillance". A similar dynamic was noted by Katz (2007: 349) who, walking through New York's public space in the wake of the 9-11 attacks, reflected on the "inappropriate bodies" of the National Guard in the streets: "Why would dressing for Desert Storm in the midst of New York City reassure residents and visitors of their safety?". Questions can be asked, then, about the agendas and politics present in efforts to bring about certain atmospheres and limit others. Who are these atmospheres for and who will comfortably attune to them? Whose interests are advanced through

these atmospheric productions and who loses out through the exertion of such 'ambient powers' (Allen 2006)? How will ways of attuning be maintained and harnessed amidst different publics by those governing counterterrorism?

It is important, though, to also recognize that such efforts to produce specific atmospheres should not devolve into dystopian visions of populations becoming passive recipients of atmospheric designs. Scholars are asking critical questions about the efforts to shape everyday experiences of secured spaces, and showing that contestations and counter-atmospheres can be sought and/or produced when it comes to security and surveillance practices. For example, Kaplan (2020: 51) has shown how drones can be a part of "the complex politics of atmospheric governance as areal systems that can participate in protest as well as policing, civil as well as state observation" (also see Schnepf 2019). Relatedly, Wall (2019: 158) highlights the potential for what he calls "counter-archive of protest atmotechnics" disrupting the affective techniques used by policing to manage and modulate protest crowds Further, more generally "an atmosphere is a contingent and potentially provisional achievement" (Simpson 2021: 96). In emphasizing that the production of an atmosphere is not a straightforward, foreclosed process, we need to also consider the unintended outcomes of such attempts at production. It may be that the intended atmosphere simply isn't produced, and such engineering efforts are unsuccessful (Ash 2010). But, it is also possible that inadvertent 'collateral' atmospheres might overspill from such efforts (Paiva and Sanchez-Fuarros 2020), leading to the production of something quite different beyond the targeted space.

There are evident parallels here when it comes to such a concern with both the material realities of urban environments and their role in securing people and institutions from the threat of terrorism, and the host of practices of policing and securing that seek to set a certain tone amongst this. Counterterrorism is replete with examples of specific policing and practices acting "beyond the realm of the observable" and becoming embodied at the everyday level (Drongiti and Masson 2022) that warrant consideration here for their atmospheric aspects and impacts. As such, recently there have been calls to further nuance these considerations of atmospheric production beyond a focus on 'designing out terrorism' and infrastructural matters and into the mundane, collective, and unintended consequences and opportunities that such counterterrorism designs entail (Trandberg and Jensen 2021). How then might different atmospheres come into being through the performance of variously expressive activities amongst such materialities?

Atmospheric Compositions

The more-than-human agency in the composition of atmospheres raises a second theme in recent literature: a tension between the status of the human in considerations of atmospheres and the extent of their role in such atmospheres' existence. A significant starting point for geographic engagements with atmosphere comes from a German body of literature in aesthetics, architectural theory, and human geography, that *mostly* departs from (subject-oriented) phenomenology and understands atmospheres based on the experiential realm of the lived body (*Leib*) (Anderson 2009; Böhme 2018; Schmitz 2014; Runkel 2018). In this, atmospheres form a 'quasi-object' (*Halb-Ding*) in that they are neither objective nor subjective in nature; they sit awkwardly between such categories, forming more a 'medium of perception' (Thibault and Halliday 2006; Böhme 2013; Riedel 2019; Wilhelm 2020). Further scholarly developments emphasize the more-than human, material-affective dimensions of atmospheres and the multitude of other 'things' that find themselves entangled with humans in atmospheric compositions (Philippopoulos-Mihalopolous 2016). This has led to efforts to make "explicit the materiality of air and atmosphere" (McCormack 2009: 38). That includes concerns

with more literal senses of atmospheres and their "always already entangled nature" when it comes to everyday and artistic practices (Verlie 2019: 1; Engelmann 2015; Engelmann and McCormack 2018; McCormack 2015; Simpson 2019), as well as atmospheres that are not-fully-tangible (Verlie 2019), or which unfold entirely beyond the threshold of human perception while nonetheless impacting on those practices (Ash 2013). The emphasis here is on the coming together of both material and 'immaterial' surroundings as part of something that might be felt by bodies but also remain diffuse or 'in the air' (McCormack 2008; Tixier et al., 2011).

In the context of (counter)terrorism, this interest in the more-than human, relational-material-affective dimension of the atmospheric has been discussed in terms of 'atmoterrorism' and an attention to the air as a medium which can be conditioned in various ways, but one which is also inherently intertwined with the bodies that move through it. As Nieuwenhuis (2016: 510) suggests in discussing less than lethal technologies like tear gas, "Atmoterrorism entails not a mere attack on the materiality of the body, but more fundamentally assaults its immersed psychological and physiological relationship to the air". Such a concern with 'negative air conditioning' draws attention to the susceptibility and vulnerability of bodies and bodily incapacities in the face of various atmospheric technologies. The atmospheric bases of this concern span geographical and political contexts. For example, Drongiti and Masson (2022) highlight the French authorities' post-2015 limitation in public space of potentially "anxiogenic" devices such as two-tone sirens from various emergency services that can affect the susceptibility of individual bodies as well as crowds. In the more extreme case of a conflict zone, discussing the use of atmospheric weapons like 'Skunk Water' and tear gas by the state of Israel against the Palestinian population, Joronen (2023) shows the complex relationships between bodies that cannot not breathe and the material-affective compositions of these weapons that come to emerge in dwelling in air. While such atmospheric materialities can act to govern through the weaponization of the air itself – showing what Joronen calls 'pneumatological vulnerability' – they also bring about "long-term spheric attunements to aerial configurations" which "become markers of everyday day like in certain site-spheres of dwelling" (Joronen 2023: 6-7). Equally, Feigenbaum and Weismann (2016: 496) show the flipside of this in terms of how such bodily vulnerability has been used at security expos to justify the advancement of the use of such weapons to ensure the safety of security forces in an "atmosphere of constantly evolving threats", again showing the mutual co-implication of the felt and material senses of atmosphere.

Such more-than- or post-humanist approaches to atmosphere have led to something of a humanist backlash, with arguments for a need to focus on the human experience of atmospheres more clearly, re-centering the analysis around socially and historically situated human experiences (Brown et al 2019; Bille and Simonsen 2019; Degen and Lewis 2020). We find such efforts to 'ground' atmospheres in an experiencing subject troubling for how they could be read to rein in something meant to be, by its very nature, unbounded and elusive. However, these are potentially productive points of tension to be worked between. For example, drawing on feminist scholarship on affect and emotions, Leff (2021: 7, citing Ahmed) calls for a clearer attention to our 'angles of arrival' into atmospheres and so the differences in how humans encounter and attune to atmospheres. This then necessitates an 'attunement to difference' which explores how "we live in atmospheres unevenly". We share the view that "[t]he affective interactions of encountering atmospheres … create relationalities of irreducible complexity that demands constant attunement to differences in power, history, and lived experiences" (Leff 2021: 7). That said, there is a difference between being attuned to such matters and presuming their determinative status. We also argue that an attention to the non-human means other senses and interpretations of difference might also be constructively brought into such attunements. While there are clear and established identity politics in terms of

discourses around who may or may not be perceived as a potential terrorist or produce collective feelings of concern amongst certain publics, from the suspect community literature (Hillyard 1992; Awan 2012; Ragazzi 2016) to wider reflections on racialised and gendered dynamics in counterterrorism (Groothuis 2020; Puar 2007), this literature remains representational and discourse based. There is, therefore, potential for more differentiated accounts of terror threat and counterterrorism responses here, given the full range of human and non-human actors tied up in such atmospheric compositions and the registers upon which this takes effect.

We argue that it is important to remain open when it comes to tracing the agents that may (or may not) have a significant role in (re)shaping these atmospheres, in playing a part in their ongoing composition. So, while it is important in thinking about the atmospheres that circulate around (counter)terrorism in cities to attend to how those atmospheres are experienced, it is also important to consider the diverse and shifting agencies at play in the ongoing unfolding of those atmospheres. Taken together, existing scholarship helps us to think about how sensory and emotional experience might be felt by multiple bodies present in a situation, be communicated between these (more-than human) bodies, and be 'worked upon' through various forms of human and non-human intervention.

