

Counter-Terrorism Post 9/11: The Hidden Agenda of Exclusion

David N. Baker*

Byron E. Price**

Abstract

Since September 11, 2001 the way that government goes about dealing with regulating security has changed drastically to meet the demands of the fearful citizens in society, who think another event could possibly happen again. The focus of this paper is to provide a different view of the mechanisms of security Post 9/11, and questions the validity of the supposed counter-terrorist tactics as they relate to the securing of personal safety. Highlighted throughout the paper are many of the various techniques employed by the State in their quest against terrorism. But a further examination of the methods they use raises many questions as to whether combating terrorism is the real goal of the government.

Introduction

To begin, it is important to understand how the state gains dominance and acceptance from the people. It is through the use of speech acts committed by powerful elites to frame the issue in a way which society will feel threatened. In harnessing a culture of fear, the government is able to legitimate itself as the provider of security in times of uncertainty (Ackleson 2005: 167-168; Weaver 1995: 55). Many theoretical frameworks have been constructed to further our knowledge of risk and security in society. Bigo (2005) attempts to explain the securitization of society through risk management of suspect populations (Aradau & van Munster 2007: 98; Sheptycki 1997: 305), while Foucault views everyone as a potential risk and sees the need for constant surveillance to monitor behaviour (Aradau & van

* Texas Southern University, Department of Administration of Justice, bakerdn@tsu.edu

** Texas Southern University, Political Science Department, pricebe@tsu.edu

Munster 2007: 91; Turner 2007: 297; Bigo 2005: 22, 44; Bell 2006: 149-156; Mythen & Walklate 2006b: 385-393). Beck sees the emergence of risk society as a product of modernity; we are now living in times of uncertainty and unpredictability (Aradau & van Munster 2007: 90-93; Mythen & Walklate 2006b: 381).

We see a heightened need to regulate the mobility of individuals whom we deem to be risky. This occurs not only across borders but also within society to protect dominant culture and social institutions. (Aas 2007: 289; Turner 2007: 288-290) In society we have a tendency to feel safe with more of the same, which results in many immigrants being the target of restricted mobility because of their difference. Government speech acts serve to reinforce the preservation of the local community, thus excluding people who are dissimilar. (Tirman 2004: 88; Barlow 2003: 83, 97; Aas 2007: 284-292) An excellent example of this practice of regulating people deemed as risky is the influx control and pass laws enforced by the pre-apartheid government in South Africa. The influx control laws are described by about.com: African History as

The **Native (Black) Urban Areas Act No 21 of 1923** (commenced 14 June) divided South Africa into 'prescribed' (urban) and 'non-prescribed' (rural) areas, and strictly controlled the movement of Black males between the two. Each local authority was made responsible for the Blacks in its area and 'Native advisory boards' were set up to regulate the inflow of Black workers and to order the removal of 'surplus' Blacks (i.e. those not in employment). Towns became almost exclusively white as a result – the only Blacks allowed to live in town were domestic workers. Superseded by the Native (Urban Areas) Consolidation Act No 25 of 1945. Repealed by the Abolition of Influx Control Act No 68 of 1986. (Bobby-Evans, 2010)

Indigenous people and minority population have long been targets of social control policies implemented once they have been disposed of their land and labor. Many of the laws are implemented under the guise of improving public safety. As a result of the transgressions of the dominant culture against the oppressed, a climate of fear pervades and uncertainty.

Uncertainty fosters a culture of suspicion in society. We are no longer trusting of anyone. It becomes the duty of society to exclude those who threaten our national security. As a consequence, some individuals become the target of suspicion much more often than others. (Melossi 2003: 371, 388; Amore 2006: 339-340) The events of September 11, 2001 only served to heighten the powers of the USA government in declaring a state of exception which placed individual's rights and freedoms as a secondary priority. It becomes the State's duty to detect, regulate, and eliminate at all costs the enemy within. (Bell 2006: 149; Tirman 2004: 105) Although the policy was directed at terrorists, the government seemed to aim its focus more towards the immigrant. The passage of the USA Patriot Act on the heels of the September 11th attacks broadened the power of federal officials by giving them more authority to track and intercept communications in hopes of making the U.S. safer from future terrorist strikes. However, critics assert that the Act goes too far in respect to enhancing the federal government's power monitor emails, telephones, and citizen's bank accounts. Furthermore, critics are concerned with how the Act invades the civil rights of citizens and is an erosion of constitutional rights of privacy. The Act has been buttressed by the already unhealthy climate of uncertainty and fear which permeates American culture. The techniques employed by the government as counter-terrorism seem to be used more readily in society for the purpose to detecting and excluding of immigrant populations.

