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BACKGROUND

This book seeks to explore the nature of globalisation and the ‘war on terror’ and how both processes are shaping and defining citizenship globally and within nation states. Citizenship does not obey a static definition. The concept is contestable and its meaning is located in changing economic, social and political contexts. Equally, civil, political and social rights are continually being politically defined. The war on terror has influenced issues of civil liberties and prioritised the need for ‘security’ over and above the protection of human rights. It has redefined the meaning of the rule of law. The nation state has become more and more coercive and the ‘state of exception’ is gradually becoming normalised (see Agamben, 2005). The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan are replays of colonial ‘civilising missions’ in Africa, clouded by deceit, corruption and corporate invasion of pacified homelands. Like the concessionaire and chartered companies in nineteenth-century Africa, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, the Development Fund for Iraq (DFI), and other international financial institutions (IFIs) are, as a consequence of the war on terror, actively involved in the corporate takeover and economic occupation of Iraq. Unlike in colonial times, in the war on terror the enemy is ‘global’ and the war is fought both abroad and at home. The enemy is within and without. The war is fought on all fronts. While the ‘imperial’ armies of the Allied forces are engaged in colonising missions abroad, significant changes are taking place with regard to the policing of communities at home. Colonial policing tactics, whereby the boundaries between civilian policing, military and security activities are blurred, are reborn and globalised, in the attempt to criminalise ‘resistance’ movements in pacified territories (Cole, 1999). Ethnic profiling replaces visual identification used in colonial times and has become a globalised method of policing (Editorial, 2006). Racist policing is normalised. One is a potential terrorist not simply because of one’s colour but also because of one’s religion and culture. Hallsworth (2006) argued that this is not simply about policing but is a reflection of the regimes of control that is characteristic of modes of governance integral to
neo-liberal rule in late modernity. The impact goes beyond individual experiences (for example, of stop and search) to the marginalisation, regulation and control of ‘suspect’ communities.

The war on terror and globalisation both confirm the need to address the issue as to what constitutes appropriate political spaces between national boundaries and global concerns. Both point to the limits of the capacities of institutions located within the nation state and the recognition that politics in the context of the nation state still matters. The environment, climate change, migrations, world poverty and the wars in Afghanistan, Iraq and more recently Lebanon seem to require institutions that are global in nature. On the other hand, issues of income inequalities, provision of education and health services still require the capacities and the political will of the nation state.

THE ECONOMICS AND POLITICS OF GLOBALISATION

The classical debates between hyper-globalists and global sceptics have tended to put the focus on the issue of intensity and whether present globalisation is qualitatively different from other periods in history. Authors in the volume have argued on the need to separate global facts from global policy choices. While global facts point to inevitabilities, policy reflects choices. There are global facts that point to a world that is becoming more integrated, interdependent and increasingly aware of a common shared humanity. Through the media, the Internet and numerous forms of communication, there is now a continuing global sharing of images, stories and pictures, which also creates a context of increased expectations about economic prosperity, the potential of a shared global humanity and universal human rights. World poverty, the environment, migration, war and losses of human life become common shared experiences, which in turn make possible the idea of the global cosmopolitan citizen (Held and Archibugi, 1995; Kymlicka, 1995; Appiah, 2003; Beck, 2006). However, cosmopolitan citizenship is resisted since the idea of citizen is seen as belonging to the politics of the nation state.

These same processes also create the potentials for conflict, of seeing globalisation as a threat to national identity, culture and history; and of a globalisation that flattens out heterogeneity and enforces a new tyranny of sameness. Globalisation creates tensions around the distribution of resources, with those that have a vested interest in protecting the status quo resisting changes that are seen as undermining their privileges and ways of life. The arbitrariness of place of birth, parents, and social and financial
inheritances shapes life chances so that some people are more citizens than others.

The discourse of globalisation is also a form of story telling. It is a story of ‘sameness’ in a world that is increasingly becoming unequal and polarised. As Cameron and Palan (2004, p. 154) put it: ‘the narrative of globalisation as an homogenous, planetary force, provides ample plausibility for the political programme of “no alternative” constrictions of global inevitability’.

