SAVING THE SECURITY STATE

EXCEPTIONAL CITIZENS IN TWENTY-FIRST-CENTURY AMERICA

INDERPAL GREWAL

SAVING THE
SECURITY STATE

NEXT WAVE New Directions in Women's Studies
A series edited by Inderpal Grewal, Caren Kaplan, and Robyn Wiegman

SAVING THE SECURITY STATE

Exceptional Citizens in Twenty-First-Century America

INDERPAL GREWAL

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Durham and London 2017

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper ∞
Text designed by Courtney Leigh Baker
Cover designed by Matthew Tauch
Typeset in Arno Pro and Helvetica Neue by Westchester Publishing Services

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Grewal, Inderpal, author.
Title: Saving the security state : exceptional citizens in twenty-first-century America / Inderpal Grewal.
Description: Durham : Duke University Press, 2017. | Series: Next wave | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2017019893 (print)
LCCN 2017022469 (ebook)
ISBN 9780822372554 (ebook)
ISBN 9780822368908 (hardcover : alk. paper)
ISBN 9780822368984 (pbk. : alk. paper)
Subjects: LCSH: United States—Social conditions—21st century. | Neoliberalism—Social aspects—United States. | National security—Social aspects—United States. | Citizenship—United States. | Feminism—United States.
Classification: LCC HN59.2 (ebook) | LCC HN59.2 G743 2017 (print) | DDC 306.09730905—dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2017019893

COVER ART: Michele Pred, *American Red Cross*, 2005. Airport confiscated knives. Image courtesy of the artist.

No project achieves “hegemony” as a completed project. It is a process, not a state of being. No victories are permanent or final. Hegemony has constantly to be “worked on,” maintained, renewed, and revised. Excluded social forces, whose consent has not been won, whose interests have not been taken into account, form the basis of counter-movements, resistance, alternative strategies and visions . . . and the struggle over a hegemonic system starts anew. They constitute what Raymond Williams called “the emergent”—and are the reason why history is never closed but maintains an open horizon towards the future. —**STUART HALL,** “The Neoliberal Revolution”

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I had thought this was going to be a short book. I had written an essay on "Security moms" and thought that I would just expand that into a few other directions and write a long essay on the topic of gender and security. But it turned out I had a lot to say and explore about US imperial power in the new century. Trained as a postcolonial studies scholar, but one who had become interested in the relation between postcolonial politics and transnational epistemologies and analytics, I thought US empire could be examined through a transnational lens that could critique the geopolitics of exceptionalism. Instead of a long essay, it's now a book that took almost a decade to write.

I've been fortunate over the years to have been part of many new paradigms that have come to decenter imperial knowledges and the racial and gendered hierarchies that prevented academic research on communities and identities resulting from colonial and imperial power. From colonial discourse analysis, to transnational feminist cultural studies, and then to critical security studies, examinations of racialized empire and militarism, and cultural politics—all these fields have been critical to the methods and subjects of my research. I've been privileged to work with colleagues and students who have changed fields and methods, though many of us still believe that there is more to be done. Many of these scholars are first- or second-generation immigrants, and scholars who have become diasporic, who have brought studies of European and American imperialisms to new directions through their critiques. The Cold War demarcations of areas, of North and South, are being undercut through a variety of practices of research and knowledge making. There is

the joy and pleasure of seeing so many wonderful books and research projects that have contributed to my thinking and writing.

This project began when I was based at the University of California, Irvine, and was supported by researchers in both the women's studies department where I was appointed and the Critical Theory Institute that took on the challenge of thinking of security as a thematic project. My thanks to the faculty in both these groups. In women's studies, Jennifer Terry and Laura Hyun-yi Kang were my key interlocutors, along with Lilith Mahmud and Jeanne Scheper. I have great appreciation for David Theo Goldberg at the Critical Theory Institute for engaging with the project of thinking security within critical theory and cultural politics. My thanks at UCI also to Arturo Arias, Tom Boellstorf, Vinayak Chaturvedi, Susan Coutin, Jim Fuji, Doug Haynes, Ketu Katrak, Arlene Keizer, Rodrigo Lazo, Karen Leonard, Cecilia Lynch, Bill Maurer, Glen Mimura, Michael Montoya, the late wonderful Mark Poster, Jill Robbins, Kamal Sadiq, Annette Schlichter, Heidi Tinsman, Linda Vo, Mei Zhan. I was so fortunate to find a wonderful collaborator in Victoria Bernal at UCI, and she and I went on to work on NGOs and to collaborate in that exciting project. My UCI students were a key part of the UCI community and taught me so much; they inspire me and make me proud: Priya Shah, Neha Vora, Cindy Cheng, Randy Ontiveros, Donna Tong, Laura Knighton, Seo Young Park.

At Yale, I am fortunate enough to have colleagues who have been terrific scholars to think with. My thanks for comradeship and conversations to Elizabeth Alexander, Vanessa Agard-Jones, Jafari Allen, Melanie Boyd, Ned Blackhawk, Alicia Camacho, Jill Campbell, Hazel Carby, Geeta Chanda, Nayan Chanda, Michael Denning, Narges Erami, Joseph Fischel, Jackie Goldsby, David Grewal, Zareena Grewal, Kasturi Gupta, Margaret Homans, Matt Jacobsen, Amy Kapzynski, Greta Lafluer, Katie Lofton, Mary Lui, Karuna Mantena, Vida Maralani, Joanne Meyerowitz, Ali Miller, Steve Pitti, Birgit Rasmussen, Doug Rogers, K. Sivaramakrishnan, Maria Trumpler, Steven Wilkinson, Libby Wood. We lost Barny Bate from Yale and, later, from the world; he is much missed. My thanks to Rebecca Wexler for her keen eye and knowledge of legal terminologies and for sharing digital media wisdom. Thank you to Laura Wexler, who also read the manuscript despite her superbusy schedule. Deep appreciation to Craig Canfield, Maureen Gardner, and Linda Hase for support that enabled me to have time for research. And last but not least, my thanks to wonderful undergraduate students: Scott Hillier, Silia Fillipis, Rhiana Gunn-Wright, Michael Singleton, Mira Vale, Will Schlesinger, Dianne Lake, Jessica Newman, Joan Gass, and Yemurai Man-

gwendeza. My wonderful graduate students are inspiring and have taught me so much: Kaneesha Parsard, Najwa Mayer, Anusha Alles, Sahana Ghosh, Courtney Sato, Gavriel Cutipa-Zorn, Grace Ting, Tina Palivos, Dina Omar, Ryan Jobson, Juliet Nebolon, Tyler Rogers, Samar Al-Bulushi, Sasha Sabharwal, Jessica Newman, Fadila Habchi, Jenny Tang, Randa Tawil.

I am so lucky to have friends who read chapters and sections and gave me wonderful feedback, as well as so much else that is so important to survive in these institutions we work in. I cannot thank enough Caren Kaplan, Minoo Moallem, Jennifer Terry, Robyn Wiegman, Eric Smoodin, and Sherene Razack for their support of this project through the years. My grateful thanks to Surina Khan and Shahin Bayat, who are always ready for great conversation and discussion, whether about national politics (in many places), global conditions, or good food and wine. A special thank you goes to Liz Montegary, who sent me some great citations that became key texts for my argument. Thanks, Liz!