An atmospheric approach to urban (counter)terrorism

The scholarship discussed here shows how thinking atmospherically allows us to question the discourses, practices, and infrastructures of urban (counter)terrorism representing the concerns of public and private actors, and focus instead on the less studied realm of the everyday felt experiences of these spaces. We find it useful to think with what Sloterdijk (2009) and Wall (2019: 5) call 'atmotechnics', that is, "techniques that aim to create, manage or change affective atmospheres". These techniques include a concern for the material design of urban spaces, the staging of such spaces for (specific) use, and the practices of both emotional and/or affective labour undertaken by the actors that come to inhabit these spaces. We would, though, extend the senses of the term used by Sloterdijk (2009) and Wall (2019) to suggest that such techniques are not just the preserve of those in power or with elite knowledges and are not deployed in a determinative fashion. These techniques also unfold as part of the more-than-human ensemble of actors whose agencies and impacts are not known in advance of their (ongoing) taking place. That said, systematic and comparative research remains to be done around how forms and politics of state 'atmospheric governance' can be understood as mobilized and experienced differently by different bodies and what 'sensitive potentials' of individuals and collectives might evolve within such urban contexts (Kazig and Masson 2015). Working with atmospheres in this way allows us to be concerned with diffuse practices of security and securing urban spaces and the sorts of atmospheres that emerge from and come to exist around them.

We now focus on two potentially contrasting elements that we see as constitutive for developing an atmospheric approach for studying everyday urban experiences of (counter)terrorism – the crowd and question of difference. This approach allows us to connect understandings, mappings, and calibrations of experiences of urban spaces by official state actors towards specific target publics without losing sight of the diffuse, quotidian, and often unpredictable responses and felt experiences among the users of those spaces. This approach connects the atmotechnics of counterterrorism and the "power with which political actors may actively invest emotions" (Clément 2021: 255) to govern urban populations, with the differential effects that these atmotechnics may result in across very diverse urban subjectivities and materialities (Paiva and Sanchez-Fuarros 2021).

Crowds, governance, publics

Crowd control and management emerged in seventeenth century European scholarly reasoning as a material and spatial manifestation of the body politic (Sloterdijk 2004). In the nineteenth century, crowds became viewed as pathological entities (Borch 2009, 2012) for their "impulsiveness, irritability, incapacity to reason, the absence of judgement of the critical spirit, the exaggeration of sentiment" (Le Bon 1985: 15). Crowds emerged as a logistical issue within colonial enterprises (Kerr 1994), from military campaigns to transatlantic slave trade and, in the 20th century, as part of Europe's world war and Nazism's destructive expulsions of population (Adey 2018). Additionally, the festive crowds of organized games and religious festivals have also been objects of affective managements (Picaud 2020), including the affective atmospheres of fascist crowd-arousing (Borch 2012, 194; Griffero 2019). Currently, the governance and study of crowds has diversified and specialized. Their governance builds on a wide range of techniques to control, shape, evacuate, engage, disrupt, or manipulate crowds such as deploying force, social engineering, and techno-ambiental interventions (Runkel 2019). These have been the object of human geographical enquiry including mobility (Bissell 2010), risk management (Runkel & Pohl 2012), public health (McFarlane 2022; Joiner et al. 2024), urban politics (Chowdhury 2019), evacuation (Adey 2020; 2022), and protest (Feigenbaum 2013; Nieuwenhuis 2016; Wall 2019).

Crowds are conceived at once as a threat for sociopolitical order and as a hallmark of liberal democracy needing to be secured and protected. This constitutes a challenging operational dialectic between the management of crowds amidst (counter)terrorism. Indeed, in the past decade, crowd behavior and crowded places have been central to (counter)terrorism in cities. For example, the European project "Safer Space for Safer Cities" (SafeCi 2019–2021) has highlighted that "the primary attack targets are 'soft targets' such as crowds" (SafeCi 2021: 10). As part of this concern with crowds in the UK, a principle of proportionality whereby "the level of restriction is commensurate with need and that the public are not unduly restricted in accessing important amenities" (Home Office 2012: 17) has been the operational response to the conundrum of keeping public spaces safe yet looking *and feeling* open for the crowds frequenting them. As part of this, the National Counter Terrorism and Security Office (Home Office 2012) issued design and technical guidance on the protection of crowded places. The two guiding principles were, firstly, "blending in" counterterrorism protective measures into the urban design of crowded places "in an imaginative and considered way" (Home Office 2012: 3) and, secondly, focusing on seamless and unobstructed ingress and egress of crowds. This can be seen in the case of hostile vehicle mitigation (HVM) in that we see cities populated with varieties of protective barriers in public spaces. These physical measures are increasingly made to recede into banal everydayness, often by being beautified, rather than presenting overt fortification and defensiveness (Allen 2006; Coaffee 2017; Ilum 2022).

Crowded places became integrated into counterterrorism by building on rational approaches in crowd psychology. These approaches tend to represent crowds as a generic and depoliticized "singular" entity (Aradau 2015: 166) following accepted views of what constitutes normal behaviour. Governing crowds, according to Aradau (2015: 157), means calibrating different psychological and social constructivist knowledges to rein in what are slippery and potentially contradictory collective-and-bodily conglomerations of "[n]either populations nor people" whose governing "depends upon different modalities of psychosocial knowledge about collective behaviour and its affective economies".

Crowds are indeed not totally malleable monoliths, neither formed of "singular and terrorial" subjects (Adey 2020: 371). This becomes particularly clear in emergencies like terrorist attacks, where crowds have been found to have autonomies and spontaneities, or "promiscuities", as Adey

(2020) defines them, that not only make crowds hard to govern and predict, but that also challenge wider assumptions around orderliness and morality. Importantly for our argument, crowd governance in (terror) emergencies often disguises micro-scale and intimate spatialities that complicate the linear geography of ingress / egress with material and affective dynamics that are central to the unfolding of emergencies because, among other things, they slow down movement. In his study of the evacuation of the Twin Towers in New York during the 9-11 terrorist attacks, Adey (2020) shows how the crowd evacuation from the World Trade Center was complicated and made slower by acts of solidarity, altruism and waiting for others, and annexed embodied practices and materialities, like swapping or removing shoes.

Today, in urban Western Europe especially, considerations around crowds and their collective affects are relevant within a policy context grappling with low-sophistication terror attacks in everyday public spaces (Home Office 2022) and citizens-based responses towards identifying suspicious behaviours by potential attackers (SGDSN 2017). The Protect Duty Consultation in the United Kingdom is a case in point. In 2021 it surveyed views and desires from the public and private sector on the nature, extent, and type of legal requirement to implement antiterrorism measures in the spaces they manage. Within the consultation, publicly accessible locations where "large gatherings" occur were most frequently considered spaces requiring a legal duty to embed counterterror training and measures in their operations (Home Office 2022). While the previous *Guidance on Crowded Places* focused on events with a delimited time-space of crowd ingress/egress at specific events, the Protect Duty, by contrast, encompasses a diffused space-time – and annexed materialities – including public squares, parks, markets, beaches, pubs, and so on, and a timeline of protection that extends beyond specific events.

A tension arises here. On the one hand, the crowd (and the thresholds at which spaces becomes crowded) is the measure by which a space falls under an obligation to be secured; crowds here are, therefore, bearers of significant future developments in urban counterterrorism. On the other hand, here crowds are predominantly understood as unproblematic and relatively bound entities, whereas counterterrorism – spanning defensive urban design, barriers, situational awareness, and vigilance – is becoming increasingly diffuse, sense-ful and everyday presence in urban public spaces. An atmospheric approach is therefore useful here to make sense of both the significance and impact of protecting crowds in cities where the contemporary terrorist threat – and its response – is spatially diffuse and temporally unbounded. Wall (2019: 158) already noted how there is an "atmospheric praxis" developed by British policing, in using "the force of affective techniques" to modulate crowd behaviour "through atmotechnic interventions". While Wall's analysis is targeted at crowds at political gatherings, like protests, how are crowds modulated when there isn't a single event or a single purpose to manage? How are the crowds that are part and parcel of everyday urban life to be protected? An example of this point is that of the UK's Project Servator, a type of police operations aimed at disrupting hostile reconnaissance for the preparation of terrorist acts. It is done by patrols of both overt and covert officers – aided by nonhuman surveillance like CCTV – in crowded public urban spaces that might be targeted by terrorists. Servator patrols focus on disrupting hostile activity by augmenting anxieties in potential hostiles amidst a crowd, thus amplifying suspicious behaviours and therefore aiding their detection. This has evident implications around whose attunements are particularly targeted or considered problematic by this atmospheric kind of policing, and how different bodily and emotional reactions by individuals as part of the everyday crowd become (or not) suspicious.

Difference and differential attunement to (counter)terrorism

This last section tackles such questions of difference in attunement to (counter)terrorism atmospheres and returns to the broader issue of whom these atmospheres are for and who will comfortably attune to them (or not). This allows us to address the question of how the sense-making of (counter)terrorism urban landscapes differs amongst diverse publics who find themselves together and/or set apart within those affective ecologies.