Globalisation is the exogenous variable to which the state has to respond; where there is no alternative but to create policy frameworks that correspond to the political and economic needs of globalisation. The basic argument is that globalisation is a process that threatens to overwhelm the nation state. Making the nation state increasingly irrelevant has resulted in further debate about citizenship and social exclusion and the shift towards the competitive state and the decline of the welfare state. In the context of the borderless economy, therefore, the nation state is often described as being hollowed out and losing relevance. Transnational corporations continue to shape global labour markets, demanding greater flexibility, long hours, low pay and the lowering of health and safety regulations. This model of economic globalisation has resulted in a situation whereby the income of the top 1 per cent of earners has increased 198 per cent over the past two decades, while for the other 99 per cent of income earners it has remained flat, stagnated or even declined.

THE NATURE OF THE WAR ON TERROR

Debates on the war on terror have centred on how to separate the real from the unreal and the facts from political manipulation. While on the real side are the victims of individual terrorist attacks in New York, Bali, Madrid, New Delhi and London, on the unreal side are the manipulative processes that seek to interpret facts in order to gain political advantage. The use of wars to gain political advantage is not new. Margaret Thatcher used the Falklands war to increase her political popularity in Britain in the 1980s. But the war on terror is a different kind of war. In the United States, the Republican Party strategist Karl Rove utilised the rainbow colours of the terror alert on the eve of the 2004 presidential election and the detentions of alleged terror suspects in the mid-term elections of November 2002 and 2006 to remind people that the USA was still at ‘war’, and that the nation was safer under Republican control since by implication the Democratic Party was soft on terror and not to be trusted with the nation’s security. In all the three occasions in the USA, the Opposition (the Democrats) was
defined as being soft and of coddling up to terror. Vietnam war heroes like presidential candidate John Kerry and Senator Jeff McClelland were put into photographs with Osama Bin Laden in the 2004 election while President George W. Bush reminded voters of how the democrats had voted against the Terror Bill in September 2006. The war on terror was also central to the Blair election campaign in 2005. It helped re-elect the Prime Minister of Australia for a fourth term and was central to the election campaign in Canada in 2005.

Of increased major concern must be how images and stories of the ‘war’ are constructed and communicated to the public. Since governments have the monopoly of such information, it is governments and their intelligence services that can give direction to stories. There are no independent checks and balances. In the war on terror, citizens have become the passive consumers of information. There is little room or space for independence of judgement. The questions usually come later. Democracy is replaced by the politics of trust, compliance and servitude. The question of the security of the state is beyond public scrutiny. In times of war the policy of government has to be taken on trust. The security of the state cannot yield to scepticism. Those who question state action are accused of treachery, madness or of literally supporting terrorism. According to Paul Krugman:

The Bush administration and the movement it leads has been involved in an authoritarian project, an effort to remove all checks and balances . . . [An] almost equally important part of the project has been the attempt to create a political environment in which nobody dares to criticise the administration or reveal inconvenient facts about its actions. And that attempt has relied, from the beginning on ascribing treasonous motives to those who refuse to toe the line. (Krugman, *New York Times*, 7 July 2006, p. 12)

In effect, the extensive usage of the words ‘the war on terror’ initiated by President George W. Bush of the USA and echoed by ex-Prime Minister Tony Blair of the UK, has contributed to the polarisation of the world as belonging either within the camp of the good or with evil. The war on terror does not allow for complexity. The other is demonised. While Hamas and Hezbollah are defined by the USA and European countries as terrorist organisations in both Gaza and the Lebanon, these groups are perceived by their local communities as their resistance movements. In the war on terror the world is made simple. In the context of the war, resistance becomes a form of terrorism and furthermore all forms of terrorism are homogenised and defined as illegitimate whatever the cause.