Elsewhere in many places I am fortunate to have these wonderful scholars and thinkers in my life: Attia Ahmad, Anjali Arondekar, Paul Amar, Srimati Basu, Tina Campt, Deb Cohler, Cathy Davidson, Karen Engle, Harjant Gill, Akhil Gupta, Janet Jacobsen, Amina Jamal, Lamia Karim, Mallika Kaur, Virinder Kalra, Melani Macalester, Arvind Mandair, Purnima Mankekar, Ghada Mahrouse, Liz Montegary, Mimi Nguyen, Geeta Patel, Kris Peterson, Ambra Pirri, Jyoti Puri, Tej Purewal, Parama Roy, Sandra Ponzanesi, Shirin Rai, Svati Shah, Nadera Shalhoub, Anu Sharma, Sima Shakhsari, Lesley Sharp, Ella Shohat, Bob Stam, Harleen Singh, Deborah Thomas, Alyssa Trotz, Toby Volkmann, and Neha Vora.

My thanks to audiences at UCLA, UC Davis, Wilfred Laurier University, University of Toronto, University of Waterloo, UT Austin, Rice University, University of Houston, University of Warwick, the Gender Institute at the London School of Economics, Northwestern University, Barnard College, Duke University, Clark University, Tufts University, Binghamton University, Birmingham University, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Purdue University, Lewis and Clark College, Punjab University, UC Irvine, Kenyon College, Texas Christian University, University of Michigan, Università degli Studi di Palermo, Casa Internationale della donna in Rome, Italy, Harvard University, Brown University, Texas A&M University, National Taiwan Normal University, Georgia State University, UC Berkeley, Columbia University, Trinity College, and University of Pennsylvania.

For research assistance, my thanks to Gavriel Cutipa-Zorn. Invaluable editorial assistance came from Cathy Hannabach, Jessica Newman, Mira

Vale, Genevieve Creedon, and Najwa Mayer. Special shout-out to Sonal Jessel, my daughter, for coming to my rescue in the copyediting stage!

Thank you to my wonderful readers at Duke University Press, who pushed me and supported the project in the most helpful ways. And at Duke University Press, Ken Wissoker has been such a great support. Ken's tireless efforts at the press have benefited all of us in expanding interdisciplinary and transnational gender studies in ways that have been invaluable to disseminating the research of so many wonderful scholars. Thanks also to Courtney Martin, Jade Brooks, and Maryam Arain for being such terrific editors. DUP has always been a home.

The Grewal and Jessel families have been such a great support, though we lost Walter Jessel, Cynthia Jessel, and Kyle Adams in the decade of the writing of this book. They are all so missed. Both Walter and Cynthia taught me so much about war, race, gender, and geopolitics; their love is always with me. Peggy Jessel, Robert Jessel and Lori Rosello, Vinnie and Anthony Jessel compose a small but close family that always gives loving support. My sister and her family have always been there for love and laughter: Kiran, Jaspal, Aneel, Rajneet, Sunny, and their partners and children. Maninder Grewal and Minty Grewal and their children, Gurmehar and Mankaran, including Jaspret and Tara, provide hospitality and wonderful company. Sukh Grewal and Paula Kavathas have been generous, kind, and loving through the years—providing food and fun, as well as passionate discussion. New Haven is always associated with you and has become a home because of you. Elena and Emily have been a joy to meet and converse with, keeping us all in touch with SF and the changes wrought by digital media. Getting to know Jasmit Rangr and Abby Dillon, and Sher, of course, has been one of the pleasures of the East Coast. I am fortunate in having so many wonderful aunts and uncles, cousins, and nieces and nephews who are great fun to be with, though often mystified by my work. The love and support of my late parents, Mehar Singh and Tej Kaur, are always with me.

I dedicate this book to Alfred, Kirin, and Sonal, the three Jessels who make life worthwhile and joyful. All three of you are the light of my life—well, maybe three lights. You inspire me to keep trying to live up to you.

An early version of chapter 2 was published as "American Humanitarian Citizenship," in *Gender, Globalization and Violence: Postcolonial Conflict Zones*, ed. Sandra Ponzanesi (New York: Routledge, 2014). A short version of chapter 4 appeared as " 'Security Moms' in Early 21st Century USA: The Gender of Security in Neoliberalism," *Women's Studies Quarterly* 36, nos. 1–2

(2006). It was reprinted in an anthology entitled *The Global and the Intimate*, ed. Geraldine Pratt (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012). An excerpt from the coda appeared as "Racial Sovereignty and 'Shooter' Violence: Oak Creek Massacre, Normative Citizenship and the State," *Sikh Formations* 9 (September 2013): 187–97.

My thanks also to Steve Bell for permission to use his brilliant and evocative cartoon.

INTRODUCTION. Exceptional Citizens?

Saving and Surveilling in Advanced Neoliberal Times

If you see something, say something.
—Sign created and sponsored by the Department of Homeland Security after 9/11

You see a girl who could do anything.
He sees a girl he can force to do anything.
STOPSEXTRAFFICKINGINTL.COM
—Sign at Tennessee rest stop, starting 2014

How might we theorize a state that sponsors and displays both of these signs?[1] One asks individuals to be responsible for surveillance and to work for the security of state and empire. The other asks them to surveil fellow travelers to rescue victims of "trafficking."[2] This book argues that these two seemingly divergent modes of participation reveal the intertwining and co-construction of citizen-subjects of welfare and militarization in the context of American imperial power within a neoliberal era. These two modes of power—surveillance and saving—in this new century construct citizens as securitized subjects within the United States, producing "exceptional citizens" who work to save the "exceptional nation." What I call the "advanced" phase of neoliberalism has made visible insecurities concerning the waning power of the US global empire that results in protests, some progressive and some revanchist, by these exceptional citizens.

The United States, under both neoliberal and imperial policies, can be understood through the "state effect" of appearing as a security state, operating through securitization as a mode of power over its populations. Its liberalism has long been contested because of its history of what Patrick Wolfe called settler colonialism and the continuing legacy of racism.[3] It cannot be seen as a welfare or a liberal state because its remit has turned to maintaining state security in the context of ongoing wars.[4] By using terms such as "securitization" and "security state," I show how constructs of security have come to dominate everyday life in the US imperial state.[5] Relations are changing between the state and its citizens: between individuals, communities, and families; and between the state, corporations, and individuals.[6] A state of security as permanent emergency and endless war has become the hegemonic logic of governance of this neoliberal security state. Security has become the rationale for militarized cultures of surveillance and protection that lead to insecurities, threats and fears, which work at material, affective and embodied levels. Security is also a cause and effect not just of the relations of the United States with the world, but also of neoliberal policies that have contributed to the inequalities that create insecurity throughout the world, including in the United States itself.[7] In response to these insecurities of the new century, private individuals who see themselves as normative citizens become empowered to take responsibility for maintaining the imperial security state.[8] These individuals, produced as responsible and self-improving and thus products of neoliberal self-empowerment regimes, hope to repair the effects of imperial and neoliberal policies and thereby save the security state. Yet however much they try, their attempts often end in failure, thus producing more insecurity. This shuttle between security and insecurity marks the exceptional citizens of the US security state.