While terrorism acts indiscriminately, terrorism and counterterrorism are neither known and experienced and *felt* identically by all (Campbell 2019). And yet, authorities tend to approach what terror threat and protection from terrorism means, feels like, and becomes manifest as a universalised status of citizens or populations made knowable through metrics or as a mass feelings (Anderson 2012). Within the logic of counterterrorism, even producing protection for vulnerable groups becomes part of maintaining a diverse but unified (and thus still exclusionary) body politic (Puar 2018). Specific to urban areas in the global north, literature has also considered, by analysing policy discourses, how counterterrorism and the transposing of military approaches to security onto very diverse urban public spaces (Saberi 2019) intersects with issues such as the limitation of civil liberties and the increase of existential insecurity (Marcuse 2006). Scholarship focused on corporeality and materiality has critiqued – via historiographical analysis of policy documents – the evolution in logics of suspiciousness and attention to what constitutes anomaly (Pawlowsky 2023; see also Krassman and Hentschel 2019) amidst a terrorism threat. Other approaches have utilized visual and textual materials, together with interpretive methods like interviews and questionnaires, to observe dynamics of resistance against (Burns et al. 2021), and trust towards (Dalgaard-Nielsen et al 2016) physical counterterrorism measures.

Atmospheres scholarship in cultural geography may be a surprising lens to adopt when it comes to placing emphasis on the differences with which (counter)terrorism is perceived, received, and felt on the urban ground. Gandy (2017: 368, 369) argues that scholarship on atmospheres, particularly that drawing on notions of affect and new materialisms, lacks historicity in analysis and that the bodies that occupy such atmospheres are often "devoid of gender or any other kind of social difference, or indeed any clear sense of historical or geographical context". This echoes critiques calling for a clear(er) focus on the place of socio-historically situated human experience in discussions of atmosphere (Brown et al 2019; Bille and Simonsen 2019; Degen and Lewis 2020) and, as noted by Gandy (2017: 369), the "different forms and scales of atmospheric politics". Following Cockayne et al.'s (2017: 590) call for geographers to explicitly consider how difference is conceptualized, here we seek to "to experiment with thinking about difference differently". We suggest that an attention to atmosphere opens up ways for thinking about such differences, given how atmospheres about and around (counter)terrorism are spatialized, composed, and unfolding politically on the urban ground. It leads us to ask: how do differences aggregate or coalesce in a given atmospheric circumstance and what does that do for those who feel them?

Massumi's (2015) notion of *differential attunement* is useful here to overcome the view of the socially constructed or emotionally charged crowd as the measure for securitizing public place, and reflect instead on the potential for engaging difference and the urban politics therein. According to Massumi (2015: 55), a collective event is one that distributes across the bodies composing a crowd as it becomes "shocked in concert" responding to the same cue. However, Massumi (2015: 56) also recognizes the bodily and material complexity of a crowd and argues that "there is no guarantee that [those bodies] will act in unison even if they are cued in concert [as] they will have been attuned – differentially – to the same interruptive commotion". Massumi conceives of affect as a distribution of difference that we find is particularly suited to analyse the collective and shared

situations and experiences that are the object of our atmospheric heuristics. We see echoes of Ahmed's 'angle of arrival' here, but there is also a greater sense of the open-ended outcomes of these encounters. These shared situations might be understood to be part of and primed by the same event, but also contain vast variability within. Where the politics reside here, according to Massumi, is in the "art" (by governing authorities) of bringing together coherently that variability of attunements – to streamline the "different ways of being interpellated by the same event" within the same broader *"affective environment"* with its expectations and procedures. Massumi (2015: 57) takes the example of the fire alarm: the trigger is the same, and there might be widely different responses to an alarm – from mild panic and rushed escapes to more composed reactions – but the people who respond inhabit the same affective milieu and are all "attuned to the threat event, one way or another".

The notion of differential attunement leads to reflections around (counter)terrorism and how this is made present to diverse everyday lives. Counterterrorism produces extremely different realities for different people. Sometimes this is not intended but rather a product of the different capacities that bodies have to affect and be affected. As Feigenbaum and Kanngieser (2015: 82) note, the political question here lies precisely in the differential between "what standardized measurements predict and what actually takes place". At the extreme end, the impacts of less-than lethal atmospheric technologies like tear gas assume both an average (fit male) body when it comes to the measure of their anticipated impact and certain ideal environmental circumstances for their deployment. Such parameters rarely match on to the reality of the circumstances of their deployment, meaning the extent and depth of their effects and affects unfold in unpredictable ways for those caught up in them. Equally, though, the effects of state policies can be differential by design. As Anderson (2012) notes, when governments pursue security policies they are engaging in a biopolitical project of population-building that both disciplines and enables. They are *meant* to be discriminatory, because terrorism justifies extreme policy reactions that produce exceptional circumstances, and because there is a politics to the goal of producing generalized security that weighs the interests of some above others.

The production of security from terrorism through unequal means shows that what counts as security in the public domain is far from impartial, always differential. Affective phenomena, including and exceeding feelings and emotions, both operate beyond self-contained persons and are inherently tied up with the openness of individuals' bodies to affect and be affected (Deleuze 1988). The workings of these affects break down distinctions between rational, conscious subjects, the pre-subjective and unconscious, and individuals and the assemblages they live within. But this is not to equate shared affects with equal experience. For example, residents caught up in the same counterterrorism operation in the same city are likely to experience, feel, and even behave in public space differently. The 2015 attacks in Paris are a case in point here. Here Fregonese (2021) has shown how the atmospherics (noise, lights, fumes) from the early morning counterterrorism raid by the French police on the neighborhood of St Denis left the local population shocked. Due to the use of explosives some buildings became uninhabitable, and some people were injured. Here, differently from the subdued and solemn atmosphere of central Paris's candle-lit vigils commemorating the victims of the November 2015 attacks, in St Denis "the diffuse experience of the neighborhood and the values attributed to the locality – in terms of reputation, community cohesion, and mutual trust" were impacted negatively in the long term (Fregonese 2021: 33). This can be seen further in Hergon's (2021) work on the embodied and intimate experiences of house searches and house arrests against Muslim or "considered-to-be-Muslim" residents in Paris after these attacks. Furthermore, Abbas (2019) has shown more broadly, ahead of terror attacks, fractures can develop even *within* the same community, where a differential attunement to fear fosters a climate of

double suspiciousness, between those coopted into prevention of radicalization and those suspected to be extremists.

That said, and following Massumi (2015), it shouldn't be assumed that those aggregated into the same categories of identity and difference will necessarily be disposed or attuned to these situations in the same way. The reality of these situations is far more circumstantial and often contexts are not fully shared despite social, historical, or geographic proximity. Aggregations of difference may well as much be an unintended outcome as part of the design-practices of counterterrorism and policy. For example, Ciax and Runkel (2024) highlight the politics and differential effects of the "atmospheric fortification" of urban squares in Berlin. In these locales, "[n]ew perceptions of everyday life are constituted […]" that, contrary to views of atmosphere as an envelopment exceeding individual perceptions and instead "producing a hierarchy of desired/undesired bodies at the square" (2024:11).

In sum, studying (counter)terrorism starting with difference highlights the diverse responses and practices that individuals adopt when they encounter the discourses and materialities of counterterrorism agendas. This foregrounds the experience of counterterrorism in cities not just as the top-down purview of the state, but also as an important component of everyday routines, individual fears, and decision-making, embedded so deeply as to often become. Laying emphasis on these experiences at the threshold of detectability is important in bringing into view an atmospheric political geography of (counter)terrorism, as "it is the quietest fears, with little political capital but more immediate materiality, which have the sharpest impact" (Pain 2009: 473).

Conclusion

This paper has joined interdisciplinary literature to foreground the spatialised lived experiences – atmospheres – of (counter)terrorism in urban spaces in Western Europe. This allowed us to explore the understandings of experiences of urban public spaces amongst official actors in relation specific target publics. We did so, though, without losing sight of the diffuse, quotidian, differential, and often unpredictable felt experiences of the diverse users of those spaces. While this does not aim to be an exhaustive review of the literature, it raises three avenues for further enquiry.

Firstly, we have articulated a need to attend to *diffusion***.** Terrorism is eventful: it produces spectacle and rupture that are extraordinary, and exceptional in the responses to it, often at international and global levels. However, it is important to follow the atmospheric dispositions around (counter)terrorism as they become distributed and diffuse across urban public spaces. This atmospheric urban geography of (counter)terrorism appreciates the reverberations of events – as felt qualities or tendencies stemming and diffusing from events (Massumi 2015) – in ways that are not confined in time and space to single terrorist events or to their commemoration, but that instead shape everyday urban experiences for the long-term. As such, then, we need to carefully consider the place of atmosphere (Paiva and Sánchez-Fuarros 2021) in the threads of everyday urban experiences, which requires an open-ended spatial and temporal imagination around terror threats and counterterrorism responses.