Risk and Security

We have seen a profound shift in the way society operates around security issues since the traumatic events of September 11, 2001. Some individuals feel that a paradigm shift has taken place from providing liberty with priority, to a society now placing undue emphasis upon security and surveillance (Crépeau *et al.* 2007: 330; Bell 2006: 156). It becomes important to realize that security is essentially a social construction provided by the government or the ones' in power, in order to exercise their dominance over the population. The very act made by elites of declaring something a security issue, is what validates itself as one. Simply put, it is not the threat that becomes the security issue, but the rather the way in which it is framed. By framing an issue in a way that gains approval of the citizenry, social and political legitimation is gained by the powerful group. (Weaver 1995: 55; Ackleson 2005: 167-170; Sowell 2006: 445; Rojo & van Dijk 1997: 528) In gaining legitimacy from the social, the government is given the authority to partake in political issues however they please; typically since September 11, 2001, it has authorized them to normalize a state of exception which places an individual's rights and freedoms of secondary importance. Crépeau *et al.* (2007: 330) and Ackleson (2005: 174) both allude to the fact that it becomes beneficial for the government to draw distinctions in society between 'us' and 'them'. By drawing boundaries and giving rise to an apparent 'other' in society, serves the purpose of constructing security as an issue in society.

Many theorists have attempted to make sense of this new society based in security and risk classifications. The Copenhagen school puts forth their idea of securitization, which Didier Bigo understood to include the common practices and routines that surround the issue of risk management in preventing the occurrence of future harms. Bigo takes on a very proactive stance in the management of risk, which has a tendency of being overly optimistic when considering how difficult it is to predict and prevent future harm in today's uncertain world. (Aradau & van Munster 2007: 90-91) It becomes the police's job to act as surveillance squads in sorting out the risky populations from those who are at risk. Certain areas in society are deemed to be zones that constitute a possible risk that must be surveyed more heavily. Thus Bigo conceptualizes a Foucauldian idea, which he calls a Ban-opticon. Although not directed at society as a whole like Foucault's Pan-opticon, it attempts to target populations who pose a potential risk to society, by using methods such as profiling foreigners, constant surveillance, and restricting the mobility of risky subjects. (Sheptycki 1997: 305; Bigo 2005: 17) It selects individuals or groups of individuals who are more likely to constitute a risk, rather than being suspicious of everyone.

One of the principal themes running through Foucault's work is the concept of Governmentality; which is essentially the idea that an individuals' conduct is shaped and guided by the presence of social institutions and authorities in society, both directly and indirectly. (Aradau & van Munster 2007: 91; Turner 2007: 297) Consequently, individuals are always under constant surveillance by the government to ensure and/or produce proper conduct by the citizens. It also serves as a mechanism of social sorting the 'goods' from the 'bads'. This is what Foucault would define as 'biopower', which is essentially the management and control of human life at-a distance. (Aradau & van Munster 2007: 103; Bigo 2005: 22, 44; Bell 2006: 147-151) Risk becomes operationalized to move away from classifying individuals to recognizing collective categories of people that pose a risk to society. Supporting the idea of the speech act, terrorism discourse serves the function of making citizens adhere to government agendas that have to do with risk reduction. (Mythen & Walklate 2006b: 385-390) Individuals in society come to recognize that 'other' individuals are more likely to pose a

risk, and take on the role of self-governing to protect themselves from the risky population.

The idea that we are living in a risk society was pronounced by the attack on the World Trade Center. Beck (1992:21) would argue that risk is a product of modernization

The concept of risk is directly bound to the concept of reflexive modernization. Risk may be defined as a systematic way of dealing with hazards and insecurities induced and introduced by modernization itself. Risks, as opposed to older dangers, are consequences which relate to the threatening force of modernization and to its globalization of doubt. They are politically reflexive.

This statement seems to be largely justified. During the industrial period, individuals were able to calculate risk and the potential for loss. In today's growing world, we have experienced such a dramatic increase in the mobility of goods and peoples, as well as being able to have the world at our fingertips; it seems impossible to even try to imagine all the possible risks that exist today. It has become uncontrollable and unpredictable to be able to meet the public's need of guaranteeing individual's safety. We have entered into a period where everything has become an uncertainty (Aradau & van Munster 2007: 90, 93; Mythen & Walklate 2006b: 381).