Neoliberal policies were implemented during the 1970s in the so-called developing world—that is, the regions formerly colonized by Europe—by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, which demanded that countries in debt from the rise in the price of oil in the 1970s repay their debts by slashing their welfare budgets. Many countries had to comply, and it was often the case that the cuts came from reducing welfare to the poorest of inhabitants. Called "The Washington Consensus," these policies were later jointly championed by UK Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and US President Ronald Reagan in the 1980s, and led to similar reductions to welfare in both countries. These policies included greater belief in the work of the market to address all social issues, the reduction of welfare, the privatization of public goods, and the language of efficiency and productivity in

everyday life. David Harvey describes neoliberalism as the acceptance of the idea that "human well-being can be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets and free trade."[9] While Harvey's emphasis lies on the market logics that are important for neoliberal policies, Nikolas Rose calls the production of an entrepreneurial self an important feature of "advanced liberalism."[10] Following Michel Foucault's theorization of the crisis of the liberal state and economism at the end of the twentieth century, Rose argues that the self-making, self-marketing, and self-improving subject is characteristic of this new phase in Western liberal democracies that are unable (or unwilling) to provide welfare to all. While considering the impact of economic policies across the globe as described by Harvey, I rely on Rose's analysis to suggest that neoliberalism also altered subjectivities; the exceptional American citizen trying to save the security state is the product of the self-empowerment regime that is central to neoliberalism in the United States.

While David Harvey, Michael Hardt, and Antonio Negri argue that neoliberalism is a global phenomenon, others note that it manifests in specific localized/national or transnational projects.[11] For instance, John and Jean Comaroff suggest the specificity of what they call "millennial capitalism" in South Africa is one example of neoliberalism being globally connected, but also having particular regional specificities.[12] Following this focus on specificities, I argue in this book that the specificity of American neoliberalism is connected to its military projects, the emergence of its Christian and humanitarian citizenship, and the rearticulation of its exceptionalism.

While theories of neoliberalism have suggested the ideologies that construct neoliberal policies were fashioned by international organizations and economists in the United States, each region and state has come to have its own history of neoliberalism, with particular impacts and differences. After many decades, we see an "advanced stage" that is also specific to each location, a stage that becomes the result of how neoliberalism manifested itself in its particularities. This "advanced" stage captures how decades of neoliberal policies have altered the social and created problems that we see across the world. In the United States, neoliberalism's "advanced" stage appears in a context that is not just economic, but incorporates both capitalism's and liberalism's late modern forms. Thus it includes wars without end, environmental and social insecurities, proliferating racial and gendered differences generated by the conjoining of militarism and capitalism. It is also manifest in the naturalization of the neoliberal individual as exceptional

citizen, one who is shaped not simply by capitalism but also by a variety of social and political formations and affiliations that construct individuals, communities, nationalisms. The shift to an "advanced" form becomes visible in the emergence of contradictions and protests to neoliberalism, as well as the management of these by neoliberal subjects, militarized power, and authority. Protests find openings and possibilities in the contradictions between transnational capital and the imperial state; between neoliberal polices and imperial state powers; and between neoliberal and securitized citizen-subjects within the complex history of American exceptionalism.

Protests are not limited to the United States either. They are also globally disparate, as neoliberal policies and divergent histories contribute differentially to particular regional and national politics and powers. Just as neoliberal policies are nationally and culturally specific, protests are also specific—though globally they can collaborate, sustain each other, or clash. Not all protests take the form of a particular racial or class formation nor a religious, gendered, sexual, or racial identity. Not all are progressive, and they can be revolutionary or revanchist in heterogeneous ways, catalyzed by local and transnational events and connections, and many shift over time according to the stresses and possibilities that protestors encounter.

Protests in the United States come from concerns over waning empire, loss of racial sovereignty among whites, and economic issues as well as social movements based on race, gender, and sexuality. Imperial wars have led to declines in US global power, and neoliberal policies have shifted power from state to private individuals (including private corporations) and created economic inequalities. "Exceptional citizens" are a result of such declines. Naturalized as entrepreneurial and aspirational but also fearful and insecure, they believe that they can do more than the state and save the empire and the world. Yet they are concerned about everyday safety and security and thus turn to the security state for protection. These citizens, insecure and imperial, wish to access and maintain the privileges of whiteness to become exceptional and sovereign. Those who pass for white, or try to do so,[13] seek a strong military state yet are historically suspicious about state power. They thus both collaborate and come into conflict with the state in the work of surveillance and security.

In the United States, these decades of neoliberal policies have altered the state and its relation to people, resulting in changes in the nature of political sovereignty. While some scholars argue that neoliberalism has waned,[14] this book argues that, on the contrary, a more "advanced" stage enables

its contradictions to be resolved by neoliberal and militarized means, that is, through the work of securitized, exceptional citizens. As contradictions have emerged between imperial state power and deeply unequal individuals, states, and cities, what becomes visible are the myriad insecurities that individuals must manage in order to become normative, exceptional citizens of the US empire. "Advanced neoliberalism" marks both the specificities of this stage of neoliberalism in this new century as well as its shifting mode of power in so-called advanced liberal democracies.[15] If neoliberalism's characteristics include self-responsible and self-improving citizens and the move from welfare to security, the characteristics of its advanced form include the emergence and management of protests as well as the visibility of insecurities of imperial power. Divisions between public and private become difficult to sustain, as sovereignty is claimed by white male power and privilege, and as corporations carry out the work of the military and as nongovernmental organizations take over the welfare function of the state. These changes have weakened ties between states and citizens that were enabled by welfare, so that the security state becomes a means to connect citizens to the state through militarization,[16] a project that often goes awry, or leads to consequences that create further insecurity. To manage protests, subjects are securitized in neoliberal ways—that is, made fearful through mediated panics about external threats from immigrants and terrorists as the causes of insecurity—and they take responsibility for security. These insecurities continue to try to repress the rebellious consequences of neoliberal policies, as much as they continue to generate its insurrections.

Such citizen-subjects who work to save the security state comprise individuals (or corporate entities) acting as both agents and vehicles of humanitarian welfare and surveillance, hoping to reassert the legitimacy of the United States as a model of a liberal, capitalist democracy. These entities undertake this work as imperial subjects: first, in deciding who should be improved, in claiming to make these improvements, and in making others into subjects of neoliberal empire; and second, in enabling and incorporating the practices of security through surveillance into the changing norms of family, consumer, and citizen. Transnational corporations are also increasingly claiming their own sovereignty, as they become endowed with some of the sovereign rights of citizens.[17] In addition, because a small transnational capitalist class also often governs corporations, the alliances of transnational corporations go beyond the United States. Neoliberalism's transnational scope produces contradictions, banality, and crises.

Since the US empire is not new, neither are its imperial subjects—including its white, masculine sovereignties—nor its militarisms.[18] US surveillance regimes can trace a history from nineteenth- and twentieth-century imperial projects in the Philippines.[19] Yet some subjects and modes of what has come to be called "securitization" by the neoliberal state are shifting because the endless war on terror, the failures of US invasions in the Middle East, and a changing politics of race, class, sexuality and religion have produced moral panics as well as economic precarities, adding to histories of racialization and expulsion from citizenship. There are concerns about American power and security, as well as protests against the reduction of welfare and the security state from what is seen as a past of plenty and prosperity, even if this was not uniformly available to all citizens or even available for long periods of time.[20] The resolution of these tensions and contradictions emerges as humanitarianisms and exceptional citizens struggle to save the security state.