Secondly, our approach emphasises a specific and expanded conception of *materiality***.** We directly address the material things of (counter)terrorism with which we are left with by official agendas in urban public space, and whose agency and relations contribute to the production of atmospheres. This goes beyond techno-centric approaches and instead both advocates a concern with the

material-affective aspects of such measures, and demands a form of material imagination that recognises that atmospheres exist as quasi-objects, being diffuse and in emanating through space. This materiality mixes an attention to: what non-human agencies are enrolled in efforts to produce specific collective feelings; the ways such atmospheres are experienced by the publics present in these spaces; and how counterterrorism agendas are not always easily aligned with specific atmospheric outcomes, given the complexity of agencies involved in their ongoing and circumstantial occurrence.

Thirdly, central to this is a sensitivity to *difference***.** Urban encounters both shape and are shaped by intersectionality: one's experiences, social position, attachments to different groups, communities and neighbourhoods, personal memories, and collective histories (Paddison and McCann 2014). Nevertheless, much research on urban encounters focuses on identity as the primary expression of difference (Watson 2006). While race, gender, class, and sexual orientation undoubtedly shape the way people are perceived by others and experience public space (Ahmed 2000), there is a wealth of individual and collective spatialized experience that influences how people interact with the material and social landscapes of the city which complicates structural conceptions of identity and difference. How, then, is (counter)terrorism experienced by diverse urban publics, and how do these different dispositions coexist (or become contested) in cities? It is important to unpack the "we" of atmosphere, the shared nature, that collective presumption that the urban crowd that much of counterterrorism theory and practice is trying to protect, is one and attuned as one to threat and shock. Atmospheric geographies of counterterrorism, therefore, are inherently diverse, contested, and open to collateral, alter- and counter-atmospheres that coexist, become latent, sometimes are never registered, but – as Massumi (2015) would have it – constitute nonetheless potential.

Working with atmospheres this way makes us concerned with the diverse and slippery entanglement of social encounters in public urban everyday life, practices and materialities of security and securing, narratives and discourses around terror and threat, moments of tension and the associated identity politics present therein, and the sorts of atmospheres that emerge from and come to exist around them. This presents methodological challenges, given the diverse range of agencies at play here, and so demands a particular sort of response. Echoing recent calls for methodological development in human geography in the light of various practice-based, sensory, experiential, more-than-textual and more-than-human geographies (see Boyd 2022; Dewsbury 2010; Dowling *et al* 2016; 2017; 2018; Dwyer and Davies 2010; Lorimer 2010; Simpson 2021), a particular sort of methodological 'style' is required here (Ash and Simpson 2019; Vannini 2015; also see Thomas 2010; Tixier 2002). This does not necessarily mean developing new 'experimental' methods or discount the sort of discursive methods that have dominated in existing scholarship on terrorism in geography and cognate disciplines (see Dewsbury 2010; Hitchings 2012). It does, though, ask us to question the sorts of 'proceduralism' that have characterised certain visions of qualitative research where 'data' is something "waiting in the 'field' to be merely 'plucked'" (Megoran 2006: 626), and where the research somehow 'captures' the thing being studied to then be analysed away from its happening (Boyd 2022; also see Dewsbury and Naylor 2002; Simpson 2015). The challenge lies not so much in the ability to increase generality through methodological experimentation, as in the fact of being able to apprehend the atmospheric dimensions of urban environments that are being reconfigured materially, symbolically, and practically (Masson 2024), here by terror threat and counterterrorism measures, in ways that are potentially more-than-phenomenal, more-than-sensitive, and more-than-discursive. Approaching the complexity of atmospheres suggested here demands that we recognise the entangled nature of the research process itself and so to think carefully about *how* we use methods, how we attend to the diverse array of matters we are concerned with here, and how

we seek to write about them given such atmospheres are always encountered from a specific, differentiated point of view.

By foregrounding its felt experience and the way it is sensed in space, this paper opens epistemological perspectives onto diffuse, more- than-human, and differential approaches to researching (counter)terrorism. *Doing* atmospheric geographies of (counter)terrorism, in sum, grounds, embodies, and places dynamics that are spatially diffuse yet experientially visceral, as they involve a vast array of everyday urban public spaces and social interactions therein. In this viscerality of experience an atmospheric approach foregrounds difference and intersectionality in experiencing, attuning to, and being impacted by (counter)terrorism threats and measures An atmospheric research praxis of (counter)terrorism, therefore, reclaims the agentive, embodied, eventful, quotidian, more-than-human and felt qualities of the connections between the global politics and localised violences that underpin terrorism and governmental responses to it. It contributes to make "situated, materializing through combinations of subjects, places, infrastructure and economies" (Lorimer 2015: 182) taking beyond discourse a host of dynamics until recently dominated by representational approaches.

References

Abbas M (2019) Producing 'internal suspect bodies': divisive effects of UK counter-terrorism measures on Muslim communities in Leeds and Bradford. *British Journal of Sociology* 70, 261–282. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12366

Adey P (2013) Securing the Volume/Volumen: Comments on Stuart Elden's Plenary Paper 'Secure the Volume.' *Political Geography* 34 (May): 52–54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2013.01.003.

Adey P (2014) Security atmospheres or the crystallisation of worlds. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 32, 834-851 https://doi.org/10.1068/d21312

Adey P (2020) "Shoe: Towards a promiscuous politics of emergency evacuation mobility. *Environment and Planning D*: *Society and Space*, 38 (2): 364-382.

Adey P, Brayer L, Masson D, Murphy P, Simpson P, and Tixier N (2013) 'Pour Votre Tranquillité': Ambiance, Atmosphere, and Surveillance. *Geoforum* 49 (October): 299–309. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2013.04.028.

Åhäll L (2019) Feeling Everyday IR: Embodied, Affective, Militarising Movement as Choreography of War. *Cooperation and Conflict* 54 (2): 149–66. https://doi.org/10.1177/0010836718807501.

Åhäll L and Gregory TA (2013) Security, Emotions, Affect. *Critical Studies on Security* 1 (1): 117–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/21624887.2013.790217.

Åhäll L and Gregory TA (eds) (2015) *Emotions, Politics and War*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Ahmed S (2000) *Strange Encounters: Embodied Others in Post-Coloniality*. London: Routledge.

Allen J (2006) Ambient Power: Berlin's Potsdamer Platz and the Seductive Logic of Public Spaces. *Urban Studies*, 43(2): 441–455. https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980500416982.

Amphoux P, Chelkoff G, and Thibaud J-P (eds) (2004) *Ambiances en débats*. Ambiances, ambiance. Bernin, A la croisée.

Anderson B (2009) Affective atmospheres. *Emotion, Space and Society,* 2: 77-81 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2009.08.005

Anderson B (2012) Affect and Biopower: Towards a Politics of Life. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 37 (1): 28–43. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2011.00441.x.

Anderson B (2014) *Encountering Affect: Capacities, Apparatuses, Conditions*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Anderson B (2015) Boredom, Excitement and Other Security Affects. *Dialogues in Human Geography* 5 (3): 271–74. https://doi.org/10.1177/2043820615607759.

Anderson B (2016a) Governing Emergencies: The Politics of Delay and the Logic of Response. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 41 (1): 14–26. https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12100.

Anderson B (2016b) Neoliberal Affects. *Progress in Human Geography* 40 (6): 734–53. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132515613167.

Anderson B and Ash J (2015) Atmospheric methods. In: Vannini P (ed) *Non-Representational Methodologies: Re-Envisioning Research*. New York: Routledge.

Aradau C (2015) 'Crowded Places Are Everywhere We Go': Crowds, Emergency, Politics. *Theory, Culture & Society* 32 (2): 155–75. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276414562429.

Ash J (2010) Teleplastic Technologies: charting practices of orientation and navigation in videogaming. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 35(3): 414-430.

Ash J (2013) Rethinking affective atmospheres: Technology, perturbation and space times of the non-human. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 49: 20-28 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2013.05.006Get rights and content

Ash J and Simpson P (2019) Postphenomenology and method: Styles for thinking the (non)human. *GeoHumanities*, 5: 139-156. https://doi.org/10.1080/2373566X.2018.1543553

Augoyard J-F (1995) L'environnement sensible et les ambiances architecturales. *L'Espace Géographique*, 4: 302-318. DOI : 10.3406/spgeo.1995.3409

Awan I (2012) "I Am a Muslim Not an Extremist": How the Prevent Strategy Has Constructed a "Suspect" Community: Extremism and Terrorism. *Politics & Policy,* 40: 1158–1185. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-1346.2012.00397.x

Awan I (2018) 'I Never Did Anything Wrong' – Trojan Horse: A Qualitative Study Uncovering the Impact in Birmingham. *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 39 (2): 197–211. https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2017.1406334.