In an attempt to manage risk as best as possible against future harms in a time of uncertainty, we allow the government exceptional powers over our individual rights and freedoms. Terrorism discourse essentially functions as a device to legitimate state violence over potentially risky individuals in our own society; for example within days of the September 11, 2001 attack, the government extended its power to detain immigrants, Homeland security expanded its duties, and soon after the USA Patriot Act was enacted (Tirman 2004: 2; Mythen & Walklate 2006b: 393). Through these practices, we see the unfolding of many very exclusionary methods targeted at immigrant communities, no matter which theoretical framework we dive into.

Regulating Mobility

We are living in a world that does not seem to be as big as it once was. Globalization gives us the increasing capacity to be able to interact with one another from across the world, as well as being able to share, and transmit information gathered across international borders within seconds. (Barlow 2003: 58) In recent years we have seen an intersection between the fields of Sociology and Geography with the increasing spread of information, technology, as well as people and goods. The joining of these two areas of study is what Urry would define as 'Mobile Sociology'. (Turner 2007: 288) Consequently however, there is a flip side to this seemingly beneficial phenomenon. The possibility for mobility is not distributed equally in society. We see the tendency of some individuals being afforded more mobility in society than others, both socially as well as geographically. This so-called 'immobility regime' is the use of government control and surveillance over targeted populations that are deemed to be 'risky'. Hence we see a mobility gap in the way that mobility is distributed across society, leading to a large inequality. (Turner 2007: 289)

Many new technologies have been created to assist with the fast and productive movement of goods and people across borders. So-called *Trusted Traveller* biometric systems have been put into play in countries around the world, to facilitate fast and easy travel. These systems utilize personal biometric data which are considered to be infallible to identify individuals while at border crossings. (Amoore 2006: 342-343) Common with most new technologies, it does not come without criticism. Are we

confident enough to say that something is truly infallible? That seems like a pretty strong word to say; especially considering the society in which we live is filled with endless uncertainties, which we cannot even begin to predict. Heath Banting made a mockery of the idea that border crossings were thought to be so impermeable, when he documented his own personal journey across twenty different international borders without the required information. (Amoore 2006: 344) But once again, depending on who you are and if you are one of the supposed risk-categories play a significant role in your border crossing prospects. There have been profound changes surrounding border control since the incident at the World Trade Center. Tirman (2004: 77, 110, 216, 229) states that after September 11, 2001 the United States of America expanded their definition of what a terrorist entailed, simply for immigration purposes. They were trying to curtail the movement of as many immigrants as possible into their country. This was noted at the USA—Mexico border, whereas prior to these events, the USA was in the midst of coming to an agreement with Mexico to loosen border control in an attempt to increase the movement of goods and people within North America. Many individuals felt that they were targeted in the aftermath by the United States government in an imaginary quest for public security. Arab and Muslim communities went to the extent of cancelling travel destinations, simply because they wanted to avoid the embarrassment not only at the airport, but also once on the plane.

Many of us have a tendency to think of regulating mobility to simply mean across borders, however this is not the only place that is occurs. It quite possibly occurs more regularly within the borders of one's own society. Take the case of Europe for example; it has been contested that the so-called Fortress Europe is turning into a Pan-opticon, following the Foucauldian idea of a society being under constant surveillance. The reminder of always being watched reinforces individuals to act with rational behaviour. The Fortress Europe actually takes a harsher stance than Foucault's Pan-opticon idea. It seeks to exclude those in society who either are irregular migrants or individual's that may be assisting them. (Broeders 2007: 74) Simply put, Europe has a get-tough attitude with regards to migrants who could potentially pose a threat to their civilization.

Borders are produced with the specific intention of either including or excluding, depending on the individual and the nature of the locale. Some individuals think that policies have been put into place with the sole purpose to trap the immigrant within the border to prevent future harm. This is what has been called 'forced localization', which obviously serves as a powerful tool of exclusion. (Melossi 2005: 14; Aas 2007: 289) When we think of the natural disaster of Hurricane Katrina, many individuals' lives and homes were destroyed. However, we see that the elites benefited first and foremost, being the first individuals to be taken away from the catastrophic scene. While the 'others' watched the world move by them without any care, left alone to suffer even more than they already had. (Aas 2007: 292-293)

The government has perpetuated this idea that individual's need to securitize themselves from risky populations. Needless to say, it is estimated that in the USA there are currently more than thirty thousand gated communities that have been erected with the ideal that they are pristine and crime free. People are feeding on this idea that they are no longer safe in normal society, and they feel a need to separate themselves from the 'bads'. What they are not informed about is the presence of other types of crimes that exist within gated communities. (Sheptycki 1997: 308) Other more primitive mechanisms of control are being constructed in today's society as a method of separating the haves from the have-nots. Enclaves are being rebuilt in modern societies around the world to keep the immigrant out, as well as to provide internal security to social institutions. (Turner 2007: 293; Aas 2007: 292; Sheptycki 1997: 308) It seems so paradoxical that when we watched the fall of the Berlin Wall the world rejoiced an end of exclusion, yet again we are witnessing the reconstruction of these exclusionary techniques.