In this book, I examine the contradictions of neoliberal empire in the United States through several securitized subjects: the "security mom" who works to privatize state security within the heteronormative and white middle-class family through parental and community surveillance; the "humanitarian," often white but including others aspiring to exceptionalism, who makes individual and consumer choices about who should get welfare and who should not in the hope that individual efforts can remedy the depredations of globalization and American racial/colonial histories; the "security feminist" who takes on the work of counterterrorism and counterinsurgency as a project of gendered empowerment to protect the security state; and the "shooter" who embodies the white, male exceptional citizen to whom sovereignty is dispersed so that he can use violence in the protection of the American empire. These figures are often struggling, tragic, or violent, and have become normative citizen-subjects of the United States as a neoliberal, imperial, security state.[21]

American Exceptionalism and Postcolonial Theories

For many who live in the United States and outside it, the history of the United States and of its geopolitics (as well as its expansion in North America) is not about claims of civilizational superiority or moral authority. Many in the United States and around the world have few illusions about the moral claims made by the US nation-state. They have long challenged its legitimacy as a proponent of freedom and democracy given its history of wars and colonialism, of being a racial settler state, and of supporting violent dictatorships

in Latin America during the Cold War. More recently, many in the United States seem concerned with its waning power, and with the insecurities engendered by such loss.[22] Their concern is that the United States has lost the stature that enabled its claim of geopolitical and national exceptionalism after the Cold War.

Postcolonial theories of the state emphasize the differential power of European and American states that make claims to normative notions of liberal democracy. They critique the ability of Europe and North America to adjudicate which states are "failed" and which are successful, which are "civilized" and which are not, which are modern and which are traditional.[23] Postcolonial theories also emphasize differences between European or US imperial states and postcolonial states, even as a transnational analysis can break down the grounds of hierarchical (rather than cultural or historical) difference, especially undercutting claims of superiority and hierarchy made on behalf of the "West." Postcolonial theory has needed theories of transnationalism to examine how the making of empire within and outside are connected, and to reveal the contradictions and emptiness of claims of liberal equality in the United States.[24]

Jean and John Comaroff argue that we need a "Theory from the South," deterritorializing the concept of the "south" away from the regional demarcation of the "Global South" to understand the forms of capitalism and state power that we see globally. Recognition of the "South," its forms of power, and governance that are now the norm, decenters the norm of the modern, liberal Western state and its assertions of liberal democracy.[25] Such theories suggest that the United States and other Western countries are now following the forms of state, governance, and authority that prevail in the regions where imperial projects and policies in tandem with neoliberal capitalism have been implemented for over four decades. For it is in the Global South where emergent nationalisms, militancies, and violence appeared in the late twentieth century. "Terrorism" against the state, as many insurgencies were called, also emerged in several regions of the Global South (i.e., India, Sri Lanka, Colombia, Peru, Indonesia, Israel, and the Philippines), providing laws and security expertise for counterinsurgency campaigns by states.[26] The Global South was the laboratory of the wars against state power,[27] as well as the site for the implementation of neoliberal policies. But it was not only the Global South that became the laboratory of neoliberalism, but also many regions within the United States and Europe, where elites could extract profits while reducing welfare or use race to extract labor and profits. These were regions where the imperial state and the racial state were operating in

conjoined ways producing what appeared as a security state for many minority populations.

While the notion of the "South" can highlight the connections between state practices within and outside US borders, it is nevertheless important to make some distinctions between the United States and regions outside it, as much as it is important to reveal the racialized discrepancies between US geopolitics and national politics. Geopolitics can be a site where contradictions of US power have become visible. As an imperial state, the United States and its inequities reveal it to be—as Achille Mbembe suggests of the postcolony—banal in its production of violence and inequalities as well as in the limits of its liberalism and welfare.[28] While the United States is different in its constant claim of superiority and power, it is similar to so many other global regions in its insecurity and burgeoning inequalities. Thus, the US nation-state can be understood as unexceptional despite its claims of national exceptionalism since, like so many states in the Global South, it has emerged as a security state rather than a liberal, welfare state with regard to its own populations. There are, however, limits to this equivalence. The insurgencies in the Global South, even if they were called "militancies" or "terrorism," did not have the impact that was the result of what was called terrorism in the empire. The US imperial state is different in scale and in the nature of its exceptionalism, rather than exceptional or superior from the postcolonial state. Its difference is that its claims the right to use violence globally while producing itself as normative and liberal, despite its waning power globally and its illiberalism within. Despite this difference, however, it also now seems unable to control geopolitics, or to assert itself as morally superior, or to gain legitimacy by providing welfare to its own populations.

The claim of American exceptionalism has been based on both a history of national formation within an anti-imperial teleology, and the imperial power to use violence.[29] Making visible this ideology requires consideration both of the historical construction of national exceptionalism and of the political concepts of sovereignty and the modern state. Amy Kaplan has argued that the idea of American exceptionalism has been understood as a claim to anticolonial origins that erases viewing the United States as empire. She suggests that exceptionalism is a denial that produces America as a self-generating and autonomous nation-state that leaves out the ways that a history of American empire and imperialism has continuities with European colonialism.[30] As Jasbir Puar argues, Kaplan's critique of exceptionalism engages usefully with an understanding of the geopolitics of sexuality and American exceptionalism through the work of Giorgio Agamben and Carl Schmitt. These

theories of the state and sovereignty as exception lay bare the violence of the state that is racial, gendered, and sexualized.[31] Such an engagement can usefully examine how United States as empire comes to appear as uniquely progressive by absorbing social movements such as those by US-based LGBT communities to create an emergent homonationalism.[32]

It is not just in the making of nationalism, but in what has been ideologically constructed as a security state that we can diagnose the contradictions of the claim of US exceptionalism. In previous work, I have argued that it is in the juxtaposition of necropolitics and geopolitics, the "interrelation between the sovereign right to kill and the right to rescue" that constitutes modes of state power at the end of the twentieth century.[33] This juxtaposition has particular salience for American exceptionalism. The United States has acted as a globally sovereign actor, able to suspend international law while insisting it applies only to Other (non-European, for the most part) nations, groups, or individuals. Conservative arguments supporting America's national exceptionalism rely on ideas of Western liberalism and humanism as superior characteristics of the United States,[34] or on the ideology of a nation of migrants, class mobility, and the "American dream." At the same time, critical scholarly studies have examined American exceptionalism as national fantasy,[35] where national exceptionalism enables war and violence. All of these approaches render liberalism as either strategic or a mode of power, as the US empire that calls itself a liberal democracy is able to wage war and to violate the sovereignty of other states, setting itself up as moral arbiter and police as well as proponent of freedom, democracy, and the capitalist "American Dream."[36]

Theories of US exceptionalism also have considered the problems of divergent effects of such claims. In a book of essays published in 1997, Seymour Martin Lipset argued that American exceptionalism stemmed from Alexis de Tocqueville's conceptualization of America, and from the position of the United States as a country born out of revolution. According to Lipset, the characteristics of US exceptionalism include liberty, egalitarianism, individuality, populism, and laissez-faire capitalism.[37] Yet he argued that the antielitist, populist, and individualist aspects of this exceptionalism can lead to problems of populism, some of which have become visible over the decades and in the new century. As he very presciently observed, while elite forms of power continue to shape policy, populist elements continue to challenge notions of liberal democracy creating forms of violence that undercut US geopolitical clout.