Aydinli E (2006) From Finances to Transnational Mobility: Searching for the Global Jihadists' Achilles Heel. *Terrorism and Political Violence,* 18: 301–313.

Barabantseva E, Mhurchú AN, and Peterson VS (2021) Introduction: Engaging Geopolitics through the Lens of the Intimate. *Geopolitics*, 26: 343–356. https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2019.1636558

Baucum M and John R (2020) The Psychophysics of Terror Attack Casualty Counts. *Risk Analysis,* 40: 399–407. https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.13396

Bazin M (2018) Peuples en larmes, peuples en marches: la médiatisation des affects lors des attentats de janvier 2015. *Mots. Les langages du politique*, 118 (novembre): 75-94. https://doi.org/10.4000/mots.23653

Bille M (2020) *Homely Atmospheres and Lighting Technologies in Denmark: Living with Light*. London: Routledge.

Bille M, Bjerregaard P, and Sorensen TF (2015) Staging atmospheres: Materiality, culture, and the texture of the in-between. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 15: 31-38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2014.11.002

Bille M and Simonsen K (2019) Atmospheric Practices: On Affecting and Being Affected. *Space and Culture*, 24(2): 295–309. https://doi.org/10.1177/1206331218819711.

Bissell D (2010) Passenger mobilities: affective atmospheres and the sociality of public transport. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 28: 70-289. https://doi.org/10.1068/d3909

Böhme G (1993) Atmosphere as the Fundamental Concept of a New Aesthetics. *Thesis Eleven*, 36(1): 113–126 https://doi.org/10.1177/072551369303600107

Böhme G (2013) The art of the stage set as a paradigm for an aesthetics of atmospheres. *Ambiances: International Journal of Sensory Environment, Architecture and Urban Space* https://doi.org/10.4000/ambiances.315

Böhme G (2018) *The Aesthetics of Atmosphere* (edited by Thibaud, J-P.). London: Routledge.

Boyd C (2022) Postqualitative geographies. *Geography Compass*, 16: e12661. https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12661.

Boyle MJ (ed) (2020) *Non-Western Responses to Terrorism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press. https://doi.org/10.7765/9781526157102.00015

Borch C (2009) Body to Body: On the Political Anatomy of Crowds. *Sociological Theory,* 27: 271–290. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9558.2009.01348.x

Borch C (2012) *The politics of crowds: an alternative history of sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brighenti AM and Kärrholm M (2018) Atmospheres of retail and the asceticism of civilized consumption. *Geographica. Helvetica*, 73: 203–213. https://doi.org/10.5194/gh-73-203-2018

Brown KE and Penttinen E (2013) 'A "Sucking Chest Wound" Is Nature's Way of Telling You to Slow Down….': Humour and Laughter in War Time. *Critical Studies on Security* 1 (1): 124–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/21624887.2013.790225.

Brown SD, Kanyeredzi A, McGrath L, Reavey P, and Tucker I (2019) Affect theory and the concept of atmosphere, *Distinktion: Journal of Social Theory*, 20(1): 5-24, DOI: 10.1080/1600910X.2019.1586740

Burns EA, Pyatt AD, and Mackie E (2021) Banal Terrorism: Re-Appropriating Terror-Prevention Concrete Bollards in Melbourne's CBD. *Journal of Australian Studies,* 45: 417–438. https://doi.org/10.1080/14443058.2021.1956572

Butler J (2009) *Frames of War: When Is Life Grievable?* London: Verso.

Ciax K and Runkel S (2024) Geopolitics of Urban Squares: Atmospheric Securitisation and Counterterrorism in Everyday Urban Spaces in Berlin. *Geopolitics* 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2023.2283465

Campbell E (2019) Three-dimensional security: Layers, spheres, volumes, milieus. *Political Geography* 69: 10–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2018.11.010

Castagnino F (2016) Séparer pour mieux surveiller. Spatialité des risques et pratiques de surveillance en Gare du Nord. *Flux*, 103-104 (1-2): 44-56. https://doi.org/10.3917/flux.103.0044

Chowdhury NS (2019) *Paradoxes of the popular: crowd politics in Bangladesh*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Clément M (2021) Emotions and affect in terrorism research: Epistemological shift and ways ahead. *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 14, 247–270. https://doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2021.1902611

Closs-Stephen A (2016) The affective atmospheres of nationalism. *cultural geographies,* 23: 181-198. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474015569994

Closs-Stephens A, Hughes SM, Schofield V, and Sumartojo S (2017) Atmospheric memories: Affect and minor politics at the ten-year anniversary of the London bombings. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 23: 44-51. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2017.03.001.

Coaffee J (2013) Rescaling and Responsibilising the Politics of Urban Resilience: From National Security to Local Place-Making. *Politics* 33, 240–252. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9256.12011

Coaffee J (2017) A Balanced Response? The Quest for Proportionate Urban Security. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* web series. www.ijurr.org/spotlight-on-overview/the-city-at-war/coaffee/.

Coaffee J (2022) *The War on Terror and the Normalisation of Urban Security*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Cockayne DG, Ruez D, and Secor A (2017) Between ontology and representation: Locating Gilles Deleuze's 'difference-in-itself' in and for geographical thought. *Progress in Human Geography*, 41: 580–599. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132516650028

Colak AA and Pearce J (2015) Securing the global city?: an analysis of the 'Medellín Model' through participatory research. *Conflict, Security & Development,* 15: 197–228. https://doi.org/10.1080/14678802.2015.1055136

Crawford NC (2000) The Passion of World Politics: Propositions on Emotion and Emotional Relationships. *International Security,* 24: 116–156.

Dalgaard-Nielsen A, Laisen J, and Wandorf C (2016) Visible Counterterrorism Measures in Urban Spaces—Fear-Inducing or Not? *Terrorism and Political Violence,* 28: 692–712. https://doi.org/10.1080/09546553.2014.930027

Davis M (2007) *Buda's Wagon: A Brief History of the Car Bomb*. London: Verso.

Degen M and Lewis C (2020) The changing feel of place: the temporal modalities of atmospheres in Smithfield Market, London. *cultural geographies*, 27(4): 509–526. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474019876625.

Deleuze G (1988) *Spinoza, Practical Philosophy*. San Francisco: City Lights Books.

De Goede M, Simon S, and Hoijtink M (2014) Performing preemption. *Security Dialogue,* 45: 411–422. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010614543585

DeMatteis F (2019) *Vita nello spazio; sullesperienza affettiva dell'architettura*. Place of publication not identified: MIMESIS EDIZIONI. http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=nlabk&AN=2251870.

Dewsbury JD (2010) Performative, non-representational, and affect-based research: Seven injunctions. In DeLyser D, Herbert S, Aitken S, Crang M and McDowell L (eds) *The SAGE handbook of qualitative geography*. SAGE: London.

Dewsbury JD and Naylor S (2002) Practising geographical knowledge: Fields, bodies and dissemination. Area, 34: pp. 253-260. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-4762.00079.

Di Croce N (2020) La Politica Degli Affetti Nell'atmosfera Urbana. Ambiente Sonoro e Autenticità Nei Mercati Storici Di Palermo. *Sociologia e ricerca sociale*, 122 (October): 130–50. https://doi.org/10.3280/SR2020-122007.

Di Croce N, Bild E, Steele D, and Guastavino C (2022) A sonic perspective for the post-pandemic future of entertainment districts: the case of Montreal's Quartier des Spectacles. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management,* 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/09640568.2022.2100247

Dittmer J (2016) Theorizing a More-than-Human Diplomacy: Assembling the British Foreign Office, 1839-1874. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy,* 11(1): 78–104. https://doi.org/10.1163/1871191X-12341319.

Dodds K and Kirby P (2013) It's Not a Laughing Matter: Critical Geopolitics, Humour and Unlaughter. *Geopolitics,* 18(1): 45–59. https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2012.668723

Dowler L and Sharp J (2001) A Feminist Geopolitics? *Space and Polity,* 5: 165–176. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562570120104382

Dowling R, Lloyd K and Suchet-Pearson S (2016) Qualitative methods I: Enriching the interview. *Progress in Human Geography*, 40: 679-686. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132515596880.

Dowling R, Lloyd K and Suchet-Pearson S (2017) Qualitative methods II: 'More-than-human' methodologies and/in praxis. *Progress in Human Geography*, 41: 823-831. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132516664439.

Dowling R, Lloyd K and Suchet-Pearson S (2018) Qualitative methods III: Experimenting, picturing, sensing. *Progress in Human Geography*, 42: 779-788. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132517730941.