Kempa *et al.* (2004: 573) and Ålund (1995: 319) both agree that the construction of enclaves or gated communities only serve to widen the existing gap in society. It functions to further divide different populations from being able to gain access/entrance to different arenas within a given society.

Securing and Strengthening the Local

In practice we see hidden political agendas unfold. As much as government and society say that they embrace difference, they really feel more comfortable with a homogenous society; more of the same is preferred, and much less of the 'other'. This seems to create a problem in our global world, with rapid movement of everything. It is thought that we embrace the processes of globalization, when in fact this is not always the case, globalization creates fear in many. Barlow (2003: 83) has defined this as the 'irony of globalization'. Globalization creates a crisis in society simply because we are living in an era where people have the freedom to come and go as they please. Time and space no longer confines them to one place. This is precisely the reason why individuals become threatened; they are no longer easily able to defend their own interests against the impacts of risk, especially foreign risk. We see Beck notion's of uncertainty with regards to risk here. Individuals come to feel safe only about the things that they know, anything different could present a possible threat. Thus this sense of *us* reinforces a national unity, and serves to further exaggerate the fear of the foreigner. (Aradau & van Munster 2007: 90, 93; Mythen and Walklate 2006b: 381; Barlow 2003: 97)

We become preoccupied with trying to label individuals in society. There is this constant need to try to protect oneself from the 'bads' that exist. There is a tendency to associate the 'bads' with people who are not similar to us. This sense of not knowing or understanding someone else's culture creates us to become suspicious and scared. Thus we label them as a possible threat to our well-being. Individuals who are native to the United States believe that the USA belongs to them, and they view everyone else as threatening the country's welfare and security. (Tirman 2004: 88; Mythen & Walklate 2006b: 384) It is thought that if foreigners really wanted to be accepted into the dominate culture they would do away with their own cultural values that constituted them as different in the first place. By assimilating into mainstream, they would no longer be perceived as different and threatening but rather one of the same. Tirman (2004: 5, 29-30) has given rise to the idea that a so-called 'cultural imperialism' exist within the United States. To begin, we need to understand what 'imperialism' means; essentially it is the projection of political power and influence across a large space. It does not have to do directly with the government's presence, but rather an infiltration of their values into the cultural. Thus we can think of cultural imperialism as a transmission of professed American values through sources such as the media as a way of securing USA hegemony in our own society.

The United States sees itself as being a supreme power, and being able to do no wrong. Tirman (2004: 105), Mythen, and Walklate (2006a: 130-132) all see American politics as very one-sided. If you do not side with the Americans, then you are constituted as the enemy or the 'other'. Similarly, if an immigrant wants to be accepted in society, then Western values tells you that total assimilation is necessary; this is what Falk calls 'culture talk', an ideology of good Muslims that conform to American values vs. bad Muslims who carry on with their own practices within western society. (Falk 2005: 71-71) Some even think that if countries—is this the correct wordsuch as Islam are going to persist into modernity, then they are going to have to subscribe to Western values or will be doomed to fail. (Ålund 1995: 312; Said 1978: 298) This seems overly one-sided and rather pessimistic of a supposed multicultural society.

We see a coming together and rejoicing of similarity in many western societies. Many tools of

exclusion have been highly prominent since the attack on the World Trade Center. In Durkheim's Social Bonding theory, punishing the immigrant acts as a purifying filter whereby strengthening the local. (Aas 2007: 288) Similarly Walter speaks of his governance tactic of 'domopolitics' which is "a will to domesticate the forces which threaten the sanctity of home." (Aas 2007: 292) It is highlighted here, that through speech acts from the government about the forces which threaten, individuals who are included in society must come together to exclude the 'other'. They feel that there is a strong urge to tighten the existing social fabric in society, and 'others' who are not like them threaten their very existence. By maintaining exclusion of the immigrant populations in society serves to strengthen the social bonds of the local people. Although many Western democratic countries preach multiculturalism, in reality they contradict it. Bell (2006: 154) discusses a paradox inherent in Canada's New National Security Policy which was put forth in the wake of the events of September 11, 2001. The policy expresses openness to Canada's cultural values, yet refers to the tensions created through ethno-cultural differences. The very action of defining this as a problem clearly racializes the 'other' as the target or reason for the problem in the first place.