Both elites and nonelites have become concerned with America's waning power, though for different agendas and reasons. David Bromwich has

argued that US exceptionalism has changed, becoming much more about the claim of being "the greatest country in the world," defending peace and democracy globally, but also being unaccountable to anyone. He believes that exceptionalism has led to moral decline.[38] While there are many who would contest the claim of the United States to the moral high ground that Bromwich's critique implicitly relies upon, his challenge that the claim of exceptionalism is a moral hazard that produces a lack of accountability is useful. It helps in understanding the US mode of empire as including a moral aspect. This moral aspect appears in the will to rescue, to save, to become humanitarians, or to wage "just war." It is this aspect that continues to be powerful in producing securitized subjects who wish to become global humanitarians, even when faced with the impacts of the neoliberal policies and wars of the United States. It is also a "moral" aspect that has been absorbed into the formation of the neoliberal entrepreneurial subject within what Didier Fassin and Mariella Pandolfi have called a "moral economy."[39] This moral striving leads exceptional citizens to continue to strive to improve themselves and others, even though such efforts may appear to be empty or futile.

Surveilling, Securitization, and the Security State

Over the last few years, journalists have revealed the extent to which the US state surveilled its citizens, especially those, such as Muslims, who are now figured as racialized national security threats.[40] This surveillance exists alongside continuing racial profiling of South Asian Muslims and those of Middle Eastern descent, as well as Latinos and African Americans; such profiling has become a method of crime and "terror" prevention.[41] Corporations also participate in surveillance by gathering consumer data, producing profiles, and predicting consumer behavior and habits.[42] Consumer data as well as political behavior and actions online that become political data are commodities that are for sale, increasing the likelihood of more surveillance by digital technology companies.[43] There is often a close relation between corporations and state security projects, as states and corporations work on surveillance either in partnership, separately, or even antagonistically. In addition, because neoliberalism often blurs divisions between public and private entities, corporations are increasingly endowed with the rights of persons. Entities and groups that claim to be outside of the state, such as NGOs, can both depend on the state and claim to be outside of it.[44] One widely noted example of the collaboration between public and private entities is the US government's privatization of state security through its use of private corpo-

rations in the invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan.[45] It is this fuzziness between public and private power through which sovereignty is shared, making some persons more secure because of power given to them and some insecure (or even targets of racial violence) because of the power exercised by these nonstate sovereignties. Both race and gender are key determinants of sovereignty or lack thereof, as race emerges to enable white citizens to governmentalize security, leading to criminalizing nonwhite groups in old and new ways.[46] New technologies of profiling emerge within legal, material, and political domains that engage with the political economy of security and insecurity.

Neoliberalism relies on racial, religious, and gender exclusions as much as did liberalism. Dispersing sovereignty to particular authoritarian white masculinities and, to a lesser extent, femininities,[47] these racialized and gendered subjects feel empowered and responsible in emergent ways in this century. Some are empowered by a sovereignty given to them to claim historically racialized white power for groups not always seen as white, while others bring together race and gender to create new imperial feminisms. While some forms of racialized exclusions (such as immigration laws) seem to continue, Muslims, Arabs, and South Asians are more visibly racialized as dangerous Others who are left out even from becoming neoliberal citizens.[48] African Americans, Latinos, and Native peoples continue to be targets of a carceral state that is also part of the security state.[49] White, imperial sovereignties constitute the "soft" and "hard power" of military force, sometimes as humanitarianism and other times as police.[50] In particular, what is visible in the new century is that this "soft power" is inextricable from the "hard power" of the military. Military and consumer technologies have long been codependent, and military technologies continue to reformulate everyday life in new ways.[51] In particular, what is called the "carceral state" is constructed through military technologies to enact forms of racialized power.[52] Racial profiling and consumer profiling are both enabled by new technologies that allow public and private organizations to collect personal data.[53] State welfare agencies, banks, and retail companies all use digital technologies to collect biometric, location, DNA, consumption, Internet, and face-recognition data. Data-mining tools grow ever more sophisticated and fine tuned, though it is unclear whether they can achieve the sophisticated profiling their marketers claim.[54]

In the context of twenty-first-century US empire, what Armand Mattelart calls "the techno-security paradigm" is focused on "terrorism," a deliberately vague concept that allows violence and is not accountable to liberal constitutional ideals. Mattelart argues that the war on terror was mobilized by

collaborations among "the entire information and technology complex."[55] Shadowy government agencies and private corporations wage "network-centric" cyberwar,[56] using information technology to create geopolitical advantage, with the support of nontechnological mechanisms such as state antiterror laws that enforce and popularize surveillance and secrecy technologies. The state and its exceptional subjects use these new technologies to mobilize racialized and Orientalist ideologies.[57]

In the name of enhancing personal and state security, the US government, the technology industry, and other corporations manage and proliferate risks and fears to create ever more surveillance. Internet and communication technology growth is fueled by the promise of accurate and effective profiling—and this is part of the long history of all technology. Caren Kaplan has shown how air-power technology industries have long relied on such claims of "precision bombing" while naming their targets as "collateral damage."[58] When the "profile" of a consumer, criminal, citizen, or terrorist is dynamic—created out of shifting information flows and racialized notions of security and fear—it is nothing but aporetic. Profiling does not work through accuracy but rather through its broad racial effects that are terroristic; that is, profiling itself produces terror for those it catches in its security net, and those it catches are a broad group identified by religious, gendered, and racial characteristics produced by histories of racialized imperialism. In the continued use of race and colonial regimes of Orientalism, new surveillance technologies rely on older racial and colonial ideologies embedded in Western visual histories.

One result of these twenty-first-century US surveillance practices is that the term "security" has come to index heterogeneous and unstable state, social, and economic powers, through blurred distinctions between individuals, corporations, the state, public entities, and private entities. It is precisely the transfer of technology from military to ordinary, everyday life that enables the duplicity of the term "security" for the state and for individuals; this creates the state effect of fluidity between individual, personal ideas of home, safety, and protection, as well as between those interests and national threats and state security. Security traffics in the dynamism of affect across family, home, safety and national security, in which differences can be highlighted or dissolved at different times and places.

Security can refer to welfare and militarization, and to safety and violence. It can refer to individual and biological processes of welfare and biopolitics that in the US context are based on biometrics, pathologization of new racial formations, old and new Orientalisms, and widespread surveillance. These

neoliberal securitizations have, since the 1970s, supported what some scholars argue is an authoritarian populism that criminalizes on the basis of race, class, gender and religion.[59] But it can also refer to the demands made on the state for safety and protection that it cannot ensure, and which it often refuses to ensure. Security works affectively through the promise of the safety of home and of nation, but also enables the powers of protection claimed by patriarchies, fraternities, and nationalisms that work through violence. Security enables a promise of welfare that the state cannot fulfill, not because it is unable to but because its neoliberal alliances prevent it from doing so. This means that neoliberalisms alter the relations between citizens, nations, and states by shifting power and sovereignty to corporations and individuals at national and transnational scales. Such shifts create problems of state legitimacy, and have come to produce protests and frictions that mark the era of advanced liberalism.

Citizenship

US imperial insecurities within advanced neoliberalism mean that citizenship itself has shifted, as rights have been replaced by humanitarianism, and social security by state security. Citizenship becomes especially fraught for many protesting the impacts of war and inequality, especially those who will not or cannot pass for white or who are able to access its privileges and are not seen as normative Americans. Sherene Razack argues that Muslims have been cast out from US liberal citizenship through their racialization.[60] I would qualify this argument by saying that they are cast out not from liberal citizenship, but from neoliberal citizenship. What is foreclosed for Muslims in the decade since 9/11 in the contemporary United States is even the opportunity to become the exception, neoliberal economic citizen-subject of rational, flexible, and self-making practices, who makes proper investments in oneself through productive consumption and who takes responsibility for saving the security state.