Drongiti A and Masson D (2022) Crises terrorists et ambiances urbaines: quelles marques les attentats laissent-ils aux villes? *Revue Internationale d'Urbanisme* (13) ⟨hal-04329155⟩

Duff C and Moore D (2015) Going out, getting about: atmospheres of mobility in Melbourne's night-time economy. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 16(3): 299-314, DOI: 10.1080/14649365.2014.979864.

Durkheim E (2005 [1912]) *Les Formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse*. Paris : Presses universitaires de France.

Dwyer C and Davies C (2010) Qualitative methods III: Animating archives, artful interventions, and online environments. *Progress in Human Geography*, 34: 88-97. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132508105005.

Edensor T (2012) Illuminated atmospheres: anticipating and reproducing the flow of affective experience in Blackpool. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 30: 1103-1122. https://doi.org/10.1068/d12211

Edensor T and Sumartojo S (2015) Designing Atmospheres: introduction to Special Issue. *Visual Communication*, 14: pp. 251–265.

Engelmann S (2015) Towards a poetics of air: Sequencing and surfacing breath. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* 40: 430-44. https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12084

Engelmann S and McCormack DP (2018) Elemental Aesthetics: On Artistic Experiments with Solar Energy. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 108: 241-259.

Ernste H (2018) The geography of spheres: an introduction and critical assessment of Peter Sloterdijk's concept of spheres. *Geographica Helvetica*, 74: 273-284. https://doi.org/10.5194/gh-73-273-2018 .

Escher A et al (2016) The Atmospheric Grid of Cruising the High Seas. *Erdkunde*, 70(4): 313-321.

European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Cooperation (2021) *European Union Terrorism Situation and Trend Report 2021*. European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Cooperation.

Fadil N, de Koning M, and Ragazzi F (eds) (2019) *Radicalization in Belgium and the Netherlands: Critical Perspectives on Violence and Security*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Fawaz M, Harb M, and Gharbieh A (2012) Living Beirut's Security Zones: An Investigation of the Modalities and Practice of Urban Security: Living Beirut's Security Zones. *City & Society,* 24: 173–195. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-744X.2012.01074.x

Feigenbaum A (2013) Teargas: A Booming Market in Repressing Dissent. *The Guardian*. June 7, 2013. http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/jun/07/teargas-booming-market-turkish-protests.

Feigenbaum A and Kanngieser A (2015) For a Politics of Atmospheric Governance. *Dialogues in Human Geography,* 5(1): 80–84. https://doi.org/10.1177/2043820614565873.

Feigenbaum A and Weissmann D (2016) Vulnerable warriors: the atmospheric marketing of military and policing equipment before and after 9/11. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 9(3): 482-498. DOI: 10.1080/17539153.2016.1197642

Flint C (2003) Terrorism and Counterterrorism: Geographic Research Questions and Agendas. *The Professional Geographer,* 55: 161–169. https://doi.org/10.1111/0033-0124.5502004

Fluri JL (2011) Bodies, bombs and barricades: geographies of conflict and civilian (in)security: Bodies, bombs and barricades. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* 36: 280–296. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2010.00422.x

Fregonese S (2017) Affective atmospheres, urban geopolitics and conflict (de)escalation in Beirut. *Political Geography* 61, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2017.04.009

Fregonese S (2021) Shockwaves: Atmospheres beyond the Conflict City/Ordinary City Divide. *Conflict and Society* 7, 26–41. https://doi.org/10.3167/arcs.2021.070103

Fregonese S and Laketa S (2022) Urban Atmospheres of Terror. *Political Geography,* 96 (June): 102569. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2021.102569.

Gandy M (2017) Urban atmospheres. *Cultural geographies* 24, 353–374. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474017712995

Geisser V, Marongiu-Perria O, and Smaïl K (2017) *Musulmans de France, la grande épreuve: face au terrorisme*. Ivry-sur-Seine: les Éditions de l'Atelier-les Éditions ouvrières.

Gensburger S (2017) *Mémoire vive: chroniques d'un quartier: Bataclan 2015-2016*. Paris: Anamosa.

Gillespie M and O'Loughlin B (2009) News Media, Threats and Insecurities: An Ethnographic Approach. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs,* 22(4): 667–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/09557570903325488.

Graham S (2004) *Cities, War, and Terrorism: Towards an Urban Geopolitics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Graham S (ed) (2009) *Disrupted Cities*. New York: Routledge.

Graham S and Wood D (2003) Digitizing Surveillance: Categorization, Space, Inequality. *Critical Social Policy,* 23 (2): 227–48. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261018303023002006.

Gregory D (2009) Terrorism. In Gregory D, Johnston R, Pratt G, Watts M, and Whatmore S (eds) *The Dictionary of Human Geography* (5th ed). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Griffero T (2019) *Places, Affordances, Atmospheres: A Pathic Aesthetics*. Aldershot: Routledge.

Griffero T (2021) *Nella luce. L'atmosfera quasi-cosale del crepuscolo*. Sciami: ricerche.

Groothuis S (2020) Researching race, racialisation, and racism in critical terrorism studies: clarifying conceptual ambiguities. *Critical Studies on Terrorism,* 13: 680–701. https://doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2020.1810990

Grosskopf KR (2006) Evaluating the Societal Response to Antiterrorism Measures. *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management,* 3(2). https://doi.org/10.2202/1547-7355.1170.

Hall TH and Ross AAG (2015) Affective Politics after 9/11. *International Organization,* 69(4): 847–79. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818315000144.

Head N (2016) Costly encounters of the empathic kind: a typology. *International Theory,* 8: 171–199. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1752971915000238

Hergon F (2021) The State of Emergency at Home: House Arrests, House Searches, and Intimacies in France. *Conflict and Society,* 7(1): 42–59. https://doi.org/10.3167/arcs.2021.070104.

Hickman MJ, Nickels HC, and Silvestri S (2012) Social cohesion and the notion of 'suspect communities': a study of the experiences and impacts of being 'suspect' for Irish communities and Muslim communities in Britain. *Critical Studies on Terrorism,* 5: 89–106. https://doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2012.659915

Hillyard P (1993) *Suspect Community: People's Experience of the Prevention of Terrorism Acts in Britain*. London: Pluto Press.

Hillyard P (1992) *Suspect Community*. Chicago: Pluto.

Hitchings R (2012) People can talk about their practices. *Area*, 44: 61-67. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4762.2011.01060.x

Home Office (2012) *Protecting Crowded Places: Design and Technical Issues*. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a78c6a740f0b62b22cbcb49/design-tech-issues.pdf (accessed 4.3.24)

Home Office (2022) *Government response document to the Protect Duty public consultation.* https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/protect-duty/outcome/government-response-document (accessed 1.11.23).

Hyndman J (2001) Towards a Feminist Geopolitics. *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe Canadien,* 45(2): 210–22. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0064.2001.tb01484.x.

Ilum S (2022) Concrete Blocks, Bollards, and Ha-ha Walls: How Rationales of the Security Industry Shape Our Cities, *City & Society*, 34(1): 88-110. DOI:10.1111/ciso.12424.

Isakjee A (2016) Dissonant Belongings: The Evolving Spatial Identities of Young Muslim Men in the UK. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space,* 48(7): 1337–53. https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X16641110.

Isakjee A and Allen C (2013) 'A Catastrophic Lack of Inquisitiveness': A Critical Study of the Impact and Narrative of the Project Champion Surveillance Project in Birmingham. *Ethnicities,* 13(6): 751–70. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796813492488.

Jarvis L and Lister M (2013) Disconnected Citizenship? The Impacts of Anti-Terrorism Policy on Citizenship in the UK. *Political Studies,* 61(3): 656–75. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2012.00993.x.

Jarvis L and Lister M (2018) *Anti-Terrorism, Citizenship and Security*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Joiner A, McFarlane C, Rella, and Uriarte-Ruiz M (2024) Problematising density: COVID-19, the crowd, and urban life. Social and Cultural Geography, 25(2): 181-198. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2022.2143879

Jones A (2020a) Towards an Emotional Geography of Diplomacy: Insights from the United Nations Security Council. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* 45(3): 649–63. https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12371.

Jones A (2020b) Manipulating Diplomatic Atmospheres: The United Nations Security Council and Syria. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers,* 110(5): 1369–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2019.1696665.

Joronen M (2023) Atmospheric negations: Weaponizing breathing, attuning irreducible bodies. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 41(5): 765-928. DOI: 10.1177/02637758231203061

Kaplan C (2020) Atmospheric Politics: Protest Drones and the Ambiguity of Airspace. *Digital War,* 1: 50-57. https://doi.org/10.1057/s42984-020-00005-y

Katz C (2007) Banal Terrorism: Spatial Fetishism and Everyday Insecurity. In Gregory D and Pred A (eds) *Violent Geographies: Fear, Terror, and Political Violence*, 349–61. New York: Routledge.