It becomes very evident that government policy aims at creating an insecurity in the dominant culture. In doing so, the average citizen takes on a governing role in society themselves, of trying to classify those who are potentially risky subjects. Together, both the government with the help of citizen succeeds at restricting the movement of the targeted 'other' in society, whether it is across borders or within their own community. These agents act as very powerful mechanisms which seek solely to exclude.

Surveillance and a Culture of Suspicion

Tying in Beck's idea of risk society (Beck 1992; Aradau & van Munster 2007: 93; Mythen & Walklate 2006b: 381) when individuals are always on guard for potential risks, in connection with the Foucauldian idea of being under constant surveillance (Aradau & van Munster 2007: 91; Turner 2007: 297), we witness a society that has become extremely suspicious of one another. With this idea that anyone could be a possible threat, we have entered into an era where trust has become almost obsolete. Unfortunately some individuals have become the object of suspicion more than others.

Melossi (2003: 371, 388), Aas (2007: 288-289), and Broeders (2007: 300) all agree that since September 11, 2001 the immigrant has entered into the public eye as the potential terrorist. They are seen as destructive to our own social fabric, and thus we classify them as the enemy or criminal within our border. It then becomes our duty to ensure that they do not cause harm at any cost. The idea of "Biopower is the power to 'make' live and 'let' die" (Bell 2006: 150) reinforces this idea that it is our duty as a society is to get rid of the potential harm which is the source of our own personal insecurity. It is only by doing this that we can be guaranteed public safety. An example in Italy goes to show that majority of the dominant population views Nigerian immigrants all as prostitutes, which serves to criminalize them without any forethought about their actual circumstances. Though they are really suffering and possibly victims of the sex trade, the government and society essentially wants to exclude them because they are seen to be a risky population. (Angel-Ajani 2003: 53-54) This example proves that we do not really care about the personal circumstances of the risky person, but rather it is our intent to rid society of this potential harm (the 'other') before it scorns us personally (dominant culture).

Trying to meet the needs of society as well as to regulate it efficiently becomes an extremely tedious task. We are living in an era where time and space are extremely fluid. This again brings us to the problem with globalization. Bigo (2005: 29) discusses how we are living an age of 'Glocality';

which is in essence the connectivity of the local with the global world at large. Although this is a tremendous benefit in so many ways with regards to commerce, finance, international trade, among other things, it can also have very devastating impacts when a terrorist lends itself to the benefits that globalization has to offer. (Amoore 2006: 339-340) This being one of the reasons for increased levels of surveillance and suspicion upon entry to other countries, or at least this is the reason that the government provides us with. Is there a hidden agenda?

If there is a hidden agenda, are these mechanisms of suspicion targeted to only find the terrorist, or served as yet another tool to further exclude the minority 'other'? Almost instantaneously after the World Trade Center attack, transnational members of society with links to specified Arab and Islamic countries become objects of immense suspicion. If they decided on trying to leave the country to visit family or go on vacation, they were faced with much humiliation upon entering the airport; such as unnecessary checks made by airport security or even as far as halting actual flight traffic. (Tirman 2004: 110, 216) Individuals in society from areas around the Middle East were fraught with undue stress in going about their daily lives due to the fact that were from a country that apparently harbours terrorists. Both Barlow (2003: 103) and Tirman (2004: 111) talk about how after September 11, 2001 the United States began to advocate for anti-immigration policies as well as they were queen to the acceptance of racial profiling techniques in securing their borders. Systems of Data-veillance have been put into place which connects different information systems (e.g. police, health, travel, financial records, etc.) which classify people into different risk categories to predict and prevent possible future criminal acts. (Amoore 2006: 339-340) These risk classifications are largely based on suspicious judgments of individuals and are by no means foul—do you mean full proof.