In my last book, *Transnational America*, I argued that citizenship is no longer tied to liberal rights, but has become defined through technological, consumerist, and transnational modes. I rejected the notion of "global citizenship" (for its history of Western travel and empire), and showed the multiple notions of "belonging" as citizenship, suggesting that when differential mobilities shape the lives of millions around the world, our relations to place and identity become unstable and malleable.[61] In this book, I continue the discussion of the shift in liberal citizenship, arguing that under neoliberalism,

rights shift as well, especially in relation to sovereignty and identity. Citizens' rights have changed as the work of welfare moves to corporations and NGOs, dissolving some ties between people and the state. These rights have become replaced by charity and privatized giving, even as the demands for welfare continue.[62] Yet rights and citizenship continue to be important, especially given the burgeoning numbers of stateless people in the new century and especially since fewer people can claim them.

Security has moved from the protection from adversities through welfare and state support to militarized security, aggrandizing the powers of the state. Yet demands for welfare and state support continue from those who see themselves as entitled exceptional citizens, though these may not be demands for rights but for special access to entitlements over others. As neoliberalism has become deeply entrenched, more and more of the population has been enlisted for humanitarian work, and more and more institutions have come to support it. In the process, poor women, children, people of color, and immigrants find it increasingly difficult to access their rights (not just to welfare but also to proper wages and protections). Yet in the phase of advanced neoliberalism, protests for rights become instead a rationale for authority and repression. Such repressions occur not just by the state but also through disparate sovereignties created by race, religion, class, and gender. This terrain of citizenship in the US security state is formed by exclusions created by new laws against terrorism, denial of citizenship to many millions, including the incarcerated, immigrants, and migrants who are Muslim or Latino, threats by powerful white neoconservative activists, and violence by antigovernment vigilantes, as well as vigorous social movements that protest violence and dispossession. What continue are also the demands for expertise and labor from the global economy and transnational corporations, though these have come to also generate protests from working-class communities in the United States. As the United States continues to wage imperial war and extract profits, populations from those targeted regions demand asylum, but most are denied entry because of opposition from groups identifying as white who scapegoat immigrants and refugees as they realize the repercussions of the waning geopolitical power of the United States.

Two seemingly contradictory ideas emerge in this new citizenship configuration: first, neoliberal authority is based on the reconfiguration of citizen-subjects by the use of state security apparatuses such as police, militarized cultures of surveillance, and carceral public and private institutions; and second, sovereignty is both devolved and still tied to the state. Yet this situation is not paradoxical. Because the notion of sovereignty has been long shared

by state and citizen through the long history of the Westphalian state,[63] these notions of citizenship are not altogether new, though the globalizations of the twentieth century—those that have disempowered working classes in the United States or produced large migrations—have created new tensions. Thomas Ilgen argues that "global forces, both political and economic, pry open states and their societies in ways that complicate the task of national governance and reduce its effectiveness," resulting in a "multilayered structure of governance."[64] While Ilgen is correct in this analysis that the state has not always had a monopoly on sovereignty, his claim that these forces also "enable sub-national authorities to govern more responsibly and effectively" does not apply to many countries in the world where authoritarian regimes repress their citizens in numerous ways.[65] Brenda Chalfin, for instance, has shown that in the case of neoliberal Ghana, state sovereignty is both segmented and enhanced, and Aihwa Ong has argued for the "graduated sovereignty" available under flexible neoliberal capitalism. Ong suggests that Asian political sovereignty is both specific and flexible, in a trajectory quite different from that in the United States.[66]

In another approach to the dispersal of sovereignty, Thomas Blom Hansen and Finn Stepputat delink the assumed connection between sovereignty and territory, showing each of these as constructs of the state.[67] Their research is useful to my project, since they examine sovereignty as exercised through violence over bodies, rather than simply by control over territories. Finn and Stepputat point out that European state violence was not exceptional, as Carl Schmitt suggests, and they claim that "colonial sovereignty remained a naked version of modern sovereign power,"[68] as Achille Mbembe has also argued.[69] They suggest that postcolonial sovereignty—expressed in the Global South by many states—is consequently "fragile, eroding and contested,"[70] in part because other sovereignties have emerged, including the "economic citizenship" that Saskia Sassen suggests is linked to "global economic actors."[71] Although Hansen and Stepputat's analysis focuses on postcolonial states, rather than on the colonial ones, their insights into violence are also applicable to the United States in its national politics, suggesting that the US empire is not exceptional, having some residues from European colonial histories, including its Orientalisms and racial formations.

Their analysis of the British colonial context also applies to US empire, as territory becomes spectacle while sovereign power is exercised through threats and violence in distant regions where the United States has waged wars in pursuit of capital or geopolitical power. In US history, sovereignty has not been given to all citizens, because of the history of race, patriarchy,

settler colonialism, and slavery; it has been a central aspect of white power, captured by populist and authoritarian elements in US culture, such as those males claiming whiteness who have been given the ability to use violence for control of nonwhite bodies. This white racial sovereignty continues to have power over other groups in the new century; for instance, the ability of white males to amass weapons and to use them with impunity is protected by interpretations of the Second Amendment of the US Constitution. What we can conclude is that both neoliberalism and the war on terror have added emergent characteristics to this dispersal of sovereignty as it constructs the exceptional citizens of the United States in this new century.

The Security State

Scholars suggest that the US welfare state peaked by the 1970s and that economic stagnation proliferated in North America and Western European countries by the 1980s.[72] How much this decline can be attributed to neoliberal policies is an important question. While some scholars suggest that neoliberalism is all powerful and has the ability to incorporate into its logic all sorts of differences and oppositions, others argue that neoliberalism's power is waning and power is shifting to other security projects. In his analysis of the relation between security and sexuality, Paul Amar argues that neoliberal governance has reduced the Global North's power and that governance is now being replaced by a humanitarian project of human security.[73] Amar reveals how powerful states construct human security laboratories around sexualized and gendered subjects who need saving or who wish to do the saving. This gendering and sexualizing of insecurity asks for a more textured analysis of the relation between neoliberalism, militarized security, and the politics of protest around sexuality and gender. While Amar is correct in his claim about reduced superpower exceptionalism, I argue that US neoliberalism in this advanced phase is being *enabled* (not replaced) by humanitarian governance, since it is precisely through the production of insecurity at individual and state scales that US neoliberalism requires humanitarian governance. To counter protests created by insecurities, twenty-first-century US humanitarian governance requires security through policing and military intervention, as well as the support of its exceptional citizens. Following Amar's focus on security and authority, I consider that the twenty-first-century US security state becomes visible as a set of racialized, classed, religious, and gendered institutions that use authority and violence to wage war and use neoliberal policies to benefit privileged groups. The state thus comes to appear—as the

state effect theories suggest—as empire not just through military or global policing but also through "soft power," exercised transnationally by particular sets of subjects and processes that gain traction because of histories of white racial, masculinized sovereignty.[74]

The contemporary proliferation of authoritarianism, technologized mass surveillance, counterinsurgency policing, and militarization of everyday life has produced a security state that is quite different from the declaration of state emergency referred to as the "state of security," which authorizes the state to declare war and to use violence in the name of protection.[75] Scholarly work on the security state follows three main approaches. In one approach—relying on Stuart Hall and Raymond Williams's reading of Karl Marx, Louis Althusser, and Antonio Gramsci—the state is controlled by the hegemonic capitalist ruling class, predominantly white in Europe and North America. In their seminal book on neoliberalism's emergence in Britain of the 1970s, Stuart Hall et al. argue that the neoliberal state tends toward an authoritarian populism.[76] Public/private collaboration on behalf of capital require police, creating an authoritarianism that relies on racism, masculinity, and patriarchy even as it allows some groups of women, especially those considered white, to be empowered. This approach is extremely useful in understanding the legacies of racism, gender, sexuality, and class. However, it does not distinguish between different capitalist classes, nor does it explain how contemporary imperial states work geopolitically to adjudicate the states labeled "failed" or "developing." Theories of hegemony and neoliberalism also need to be modified (as Hall later did)[77] toward inclusion of postcolonial, feminist, and race theorists who focus on the gendered and racialized nature of these elites and states formed under colonialism as well as the ways that capitalist oligarchies are also patriarchies.