More importantly, the war on terror has provided the context for a number of nation states to redefine the boundaries between security and civil liberties. The US Patriot Act passed in 2001 and revised in 2006 has
provided a number of contexts that allows the President to confine detainees without trial, use surveillance orders, and wire taps on US citizens without seeking the consent of Congress. Major telephone companies have also had to surrender databases of telephone calls of US citizens. In the UK, the most recent anti-terrorism legislation (the Terrorism Act, 2006) has provided frameworks that allows the police to detain suspects for a period of 28 days without charge and also, despite opposition, introduced measures that deal with what has been legally defined as ‘the encouragement of terrorism’. This includes acts which ‘glorify’ the commission or preparation of terrorism or acts from which members of the public could reasonably be expected to infer that terrorism is being glorified (section 1). This law went ahead in spite of the fact that a number of UK civil liberty groups and even Parliament have argued that this would seriously undermine freedom of speech and civil rights. The ‘war’ has provided an environment where the due process of law is perceived as more of a hindrance than a safeguard of civil liberties and human rights. Legal safeguards are defined differently for ‘terrorist’ suspects. For ‘terrorists’ it is often justice before trial. The case of the detainees at Guantánamo Bay clearly demonstrates this. On 17 October 2006, President Bush signed the Military Commissions Act into law. The law, which was passed specifically in relation to the war on terror, suspends habeas corpus for any alien (non-citizen of the USA) deemed to be an unlawful enemy combatant engaged in hostilities or having supported hostilities against the United States. Such detainees are considered an ongoing threat to the security of the United States. This law blocks the chances of these suspects ever being released, which means that they will remain in custody indefinitely without trial and their cases cannot be reviewed in US courts. The President already has the power, under the Presidential Military Order of 2001, to detain non-citizens suspected of connection to terrorists or terrorism as an enemy combatant, in which case, the person could be detained indefinitely, without charge, without a court hearing, and without entitlement to a consultation with a lawyer. In addition, contrary to the rules against torture under the Geneva Convention, evidence obtained through ‘coercive interrogation’ (torture and coercion) may be allowed in ‘terrorist’ cases.

Of even more significance are the ‘moral’ arguments that have been used to justify this war. Islamic fundamentalists are blamed for terrorist acts against predominantly Christian countries and President Bush (and his Christian Right followers), and ex-Prime Minister Blair, at various points in the debates on the war, have made reference to their own personal Christian convictions. The war is defined in terms of a struggle between ‘good’ and ‘evil’, in which God intervenes on the side of the ‘good’. In various statements, Bush and Blair have maintained that the ‘war’ is a struggle of Western
democracies against Islamic fascism and the threat of violence and ideological visions that seek to impose a specific form of intolerant Islam.

‘Islamic’ terrorism cannot be seen as individual criminal acts; it has to be located in the context of a global ideological struggle. Muslims all over the world are being lumped together as a homogeneous group. Homogeneity flattens differences and people as individuals become caricatures and stereotypes of images, which in turn undermines humanity and at the same time legitimises violence because the other becomes less human. Multiculturalism is under attack and anti-Muslim racism has increased at every level in most Western countries. But politicians have continued nevertheless to promote a politics of fear (see Sivanandan, 2006). In his speech on the HMS Albion in Plymouth, in January 2007, Tony Blair asserted that ‘Put simply, September 11 2001 changed everything’. He described the war on terror as:

[A r]adically different type of warfare requiring a radically different type of response. What we face is not a criminal conspiracy or even a fanatical but fringe terrorist organisation. We face something more akin to revolutionary Communism in its early and most militant phase. It adherents may be limited. Its sympathisers are not. It has states or at least parts of the governing apparatus of states that give it succour. Its belief system may be, indeed is, utterly reactionary. But its methods are terrifyingly modern. (Blair, 2007)

On terrorism, he said:

Terrorism is an attack on our values. Its ideology is anti-democratic, anti-freedom, anti-everything that makes modern life so rich in possibility. When the Taleban murder a teacher in front of his class, as they did recently, for daring to teach girls; that is an act not just of cruelty but of ideology. Using force against them to prevent such an act is not ‘defence’ in the traditional territorial sense of that word, but ‘security’ in the broadest sense, an assertion of our values against theirs. (Ibid.)