Individuals have been placed on different lists (e.g. no-fly list) wrongfully. Although the government does acknowledge that individuals do have a right to appeal the false claim, the government is unclear as to where the burden of proof should lie. (Tirman 2004: 70) It is interesting that the government thinks that it is the individual citizen's duty to proclaim that they are a safe and law-abiding member of society, when in fact the fault is a result of the government's inability to properly manage suspicion and risk. Heath Banting also argues that many features of increased information systems are a threat in-and-of themselves. Not only do they run a huge risk of being incorrect and ruining an innocent person's life but information that is gathered through these techniques contain very personal and important knowledge which could potentially be used as a weapon if entering into the hands of the wrong person. (Amoore 2006: 340-341) Ericson highlights many weaknesses within the whole risk-management approach to security. In a society filled with innumerable risks, where and what is one suppose to begin to focus on? What if we focus on the wrong risk? What if we catch the wrong person (innocent) and let the right one (guilty) pass through? What is the technology that we use is not producing the desired results? Are we over exhausting our resources that may be needed in times of future crisis? (Ericson 2006: 346-349)

Is the terrorist our major priority? Or is the government using this as a scapegoat to manage their real scheme, which seems to be to exclude the unwanted immigrant, while propagating the existing dominant culture? For example under the terrorism discourse, it becomes the government's job to ensure our safety in society, which is the reason for tighter security at the USA—Mexico border. The speech act "illuminates how threats, risks, and security—as modes of self-defense and national interests—are being discursively deployed to securitize the U.S.—Mexico border as a conduit for terrorist and migrant incursions." (Ackleson 2005: 180) The government frames the issue of border security between USA and Mexico as a potential threat. In return, citizens acknowledge and accept this as a relevant security issue which must be dealt to secure ourselves from the potential of terrorist

attacks. In all reality, tightening the U.S.—Mexico border is not going to provide anymore security from terrorist attacks. Firstly, we have never thought of or had reason to believe that Mexico was a potential terrorist threat to the USA, and secondly, if a terrorist was going to invade the United States there are many more points of entry than simply the U.S.—Mexico border. (Ackleson 2005: 180) It seems quite possible that the governments reasoning for securing the border has more to do with keeping the migrants out of the USA.

Normalizing the State of Exception

September 11, 2001 served to heighten the powers of the United States government to unprecedented levels. The fact that a terrorist act was committed to such a degree struck fear in the eyes of the country. If the government could not predict and prevent such an act as catastrophic as this, what else did they have to fear? Siding with Beck, as the government was unable to reasonably insure public safety in a time of uncertainty, served to legitimate the state use of violence and exceptional powers. (Mythen & Walklate 2006b: 387) The government now had reason enough that the border boundary had to be moved beyond the state line to guarantee public safety. (Ackleson 2005: 176) This simply means that it was now a priority to know what was going to be entering into the country before it physically landed on the United States soil.

More coercive measures became accepted in society because they were apparently for the purpose of risk reduction. Bush's counter terrorism tactics, not surprisingly, have to do with strengthening coercive and regulatory capacities of the state to inhibit the chance that terrorists networks would be able to function productively within the United States. It is also interesting that in this state of exception, the United States denies that its constitution is valid on the Guantanamo Bay Navy Base, even though it is considered to be American soil. Thus prisoners of this facility are subject to unchecked and possibly brutal misuses of force by the American government. (Tirman 2004: 34-35, 60) It seems unjust to be able to criticize another group of people for the inappropriate ways in which they behave, yet be able to justify your own immoral behaviour.

The way Foucault would conceptualize this issue of state exceptionalism is that in the surveillance society governed by this panoptic gaze, the duty or purpose is to detect, regulate, and eliminate the unwanted agent causing harm. Thus when we conceive of biopower and the management of life, no matter what it takes the evil must be weeded out. This is an end-justifies-means rationale to securing society. (Bell 2006: 149, 156) The end justifies the means approach is a very good way of understanding how the state of exception became normalized. With the government constantly talking about the potential for risk in society, if the people wanted to have a sense of security then it would be necessary for the state to exercise their additional powers—an expansion of the “social contract”. In this way, the citizens came to accept that it was necessary to sacrifice some of their freedoms at the price of supposed personal and national security.

The normalizing of excessive state power has served to widen the gap between dominant society and the immigrant, which has become labeled as the criminal. The immigrant has become the center of focus since the attack on the World Trade Center, especially with specific regards to people from areas around the Middle East. Mythen, Walklate (2006b: 391), and Tirman (2004: 105) all discuss how in times of war or near-war situations the government's mechanisms for counter-terrorism justifies the exceptional measures that they employ. These exceptional measures have a strong tendency toward racializing immigrant populations as a potential threat to the state's well-being. It seems to grant the government the right to exercise excessive control over these populations giving rise to many situations

that we would otherwise consider to be discriminative.