In a feminist approach to the security state, Iris Marion Young, for instance, argues that the security state has a "patriarchal logic": "The role of the masculine protector puts those protected, paradigmatically women and children, in a subordinate position of dependence and obedience," and they, then, come to "occupy a subordinate status like that of women in the patriarchal household." She sees the security state as having "a more authoritarian and paternalistic state power, which gets its support partly from the unity a threat produces and our gratitude for protection," while "it legitimates authoritarian power over citizens internally" and "justifies aggressive war outside."[78] Young separates "dominative masculinity" from "protective masculinity," arguing against Carole Pateman's more essentialized and heteronormative versions of women and of patriarchy that sees all women as belonging to the

private sphere of the patriarchal family.[79] Yet, Young's analysis of a Hobbesian Leviathan-like security state, while useful in the analysis of the production of fear and insecurity, leaves out the geopolitics of differentiating states. It also disregards gender as intersectional, leaving aside the ways that notions of dominative and protective masculinity are differentiated *also* by race in the United States. In a geopolitical context, differential state trajectories and aspirations separate the colonial state from the postcolonial as well as the imperial state from the states that it controls and invades. Furthermore, the relation between colonialism and capitalism produces different sorts of masculinities and patriarchies, based on culture and histories of empire.

Understanding such hegemonic masculinities as articulated with race, religion, and class reveals the security state and its patriarchal authority as contingent and shifting, and its relation with global capital as transnational. Scholars deploying the second scholarly approach to the security state use Michel Foucault's theory of governmentality and state effect, theorizing securitization as incorporating state subjects in the governance project. For Foucault, security is a mode of liberal power. Colin Gordon has argued that for Foucault, even liberalism becomes an "effective practice of security" that is the "political method" of modern governmental rationality.[80] For Foucault, the state is made up of diverse governance practices, many of which go awry or do not reach their goals. Furthermore, Foucault theorizes the state as a "state effect," due to its heterogeneity and diversity of practices. This "state effect" approach accounts for the ways that security and insecurity concerns produce the state as a node of power, which is both feared and desired. As Thomas Biebricher and Frieder Vogelmann argue, Foucault's focus on governmentality explains how the state comes to be perceived in a particular way in a given period, "under what conditions, and in what form the state began to be projected, programmed, and developed . . . at what moment it became an object of knowledge and analysis . . . at what point it began to be called for, desired, coveted, feared, rejected, loved and hated."[81] While Foucault does not contend with state imperial projects, theories of governmentality have become useful in the context of neoliberal empire. For instance, Miguel de Larrinaga and Marc G. Doucet suggest that security has been governmentalized and encompasses not simply military defense but also new political, economic, and social spaces and processes.[82]

The contemporary neoliberal state requires a Foucauldian, Gramscian, critical race, and feminist approach, which explains the forms of equality, elitism, and power that have become visible—especially the making of patriarchal oligarchs (a masculinized and classed project) and powerful white

masculinities, including the "homonationalisms" that Jasbir Puar has critiqued.[83] Many scholars—especially those studying race, gender, sexuality and empire through cultural practices or local social movements—are attentive to power and inequality. For instance, Hugh Gusterson and Catherine Besteman reveal that the emphasis on security has enabled power and wealth to be concentrated in the hands of the wealthiest Americans, leading to economic and political precariousness and the loss of civil liberties for many.[84] Jennifer Terry shows how war becomes governmentalized in medical research through war funding and war injuries.[85] What is especially useful about the Foucauldian approach is that it helps to understand how such inequalities make subjects who do not belong to ruling classes but who governmentalize the state and its powers. Foucault's idea of "state effect" also critiques the positivism in international relations literature, and allows an examination of geopolitics as a mediated and technologized project through which the state can become both alien and exceptional. It explains how the United States can be seen simultaneously as a waning empire and an exceptional power.

A third approach to the security state comes from international relations scholars who see "state security" as national security in realist terms. National security in this formulation becomes a matter of military and diplomatic geopolitics, with emphasis on the Weberian model of the state as having a monopoly on violence. More recently, scholars have critiqued this approach as too narrow and needing to be modified by adding cultural, economic, and social factors.[86] It remains powerful, however, among those who work in government, diplomacy, and media, as well as in many academic institutions. Some of these critics emphasize the importance of those nonstate and transnational actors who are often ignored in the international relations literature.

Thomas Hansen and Finn Stepputat argue that international relations scholars have produced a normative idea of the state that is increasingly out of touch with the kinds of dispersed sovereignty and governance regimes that currently operate beyond the state.[87] The dominant international relations notion of nation-states as bounded and territorialized entities has also come under critique. Joseph Nye argues that power is dispersed, divided among military, economic, transnational and non-state actors, and while the US is still dominant in military power, economic power is multipolar and diffused across many different actors. He argues for a new concept of US power that is "smart" because it is focused not on domination but on using "soft power" to set agendas that benefit the United States. He advocates that the United States take a paternal role, offering ideas and directions to attract

other countries and ultimately enhance its own power.[88] He does not address, however, the violence and coercive aspects of this "soft power," which produce violence and inequality. For instance, the pressures put on states to wage a "war on terror" has made it a transnational project, with countries borrowing from each other to create laws that enable states to incarcerate and exclude without cause. While countries such as India have long-standing antiterrorism laws that derive from colonial rule and have been in operation since the 1980s—and many other countries have their own trajectories of violence and exclusion—US support (and funding) has transnationalized these projects in new ways, producing counterinsurgency and "antiterrorism" as technologies of power that connect the heterogeneous actions of actors dispersed globally.[89]

Some international relations scholars eschew realist approaches and suggest that rather than security, the project must be securitization, which may include nonstate actors.[90] Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde see securitization as the shifting relations between subjects and sovereign, arguing that the traditional approach that sees security as the domain of a state-centered security apparatus as inadequate.[91] Securitization needs to address the governmentalization of security through the work of individuals and citizens and to examine the ways that particular institutions and subjects produce the "state effect."

The difference between "security state" and "national security state" approaches is made clear through examining empire and colonial histories. Scholars such as Paul Amar see the security state as an empire that is now transnational in its focus on policing and war, which uses humanitarianism as an imperial tool because neoliberal power has waned.[92] Mark Duffield argues that even development has become a technology of security, while others suggest that development (and welfare) has taken a back seat to security projects in many countries.[93] Laleh Khalili suggests, against Giorgio Agamben and Carl Schmitt, that states are unexceptional in creating zones where laws are temporarily allayed and that they work to expand their influence and power over other states and regions.[94] With a more feminist approach, the security state becomes visible as a construction of a particular masculine authority—manifest diversely as patriarchy, as a variety of racialized and uneven hierarchies of masculinities, or as patrimonial capitalism. These versions of hegemonic, racial white authority, intimately connected to elite transnational masculinities and femininities, enable state violence, capital accumulation, and its corollary insecurities. These insecurities have made visible economic and sexual violence that both oppresses and disciplines; insecurities produce

violence that represses and excludes in the name of neoliberalism but can also disrupt the neoliberal project, revealing its contradictions.