As Sivanandan (2006) argued, this is new racism (anti-Muslim racism) thrown up by the processes of globalisation and modern empire. The war on terror is being sold to the world as a war against an emerging Islamic totalitarianism; a war of ideas between the science, rationality and reason to be associated with the Christian civilised West against the corrupt medieval world of Islam.

CONCEPTUALISING CITIZENSHIP

It is therefore important to ask what happens to ideas of democracy and citizenship in a world that is becoming increasingly significantly polarised
and where dialogue is undermined. Ideas of citizenship are being continuously constructed and deconstructed, influenced by deliberate policy choices but also by changes that reflect changing social, economic and political expectations. The narratives of globalisation and the war on terror have led to the construction of new landscapes that have given a different meaning to the concept of citizenship. The global context that, on the one hand, has created the awareness of human interconnectedness and of the potential of a ‘cosmopolitan citizen’ has, on the other hand, partially as a consequence of the war on terror, generated a meaning of citizenship that is defined by individualism, categorisation and the suspicion of the other. While Muslim communities and their representatives in Europe have come out to say that Muslims who commit acts of terrorism are in the minority, Muslim communities are being targeted as a whole. The war on terror is not about individual criminals but an attempt to defeat a ‘movement’, however ill defined. The war on terror has created racial tensions and has revived the colonial legacy of first- and second-class citizens. It is among the second-class citizens that one expects disloyalty. Muslim communities in the USA and Europe are retreating from public spaces and having to continually prove their innocence and loyalty. The war on terror has created a culture of fear, pessimism, passivity and silence. But the West presses on with legislation and surveillance technology that terrorises these citizens at airports and in their communities. The use of profiling in identifying potential terrorists at airports puts racism at the highest possible level in crime prevention. Now, connections are being made between terrorism and immigration; even asylum seekers who are Arab and Middle Eastern are themselves not immune from suspicion under anti-terrorism and immigration laws.

The war on terror is certainly influencing the meaning of citizenship. On the one hand, citizenship has become more than an ascription based, for example, on being born within a territorial space or on historic blood ties. It is consciously being racially defined. Immigrant citizens (especially Muslims), are increasingly being excluded from this definition and are having to define their citizenship outside the boundaries of their nation states, and in the context of their religion and culture. Citizenship has become a process and is taking the shape of resistance and struggles. On the other hand, the idea of the social citizen who is a member of a community with a sense of belonging is being replaced by that of the consumer citizen – where the government are trustees of the nation’s interest and electors become consumers of policy. This neo-liberal thinking reduces citizenship for some, to almost ‘bare life’ (Agamben, 1998). The role of the state is redefined in terms of security and issues of human rights are reclassified. The symbolic politics of identity, cultural values and crime
statistics fill the political agenda while policy aimed at the distribution of resources is downgraded.

THE BOOK

This volume is a collection of essays on the link between globalisation, citizenship and the war on terror written from various academic perspectives, incorporating ideas from sociology, criminology, political science and development studies. The book is divided into three interconnected parts.

In Chapter 4, Terrence Casey uses the Polanyian insight of market embeddedness to argue that how societies respond to globalisation, either through defensive resistance or proactive adaptation, depends on the extent to which societies (more or less) mimic underlying ideals of markets, creating a sense of citizenship within the economy as well as within the polity. Such market-responsive societies, he argues, are likely to exhibit superior economic performance and political stability as globalisation progresses.

Simon Lee (in Chapter 8) provides an insight into how globalisation has been used as a weapon to justify and legitimise domestic and foreign policy choices which have had major implications for citizenship and communities internationally. He argues that the war on terror needs to be understood as the third of four distinctive phases in the politics of globalisation which have shaped international relations and domestic statecraft since the early 1970s. The common denominator of all four phases, he maintains, has been their domination by the neo-liberal perspective on globalisation.