Kaunert C and Léonard S (2019) The collective securitisation of terrorism in the European Union. *West European Politics*, 42: 261–277.

Kazig R (2008) Typische Atmosphären städtischer Plätze. Auf dem Weg zu einer anwendungsorientierten Atmosphärenforschung. *Die alte Stadt,* 35(2): 147-160.

Kazig R and Masson D (2015) L'ambiance Comme Concept de La Géographie Culturelle Francophone: Défis et Perspectives. *Géographie et Cultures*, 93–94 (April): 215–32. https://doi.org/10.4000/gc.3969.

Kerr D (1994) Crowds, colonialism, and "lord Jim" *The Conradian*, 18 (2): 49-64

Klauser FR (2010) Splintering spheres of security: Peter Sloterdijk and the contemporary fortress city. *Environment and Planning: Society and Space*, 28 : 326-340. https://doi.org/10.1068/d146.

Kraftl P and Adey P (2008) Architecture/Affect/Inhabitation: Geographies of Being-In Buildings. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 98(1): 213-231.

Krasmann S and Hentschel C (2019) 'Situational Awareness': Rethinking Security in Times of Urban Terrorism. *Security Dialogue,* 50(2): 181–97. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010618819598.

Laketa S, Fregonese S, and Masson D (2021) Introduction: Experiential Landscapes of Terror. *Conflict and Society,* 7(1): 1–8. https://doi.org/10.3167/arcs.2021.070101.

Laketa S and Fregonese S (2022) Lockdown and the intimate entanglements of terror, virus, and militarism. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 41(8): 1495-1625. https://doi.org/10.1177/23996544221143041.

Larsen M and Piché J (2009) Public Vigilance Campaigns and Participatory Surveillance after 11 September 2001. In Hier S and Greenberg J (eds) *Surveillance: Power, Problems, Politics*, Vancouver: UBC Press, p. 187-202.

Le Bon G (1895) *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind*. https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/125518/1414_LeBon.pdf (accessed 5.3.24).

Leff JR (2021) Expanding Feminist Affective Atmospheres. *Emotion, Space and Society,* 41 (November): 100844. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2021.100844.

Legg S (2020) 'Political Atmospherics': The India Round Table Conference's Atmospheric Environments, Bodies and Representations, London 1930–1932. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers,* 110(3): 774–92. https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2019.1630247.

Lin W (2021) Summit Atmospheres: Aviation Diplomacy and Virtual Infrastructures of Politics. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* 46(2): 406–19. https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12428.

Lorimer J (2010) Moving image methodologies for more-than-human geographies. *Cultural Geographies*, 17: 237-258. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474010363853.

Lorimer H (2015) Afterword. Non-Representational Theory and Me Too. In Vannini P (ed) *Non-representational Methodologies: Re-envisioning Research*. Routledge: London.

Marcuse P (2006) Security or Safety in Cities? The Threat of Terrorism after 9/11. *International Journal of Urban Regional Research*, 30: 919–929. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2006.00700.x

Massumi B (2015) *Politics of Affect.* Oxford: Wiley.

Masson D (2024) Mobilités urbaines sensibles: expériences et usages des ambiances. In Fretigny J-B (ed) *Les transports et leurs lieux*, ISTE éditions, Encyclopédie SCIENCES, 1789481740. https://www.istegroup.com/fr/produit/les-transports-et-leurs-lieux/?/56084

McConnell F (2020) Tracing Modes of Politics at the United Nations: Spatial Scripting, Intimidation and Subversion at the Forum on Minority Issues. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space,* 38(6): 1017–35. https://doi.org/10.1177/2399654420916754.

McCormack DP (2008) Engineering affective atmospheres on the moving geographies of the 1897 Andree expedition. *cultural geographies,* 15: 413-430. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474008094314

McCormack DP (2009) Aerostatic Spacing: On Things Becoming Lighter than Air. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* 34: 25-41. doi:10.1111/tran.2009.34.issue-1.

McCormack DP (2015) Envelopment, exposure, and the allure of becoming elemental. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 5: 85-89.

McFarlane C (2020) The Force of Density: Political Crowding and the City. *Urban Geography*, 41: 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2020.1837527.

Megoran N (2006) For ethnography in political geography: Experiencing and re-imagining Ferghana Valley boundary closures. *Political Geography,* 25: 622–640. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2006.05.005

Meroueh S (2020) Commémorer les défunts par corps: Tatouages post-attentat et deuil collectif à Manchester, *Sensibilités*, 8(2): 66-77. https://doi.org/10.3917/sensi.008.0066

Militz E and Schurr C (2016) Affective nationalism: Banalities of belonging in Azerbaijan. *Political Geography,* 54: 54–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2015.11.002

Mountz A (2013) Political geography I: Reconfiguring geographies of sovereignty. *Progress in Human Geography*, 37: 829–841. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132513479076

Nguyen N (2019) *Suspect Communities: Anti-Muslim Racism and the Domestic War on Terror*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Nieuwenhuis M (2016) Breathing Materiality: Aerial Violence at a Time of Atmospheric Politics. *Critical Studies on Terrorism,* 9(3): 499–521. https://doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2016.1199420.

Nyman J (2021) The Everyday Life of Security: Capturing Space, Practice, and Affect. *International Political Sociology,* 15(3): 313–37. https://doi.org/10.1093/ips/olab005.

Oldra A (2021) Spatialités individuelles et jeux de places dans l'espace public urbain: de quelques perspectives géographiques à propos des militaires en opération Vigipirate/Sentinelle. *Carnets de géographes*, 15, https://doi.org/10.4000/cdg.7319.

Ó Tuathail G (1996) *Critical Geopolitics: The Politics of Writing Global Space*. London: Routledge.

Ó Tuathail G (2003) 'Just Out Looking for a Fight': American Affect and the Invasion of Iraq. *Antipode,* 35(5): 856–70. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2003.00361.x.

Ó Tuathail G (2009) Placing blame: Making sense of Beslan. *Political Geography,* 28: 4–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2009.01.007

Ó Tuathail G and Agnew J (1992) Geopolitics and Discourse. *Political Geography,* 11(2): 190–204. https://doi.org/10.1016/0962-6298(92)90048-X.

Paddison R and McCann E (eds)(2014) *Cities and Social Change: Encounters with Contemporary Urbanism*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Pain R (2009) Globalized Fear? Towards an Emotional Geopolitics. *Progress in Human Geography,* 33(4): 466–86. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132508104994.

Pain R (2014) Everyday Terrorism: Connecting Domestic Violence and Global Terrorism. *Progress in Human Geography*, 38(4): 531–550. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132513512231.

Pain R (2015) Intimate War. *Political Geography,* 44 (January): 64–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2014.09.011.

Pain R and Smith SJ (eds) (2008) *Fear: Critical Geopolitics and Everyday Life.* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Paiva D and Sánchez-Fuarros I (2021) The Territoriality of Atmosphere: Rethinking Affective Urbanism through the Collateral Atmospheres of Lisbon's Tourism. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* 46(2): 392–405. https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12425.

Pawlowski NS (2023) Suspicious cities: An analysis of the securitisation of urban everyday life in London and Brussels. *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 16, 305–327. https://doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2023.2176408

Philippopoulos-Mihalopolous A (2016) Withdrawing from atmosphere: An ontology of air partitioning and affective engineering. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 34(1): 150-167. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775815600443.

Picaud M (2020) Le gendarme et les festivals: l'indemnisation des forces de l'ordre par les organisateurs d'événements musicaux en France. *Lien social et Politiques*, 84 : 104–121. https://doi.org/10.7202/1069445ar.

Pink S (2009) *Doing Sensory Ethnography*. London: SAGE.

Power N, McManus MA, Lynch R, and Bonworth J (2016) Fear of Crime on the Rail Networks: Perceptions of the UK Public and British Transport Police. *Crime Prevention and Community Safety,* 18(2): 91–104. https://doi.org/10.1057/cpcs.2016.2.

Puar JK (2018) *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. *Terrorist Assemblages*. Durham MC: Duke University Press.

Quirin M, Malekzad F, Kazén M, Luckey U, and Kehr H (2021) Existential Threat: Uncovering Implicit Affect in Response to Terror Reminders in Soldiers. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12: 585854. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.585854

Ragazzi F (2016) Suspect Community or Suspect Category? The Impact of Counterterrorism as 'Policed Multiculturalism.' *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,* 42(5): 724–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1121807.

