

# editorial

Security is the theme of this latest issue of *risk&regulation* – a theme that has featured extensively in **carr**'s activities over the past six months, and which also raises important questions that are shaping our future research agenda.

The topic of security has received less attention in risk and regulation scholarship than the theme of safety. We suggest that it is time to devote more attention to security and the relationship between safety and security. Amongst other things, security is about the identification of threats and the definition of what is worth preserving. Both such undertakings are highly political ones, as is the devising of strategies to promote security. How to provide security to citizens when exposed to potential transboundary threats from large-scale infrastructure failures has been a growing theme as there has been a growing awareness of potential vulnerabilities. Equally, debates about the appropriate regulation of the security state have received heightened attention. Such debates are of a long-standing nature. However, events such as 9/11 and information-technological changes have arguably changed the nature of the debate around security. One such change can be seen in the rise and amalgamating of the notions of 'homeland security' and 'societal security' which have brought together the civil protection and intelligence arms of the state. Concerns with the activities of intelligence services and cyber security have given rise to debates about appropriate regulatory oversight. These debates are reflected in the contributions by Robert Rizzi and Charles Borden and by Lodge in this issue.

Security touches on many other themes central to **carr**'s research activities, whether relating to questions of food security and transboundary crisis management, or to the management of indicator and other quantified steering systems.

Security is necessary to provide space for life to flourish, notwithstanding questions and concerns about its ambivalence. Also, the intellectual life of **carr** can only flourish in somewhat secure surroundings, both in an institutional and financial sense. Funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 scheme and the Open Research Area initiative that brings together different national research councils – in the UK, the ESRC – form a cornerstone of that security. The Horizon 2020 TransCrisis and ORA QUAD projects are now up and running and harvesting their first findings, as illustrated by the contribution by Lavinia Cadar and Maureen Donnelly. Alex Griffiths has joined us as a research officer on the QUAD project. More recently, we have been successful in bringing together funding from the Food Standards Agency and LSE's knowledge exchange and impact fund for a co-funded research officer position. Jeremy Brice, who we have appointed to this position, introduces in this issue his earlier work on food security. Finally, we managed to secure funding from the UK Prosperity Fund for a study (together with RAND Europe and the Brazilian IPEA) to investigate the regulation of logistics infrastructures in Brazil.

Funding is certainly an important prerequisite for good research and **carr** depends on it. Yet, that on its own would not be sufficient. For **carr** to provide a venue for cutting-edge interdisciplinary research in risk and regulation support is needed from institutions that accept explorations at the overlapping peripheries of different social science disciplines. In an age where disciplines and deans often seek to assert particularistic core understandings by pressing for publications in the 'top three' journals, the provision of such a secure space cannot be taken for granted. We are grateful to LSE's Department of Accounting for granting such space in both a physical and an intellectual sense.

**carr** has always understood its role to be a venue to bring together perspectives from the worlds of research and practice. A few months ago, **carr** brought together international researchers from law, political science and history to explore whether regulation scholarship is in crisis (see also the contribution by Haber and Heims in this issue). This event illustrated the central place that **carr** can play in bringing together and advancing international debates and collaborations. That event took place a few days before the Brexit referendum. Whatever shape Brexit might take, Brexit represents an existential threat to UK higher education in general and **carr** in particular. In that sense, the world has certainly become less secure for international research collaboration, although, ironically, Brexit has placed debates about transnational regulatory standards and their enforcement even more prominently on the policy agenda.

Whatever the outcome of the Brexit process, we are committed to continuing **carr**'s role in the international conversation on risk and regulation, and we are greatly looking forward to your comments and contributions. **Martin Lodge & Andrea Mennicken**