Colin Tyler’s and Lee’s chapters (Chapters 3, 7, 8 and 9) provide a critical analysis of Bush’s and Blair’s positions on the war on terror and the impact these have had on the international community. In Chapter 3, Tyler considers the triumphant assertion of a senior adviser to George W. Bush that, during the ‘war on terror’, the US administration has acted as ‘history’s actors’. The chapter traces the origins of the Bush administration’s post-9/11 policy towards Afghanistan and Iraq, to the concerns of neo-conservative lobby groups, especially the Project for the New American Century. After a critical analysis of Bush’s policy on the war, Tyler argues that waging a war of righteousness, of the type the Bush administration has pursued post-9/11, has dangerous implications for the processes of international recognition and thereby international order. He concludes with the position that we should welcome the apparent decline of Bush’s standing in the USA and the wider international stage, and have hope that the normal processes of international recognition will reassert themselves in the near future. This theme is pursued further by Lee in Chapter 9, where he explores the political economy of neo-conservatism. Lee shows how the
Bush administration’s agenda for the World Bank and IMF has reflected an important economic dimension to the war on terror.

Tyler’s second chapter (Chapter 7) examines Tony Blair’s doctrine of international community, in both its political and economic facets. The former is shown to presuppose leadership of the international institutional architecture and the major developed states by a US administration that is on balance benevolent. The latter is shown to presuppose the extension globally of ‘progressive’ welfare capitalism. Tyler argues that Blair’s excessive faith in the Bush administration and the collapse of the post-Doha talks has rendered Blair’s doctrine of international community a very dangerous aspiration indeed. After examining Blair’s anti-terrorist policies and their wider implications at the domestic level in the UK, Tyler concludes that Blair’s doctrine has created highly significant problems, both internationally and at home. Further critique of Tony Blair’s doctrine of ‘international community’ is provided by Lee in Chapter 8.

Contemporary understandings of the war on terror are underpinned by a series of powerful myths and narratives. These narratives, some argue, are orchestrated by the state and the aim is to delegitimise dissent (see for example, Jackson, 2005). In Chapter 2, Michael S. Drake assesses how the study of discourse can illuminate the dynamics of the war on terror. From the review of the work of Fairclough, the development of discourse analysis, and a critique of the writings of Jackson, Tilley, Baxi and Barkawi, Drake argues that the discourse of the war on terror appears to be driven either by the agency of external interest factors or by internal structural and ideational factors. The chapter concludes with a summary of the problems of discourse analysis as a means for assessing the effects of discourse in society and politics, and especially the dynamics of the war on terror, arguing that the problems reiterate some classical debates in social science over ideology and the function of ideas in history.

There are similar controversial debates on the definition of a terrorist or terrorism. Whatever definition is supported, the common denominator is the deliberate use of terror and violence or the threat of violence for a political goal. In Chapter 12, Tony Ward and Peter Young use the work of Norbert Elias as a framework for understanding the relationships between organised violence, legitimacy and terrorism, focusing on suicide bombers. They argue that Elias’s work provides a useful device from which to construct a sociological perspective of this relationship. While not setting out to furnish a comprehensive account of the relationship between organised violence and terrorism, Ward and Young’s position is that the use of Elias’s work enables interesting questions to be asked. The chapter begins with a critical exposition of Elias’s work that centres upon the role that the concept of pacified social spaces plays in his theory. Ward and Young then
examine Elias’s later work where he introduces the notion of decivilisation. It is in this context, they argue, that Elias provides an account of terrorism. The chapter then uses Elias’s work to examine the relationship between decivilisation and terrorism and the relationship between terror, democracy and sensibilities. The analysis explores the relationship between the state’s monopoly of violence, its own use of violence, conceptions of legitimacy and how terrorism and violence challenge these, often by mimicry and through symbolism. The chapter also examines the dynamics and complexities of the sensibilities of suicide bombers. The authors argue that contests over legitimacy clearly play a key role in understanding the sensibilities of terrorism and how and why terrorists use violence. Their analysis suggests that terrorism raises questions about how the state maintains control over its use of legitimate violence. The chapter concludes by looking at the relationship between state action and the construction of the terrorist as the ‘other’.