Unfortunately the discrimination and invasion of civil liberties becomes justified as a necessary means to protect society, especially considering the fact that the immigrant is considered to be dangerous and probably a criminal. Galabuzi (2006: 201-202) highlights many exceptional measures that were used in Canada after the events of September 11, 2001. Pakistani students were detained and arrested for no apparent reason, but rather due to the fact that they were seen to be a potential terrorist and thus were classified as a high risk group. Similarly, a Federal Minister declared that students from regions of the Middle East were to be deterred from taking science until further notice. As well the Harris government came to openly admit that they were endorsing practices of racial profiling. These techniques were supposedly to be in the best interests of the members of society in providing for the guarantee of a more secure society.

Is the state of exception justified? Is its central purpose or aim to provide security to its people from possible future terrorist acts? Tirman (2004: 217) questions if the selling or neglecting of vulnerable minorities human rights has made us or the country a safer place to live? If anything by displacing an already marginalized individual could possibly create more risk. The very act by the government and society of neglecting to treat immigrants as essentially human beings puts them at greater risk of being recruited into a criminal way of life. (Turner 2007: 300) Consequently, the criminal deviant becomes a product of our own faulty system. The state in and of itself social constructs many of the criminals in society, because of the unreasonable demands it places upon the immigrant populations. Broeders (2007: 89) states that many individuals in society think that exclusion and marginalization of migrant communities is the unspoken real policy goal of counter-terrorism.

This fear of future terrorist activity generates a society that is always on heightened alert of possible risks. It also guarantees people that we were no longer living in a society that we can predict what the future was to hold. Localizing fear of terrorism as our individual responsibility fosters this fear of the public and essentially the stranger. It serves to widen the gap between the 'others' and us. (Aradau & van Munster 2007: 90-93; Mythen & Walklate 2006b: 130-132) It becomes every citizen's individual duty and patriotic responsibility to lend a hand in the securing of society, especially during times of crisis. As Amoore (2006:346) points out, the state believes that every well-intentioned citizen has a right to take on the task of becoming a foot soldier in the fight against terrorism. This model seems to overstate the extent to which terrorist activity occurs. The government is basically embedding the rules and practices of exceptionalized routines into our daily lives, when we know in all reality that although terrorism has devastating impacts, the chances of it occurring are of relatively low probability. (Ericson 2006: 353; Mythen & Walklate 2006b: 387) It would seem more rational to pay attention to risks that have a higher chance of occurring in our daily lives, such as car accidents or even property crimes. However the government perpetuates this idea that we as citizens in a position of potential risk, need to constantly be on guard. Thus we see are constantly putting up with intrusions day after day as a consequence. Bell (2006: 160) provides us with the example of the excessive interruptions, intrusions, and delays that we now accept without question at places such as the airport or border crossings as a result of the terrorist attack on September 11, 2001.

Through the State exercising its powers and declaring these actions necessary for our protection, we accept without question these intrusions into our personal lives. The government has made us believe that this is the only true guarantee of safety. It begs the question however, are the exceptional measures used really having an impact on the war against terrorism? Or is the increasingly high amount of government expenditures put forth in this supposed 'war on terrorism' simply putting us at greater risk of not being able to properly protect ourselves in the future from another disaster? (Ericson 2006:

354) Or maybe the government really does not care because the 'war on terrorism' is not really their agenda, but rather something more like a method of excluding the unwanted in society?

Conclusion

It would be a lie to dismiss the fact that we feel the need for more security today than we did even ten years ago. September 11, 2001 had a significant impact on the way we view the world. We do live in a society saturated with fear and unease. Everywhere we go we are wondering if we are going to be the target of a criminal act. But we can all agree that it is not every day that we are worrying about another terrorist attack occurring. The fear instilled by government agencies with regards to terrorism has severe effects. It shapes the way we regulate our lives and the way in which we view people who are not like us. Although the government claims that it is trying to protect us as citizens from future terrorist attacks, it seems that there is a hidden agenda unfolding. Anti-terrorist initiatives are largely directed at the unfamiliar immigrant in society. From making it more difficult to cross state lines to developing risk categories largely based on racial profiling techniques, it is clear that we view that there is an outsider within us. Government aims at excluding the already marginalized to preserve the dominant classes in society. Although there is an illusion of acceptance of difference in society, we can see through the various tools employed by the government that exclusion is the ultimate goal. Whether it is by not allowing you entry to institutions, denying your existence through denial of rights, or just treating you like a criminal, the government is using its exceptionalized powers heightened from the events of September 11, 2001 to exclude the unwanted individuals from their inclusive society.