Ragazzi F (2017) Countering terrorism and radicalisation: Securitising social policy? *Critical Social Policy* 37: 163–179. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261018316683472

Riedel F (2019) Atmosphere. In: Salbe J and von Scheve C (eds) *Affective Societies*. London: Routledge. 85-95.

Ritchie M (2015) Feeling for the State: Affective Labor and Anti-Terrorism Training in US Hotels. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies,* 12(2): 179–97. https://doi.org/10.1080/14791420.2015.1023816.

Runkel S (2016) Zur Genealogie des Atmosphären-Begriffs. Eine kritische Würdigung der Ansätze von Hermann Schmitz und Gernot Böhme. In Wünsch U (ed) *Atmosphären des Populären II. Perspektiven, Projekte, Protokolle, Performances, Personen, Posen*. Berlin: Uni-Edition. 20-39.

Runkel S (2018) Collective Atmospheres. Phenomenological explorations of protesting crowds with Canetti, Schmitz, and Tarde. *Ambiances*, https://doi.org/10.4000/ambiances.1067

Ruppert L (2022) Affective Atmospheres of Weapons Technologies, *Emotion, Space and Society*, 45: 100909

Saberi P (2019) Preventing radicalization in European cities: An urban geopolitical question. *Political Geography,* 74: 102039. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2019.102039

SafeCi (2021) *European Recommendations for the Protection of Public Spaces against Terrorist Attacks.* https://www.berlin.de/polizei/_assets/aufgaben/praevention/english_safeci_handbook_shortversion.pdf (accessed 5.3.24)

Saurette P (2005) Humiliation and the Global War on Terror. *Peace Review,* 17(1): 47–54. https://doi.org/10.1080/14631370500292078.

Schmitz H (2014) *Atmosphären*. Baden-Baden: Alber.

Schnepf JD (2019) Unsettling Aerial Surveillance: Surveillance Studies after Standing Rock. *Surveillance & Society,* 17(5): 747-751. https://ojs.library.queensu.ca/index.php/surveillance-and-society/index

Secretariat General de la Defense at de la Securite Nationale (2017) *Signalemente de situations suspectes. Recommandations a l'usage du grand public.* DSAF/DPL gouvernement.fr/sites/default/files/risques/pdf/fiche-signalement-situation-suspecte.pdf (accessed on 26.4.23)

Shaker R (2021) 'Saying Nothing Is Saying Something': Affective Encounters with the Muslim Other in Amsterdam Public Transport. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 111(7): 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2020.1866488.

Sidaway J (2009) Shadows on the path: negotiating geopolitics on an urban section of Britain's South West Coast Path. *Environment and Planning D: society and space*, 27(6): 1091-1116

Simpson P (2015) Atmospheres of arrival/departure and multi-angle video recording: reflections from St Pancras and Gare du Nord. In Bates C (ed) *Video Methods: Social Science Research in Motion*. Routledge: London

Simpson P (2019) Elemental Mobilities: atmospheres, matter and cycling amid the weather-world. *Social and Cultural Geography*, 20: 1050-1069. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2018.1428821

Simpson P (2021) *Non-representational Theory*. London: Routledge.

Slesinger I (2022) A strange sky: Security Atmospheres and the technological management of geopolitical conflict in the case of Israel's Iron Dome. *The Geographical Journal,* 188(3): 429-443.

Sloterdijk P (2009) *Terror from the Air*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Sloterdijk P (2011) *Spheres, Volume I: Bubbles Microspherology*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Sloterdijk P (2014) *Spheres, Volume II: Globes Macrospherology*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Sloterdijk P (2016) *Spheres, Volume III: Foams Plural Spherology*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Smith FM (2001) Refiguring the Geopolitical Landscape: Nation, "Transition" and Gendered Subjects in Post-Cold War Germany. *Space and Polity,* 5: 213–235. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562570120104418

Smith MM (2006) *How Race Is Made: Slavery, Segregation, and the Senses*. Chapell Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Staeheli LA, Kofman E, and Peake L (eds) (2004) *Mapping Women, Making Politics: Feminist Perspectives on Political Geography*. New York: Routledge.

Stevens D and Vaughan-Williams N (2016) *Everyday Security Threats: Perceptions, Experiences, and Consequences*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Sumartojo S and Pink S (2019) *Atmospheres and the Experiential World: Theory and Methods*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Thibault PJ and Halliday MAK (2006) *Brain, Mind and the Signifying Body: an ecosocial semiotic theory*. London: Continuum.

Thibaud J-P (2002) From situated perception to urban ambiences. First international Workshop on Architectural and Urban Ambient Environment, February 6-8 2002, Nantes. Nantes : Cerma, Ecole d'architecture.

Thibaud J-P (2004) Une approche pragmatique des ambiances urbaines. In Amphoux P, Thibaud J-P, and Chelkoff G (eds) *Ambiances en Débats*. Editions A la Croisée, pp. 145-161, 2004

Thibaud J-P (2011) The Sensory Fabric of Urban Ambiances. *The Senses and Society,* 6: 203–215. https://doi.org/10.2752/174589311X12961584845846

Thibaud J-P (2015) The backstage of urban ambiances: When atmospheres pervade everyday experience. *Emotion, Space and Society,* 15: 39–46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2014.07.001

Thomas R (2010) Architectural and urban Atmospheres shaping the way we walk in town. In Methorst R, Monterde i Bort H, Risser R, Sauter D, Tight M and Walker J (ed) *Pedestrians' Quality Needs Final Report: Part C Executive Summary*.

Tixier N (2002) Street listening. A Characterisation of the Sound Environment: the 'qualified listening in motion' method. In Jarviluoma H and Wagstaff G (ed) *Soundscape Studies and Methods*. The Finnish Society for Ethnomusicology: Helsinki.

Tixier N, Masson D, Okamura C, Amphoux P, Brayer L et al (2011) *L'ambiance est dans l'air: la dimension atmosphérique des ambiances architecturales et urbaines dans les approches environnementalistes*. [Rapport de recherche] 81, Cresson.

Trandberg M and Jensen OB (2021) The Social Life of a Barrier: A Material Ethnography of Urban Counterterrorism. *Space and Culture*, 26(1): 74–88. https://doi.org/10.1177/1206331220985445.

Trigg D (2020) The role of atmosphere in shared emotion. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 35: 100658. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2020.100658.

Trigg D (2022) *Atmospheres and Shared Emotions*. Aldershot: Routledge.

Urry J, Elliott A, Radford D, and Pitt N (2016) Globalisations utopia? On airport atmospherics. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 19: 13-20. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2016.03.003

Vannini P (2015) Non-representational Methodologies: An introduction. In Vannini P (ed) *Non-representational Methodologies: Re-envisioning Research*. Routledge: London.

Vasilopoulos P and Brouard S (2020) System Justification and Affective Responses to Terrorism: Evidence from the November 2015 Paris Attacks. *Political Psychology,* 41: 569–586. https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12639

Vaughan-Williams N and Stevens D (2016) Vernacular Theories of Everyday (in)Security: The Disruptive Potential of Non-Elite Knowledge. *Security Dialogue,* 47(1): 40–58. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010615604101.

Verlie B (2019) 'Climatic-affective atmospheres': A conceptual tool for affective scholarship in a changing climate". *Emotion, Space and Society*, 33: 100623. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2019.100623

Wæver O (2011) Politics, Security, Theory. *Security Dialogue,* 42(4–5): 465–80. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010611418718.

Wall I (2019) Policing Atmospheres: Crowds, Protest and 'Atmotechnics.' *Theory, Culture & Society,* 36: 143–162. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276419829200

Wall I (2021) *Law and Disorder: Sovereignty, Protest, Atmosphere*. London: Routledge.

Watson S (2006) *City Publics: The (Dis)enchantments of Urban Encounters*. London: Routledge.

Watson A, Ward J, and Fair J (2021) Staging atmosphere: collective emotional labour on the film set. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 22(1): 76-96, DOI: 10.1080/14649365.2018.1551563.

Wigley M (1998) The architecture of atmosphere. *Daidalos,* 68: 18–27.

Wilhelm JL (2020) Atmosphere in the home stadium of Hertha BSC (German Bundesliga): melodies of moods, collective bodies, and the relevance of space. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 21(5): 718-737, DOI: 10.1080/14649365.2018.1514646

Woon CY (2013) For 'Emotional Fieldwork' in Critical Geopolitical Research on Violence and Terrorism. *Political Geography,* 33 (March): 31–41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2012.11.007.

Yu S-J (2019) Can affective atmospheres justify megaprojects? A case study of the 'Asia T New Bay Area' in Kaohsiung, Taiwan. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 31: 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2019.01.003

Zevnik A (2021) Anxiety, subjectivity and the possibility of emancipatory politics. *Journal of International Relations and Development,* 24: 1050–1056. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41268-021-00221-3