It is generally accepted among commentators that the war on terror has been used to legitimate restrictive legislation and policing practices which encroach on civil liberties and citizenship rights, and which function as new conditions for power and resistance in the political sphere (see, for example, Lyon, 2003; Agamben, 2005; Beck, 2005). Mike McCahill (Chapter 11) explores the impact of the war on terror in terms of the global expansion of the use of surveillance technology before and after the September 11 attack in the USA. McCahill situates these developments within theoretical debates in the surveillance literature on ‘panopticism’ and ‘post-panopticism’ and argues that the rush to a ‘technological fix’ may not have the desired effects in terms of preventing ‘global terrorism’. The chapter concludes by considering the likely ‘social impact’ of the ‘globalisation’ of surveillance, on issues of ‘social sorting’, ‘discrimination’ and ‘community cohesion’.

Andrew Robinson (Chapter 13) continues with this line of argument by looking at the war on terror in the context of the spread of an increasingly pervasive form of state regulation of everyday life. This, he argues, exists in the demonisation of minor deviance and non-conformity and through the cultivation of fear of terrorism and a global state of war. Robinson shows how a new, especially insidious system of social control is being constructed in certain Western societies, instantiated by crackdowns on minor deviance and by the war on terror and its domestic correlates. This system, he maintains, is not simply a response to particular problems but rather, an attack on difference in general, and on the ‘right to have rights’. More importantly, the system is constructed around a demonisation of others, mainly by means of Barthesian myth which, in turn, constructs social relations of voicelessness and domination. By constructing social problems in
a way which precludes dialogue, this construction makes problems insoluble, and makes resistance both inevitable and necessary. Robinson concludes that this development should be viewed as an outgrowth of a state logic of control inherent to state power as such and inimical to horizontal association. In this context, everyday deviance can often be interpreted as resistentz, and an insurrection in everyday life is constructed as the only possible response to pervasive voicelessness.

In Chapter 14, Drake focuses specifically on resistance, looking at the issues from the angle of social movements. Specially, Drake looks at ‘anti-globalisation’ movements in the context of the war on terror. Through an analysis of the positions, tactics and responses adopted by actors in the events around the Gleneagles G8 Summit of 2005, the chapter investigates the contemporary relations between theories and practices of power and resistance. It shows how the new conditions of power and resistance have affected the ‘anti-globalisation’ movement and questions whether these new conditions are a consequence of the war on terror, or whether they represent deeper and longer-term developmental tendencies inherent in the condition of globalisation. A critical review of the sociology of power and of social movement theory in conjunction with analysis of the frames of interpretation of key actors in the events around G8 reveals how contemporary sociological analysis falls short of a capacity to engage with developments under the conditions of globalisation and the war on terror. Drake concludes that the war on terror illuminates a struggle over power itself, between constituted power in the globalised security state, and the constitutive power that networked global movement activism seeks to embody.

Stefan Skrimshire’s chapter on citizenship (Chapter 6) describes how ‘liberal democracies’ have inherited the notion of a public sphere free for rational debate and political expression that has today all but disappeared, subsumed within a climate of acquiescence, consumption and fear. He discusses this with particular reference to the manner in which the 2003 US/UK invasion of Iraq was, and continues to be justified, but more generally to the institutional and discursive tactics of the war on terror as the ultimate paradigm of this de-politicised mode of citizenship. Skrimshire concludes with some suggestions of how this climate is producing alternative modes of political participation, including the reinvention of (political) public spaces through the emergence of global mobilisations of resistance and protest.

Further, on citizenship, Su-ming Khoo (Chapter 10) examines the impact of globalisation and the war on terror on the state of poverty and citizenship in ‘developing’ countries. She argues that the war on terror has led to structural tendencies towards maldevelopment, involving gross
inequality, exceptionalism and subjection underpinned by injustice, violence and disproportionate militarism. She shows how globalisation and the rise of the ‘competition’ state are making it increasingly difficult for states in developing countries to deliver social citizenship. She concludes that a rights-based model of development is desirable and essential for the future development and realisation of social citizenship in developing countries.

Finally, Maurice Mullard (Chapters 5 and 15) provides a theoretical discussion of different models of citizenship. Mullard highlights the reasons why we should be concerned that in the context of globalisation and the politics of the war on terror, geographical spaces and boundaries of nation states no longer define what citizenship is.
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