References

- Aas, Katja Franko. 2007. "Analysing a World in Motion: Global Flow meet 'Criminology of the Other.'" *Theoretical Criminology* 11(2): 283-303.
- Ackleson, Jason. 2005. "Constructing Security on the U.S.—Mexico Border." *Political Geography* 24: 165-184.
- Ålund, Aleksandra. 1995. "Alterity in Modernity." *Acta Sociologica* 38: 311-322.
- Amoore, Louise. 2006. "Biometric Borders: Governing Mobilities in the War on Terror." *Political Geography* 25: 336-351.
- Angel-Ajani, Asale. 2003. "The Racial Economies of Criminalization, Immigration, and Policing in Italy." *Social Justice* 30(3): 48-62.
- Aradau, Claudia and Rens Van Munster. 2007. "Governing Terrorism Through Risk: Taking Precautions, (un)Knowing the Future." *European Journal of International Relations* 13(1): 89-115.
- Barlow, Andrew. 2003. *Between Fear & Hope: Globalization and Race in the United States*. USA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Beck, Ulrich. 1992. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage.
- Bell, Colleen. 2006. "Surveillance Strategies and Populations at Risk: Biopolitical Governance in Canada's National Security Policy." *Security Dialogue* 37(2): 147-165.
- Bigo, Didier. 2005. "Globalized (in)Security: the Field and the Ban-opticon." Pg.5-49 'Translation, Philosophy and Colonial Difference', *Traces: A Multilingual Series of Cultural Theory* edited by John

Solomon & Naoki Sakai. Hong Kong.

- Boddy-Evans, A. (2010). Pre-Apartheid Era Laws: Native (Black) Urban Areas Act No 21 of 1923. *About.com: African History*. Retrieved from <http://africanhistory.about.com/od/apartheidlaws/g/No21of23.htm>
- Broeders, Dennis. 2007. "The New Borders of Europe: EU Databases and the Surveillance of Irregular Migrants." *International Sociology* 22(1): 71-92.
- Crépeau, François, Delphine Nakache, and Idil Atak. 2007. "International Migration: Security Concerns and Human Rights Standards." *Transcultural Psychiatry* 44(3): 311-337.
- Ericson, Richard V. 2006. "Ten Uncertainties of Risk-Management Approaches to Security." *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* 48(3): 345-357.
- Falk, Richard. 2005. "Review Essay: Imperial Vibrations, 9/11, and the Ordeal of the Middle East." *Journal of Palestine Studies* XXXIV(3): 65-76.
- Galabuzi, Grace-Edward. 2006. *Canada's Economic Apartheid: The Social Exclusion of Racialized Groups in the New Century*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Kempa, Michael, Philip Stenning, and Jennifer Wood. 2004. "Policing Communal Spaces: A Reconfiguration of the 'Mass Private Property' Hypothesis." *British Journal of Criminology* 44: 562-581.
- Melossi, Dario. 2003. "'In a Peaceful Life': Migration and the Crime of Modernity in Europe/Italy." *Punishment & Society* 5(4): 371-397.
- Melossi, Dario. 2005. "Security, Social Control, Democracy and Migration within the 'Constitution' of the EU." *European Law Journal* 11(1): 5-21.
- Mythen, Gabe and Sandra Walklate. 2006a. "Communicating the Terrorist Risk: Harnessing a Culture of Fear?." *Crime Media Culture* 2(2): 123-142.
- Mythen, Gabe and Sandra Walklate. 2006b. "Criminology and Terrorism: Which Thesis? Risk Society or Governmentality?" *British Journal of Criminology* 46: 379-398.
- Rogo, Luisa Martín and Teun A. van Dijk. 1997. "There was a Problem, and it was Solved!": Legitimizing the Expulsion of 'Illegal' Migrants in Spanish Parliamentary Discourse." *Discourse & Society* 8(4): 523-566.
- Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Random House, Inc.
- Sheptycki, James. 1997. "Insecurity, Risk Suppression and Segregation: Some Reflections on Policing in the Transnational Age." *Theoretical Criminology* 1(3): 303-315.
- Sowell, Thomas. 2006. *Ever Wonder Why and Other Controversial Essays*. California: Hoover Institution Press.
- Tirman, John. 2004. *The Maze of Fear: Security and Migration after 9/11*. New York: The New Press.
- Turner, Bryan. 2007. "The Enclave Society: Towards Sociology of Immobility." *European Journal of Social Theory* 10(2): 287-303.
- Weaver, Ole. 1995. "Securitization and Desecuritization." Pg. 46-86 *On Security* edited by Ronnie Lipschutz. New York: Columbia University Press.