Authority is constitutively a matter of gender, as well as of intersectional formations of class, race, and empire; it is visible in racialized and patriarchal masculinities that are fought over because they appear to be waning, even as they remain violent. The US security state depends on and creates not just a masculine authority, but also a white, masculine and imperial authority whose patriarchal power is aspirational to its many subjects. Its state effect becomes an exclusionary realm of white, Christian power that produces insecurity and threats to many who live within it or who wish to enter it. While the state effect displays this masculinist power, some feminine subjects are also incorporated into this state. Wishing to be seen as empowered, imperial, and white subjects, they struggle with and against this patriarchy-desiring masculinity to demand individuality, equality, and sovereignty. These struggles can be antagonistic but also collaborative, securing the nation and its exceptionalism. The United States as security state is thus a racialized and gendered imperial and neoliberal state effect that produces insecurity and securitizes populations nationally and transnationally. This effect is produced not only by the state, but also by the work of exceptional citizens—white, male, Christian—endowed with sovereignty to target black and brown Others within it and outside of it through modes of war that incorporate militarized humanitarianism and surveillance.

Media Convergence

Security is a difficult project because it cannot be ensured. All we have are the promises of security. Fears required and engendered by insecurity have a political economy in which media and culture industries are vital.[95] Such insecurities are amplified across multiple boundaries, institutions, and subjectivities. As David Campbell has argued, foreign policy and security are essential for producing national identity and the self/other divide.[96] They create commodities that gain value from circulation. Insecurity has a political economy that works via the notion that militarization and technological change will produce commodities that can in turn provide better security. Proponents of digital technologies, for instance, promise state security that is better, faster, and total, on the one hand, even as they claim to enable "democratization," insurgencies, and "commons" on the other. Despite the use of such technologies by "nonformal political actors" to "accommodate a broad range of social struggles and facilitate the emergence of new types of

political subjects," as Saskia Sassen wrote in 2002,[97] the digital media that has become iconic of this new century creates value for corporate and formal networks and shapes popular culture in ways that are similar to earlier media technologies. Such control is not absolute, however, and there are failures that challenge security claims, even as those insurgent challenges lead to counterinsurgencies in turn.

Neoliberal capitalism's contradictions are not solely responsible for this insecurity around US exceptionalism. Rather, it occurs through the transnational media spectacle of US failure and audience responses to this failure. Contradictions are not simply "there" in some transparent way so they can be read as such; contradictions are *made* visible in ways that enable protests and upheavals that are narrated and understood in a variety of ways. Capitalism's contradictions appear through the agency of viewers, readers, writers, politicians, and the "international community," as well as media technologies and knowledge networks that articulate those contradictions in divergent ways—some through a concern for the loss of empire and some through the struggle for inclusion and social justice. How these become visible and how they circulate is thus a critical issue for the study of cultural politics.

In the twenty-first century, there is a struggle over the United States as a declining superpower or an exceptional nation. That the United States is a superpower is made clear by its imperial wars, through which its own temporality becomes historicized and universalized. US events are made into world events. This resonance is not magical but rather enabled by multiple forms of power generating uncontrollable violence. In *Philosophy in a Time of Terror*, Jacques Derrida explains that 9/11 was "felt" in the United States as a "singular" and "unprecedented" event, which was "to a large extent conditioned, constituted, if not actually constructed, circulated . . . by means of a prodigious techno-socio-political machine."[98] He goes on to say that " 'to mark a date in history' presupposes, in any case, that 'something' comes or happens for the first time, 'something' that we do not yet really know how to identify, determine, recognize or analyze but that should remain from here on as unforgettable: an ineffaceable event in the shared archive of a universal calendar."[99] Here, Derrida makes three points: first, the event is produced by a vast and complex machinery that disseminated images of 9/11 around the globe; second, such a machinery produces a temporality that comes to be seen and understood as universal; and third, we need to distinguish the *event* (the thing itself) from the *impression* (created through repetition by the US hegemonic machinery) and the *interpretation* (the belief that it was a major event). Derrida's distinctions are critical, suggesting that it is equally

important to recognize how the individual, the nation, and the state—and many outside of the United States—all came to recognize 9/11 as an event, and an unprecedented one, at the same time. The time of terror became universal when the temporalities of these entities became globally synchronous and when the United States enlisted states around the world to join the "war on terror." Thus, one can argue that the United States and its policies create convergences through media and media corporations, ignoring or eliminating differences to gather and create new consensus.[100]

As Derrida suggests, the power of the superpower is never absolute. Corporate media's unstable representations and heterogeneous audiences, as well as its political economy that depends on a transnational reach and rapid circulation of images, unsettle the hegemon. Migrations and diasporas may (though not always) disrupt the nation and its hegemonic formations. Media audiences—whether they are US based, American nationalist, anticolonial, antiracist, or anti-Western—use the discourses of crisis, loss of US economic power, and critique of human rights to make visible the contradictions of the imperial project; and they challenge the United States in its claims of superiority. Struggles over US power, over its state effect, become visible in new and powerful ways.

Geopolitics is produced not simply through "real" relations between states, but through multiple political projects in which media and spectacle have played important roles. Media images are always open to interpretation, as well as encoded with ideologies,[101] and can unsettle a superpower or, in other times, make it more powerful. Media's many screens send out diverse messages that can enable contradictory meanings, though their effects cannot always be controlled and may lead to protests and uprisings. Embodied political agents and diverse organizations make meanings through the repetition and circulation of specific content. In the context of digital media—while some scholars believe that capitalism's incorporation of digital media may lead to depoliticization[102]—it is also possible that the heterogeneous receptions of transnational media may produce challenges and protests as much as they produce acquiescence. Further, media does not function alone. It is always connected to a variety of institutions and subjects that give it meaning. The securitized subjects I discuss in this book become visible through these media industries, gaining agency within a transnational network that can be linked to national projects, yet is not contained by them.

The connection between protests and digital media has become an important question, as media corporations, such as Facebook, claim that they enable democratization.[103] There are many claims about new digital media technologies

that were also made about older media technologies: they are global or enable globalization; they will produce democracy; they can resist power or a state; they are democratic; they can produce moral and social panics, governmentalities, and new forms of governance. At the same time, digital technology has amplified and circulated changes in social relations, subjectivities, and the ways many of us live and work—all while keeping capitalist neoliberalism alive. David Lyon has written that technology must be seen as a "mode of mediating daily life,"[104] and it is true that many people live with computers in a way they did not live with television or radio; for many, their laptops are now a prosthetic technology that makes media embodied in new ways. Digital technology reproduces security as affect that is historically specific to the period, where external threats such as terrorism, via the war on terror, produce subjects who work to contain and respond to these threats.

Much of the debate around security and new technologies has focused on surveillance, the deliberate leaking of corporate or personal secrets, and the disclosure of state secrets. Scholars have suggested that the security state signals a shift from Foucault's notion of the disciplinary society to Gilles Deleuze's notion of the society of control. While Mark Poster argues that networks create a "superpanopticon"—a vastly expanded and powerful version of Foucault's notion of panopticon, which disciplines subjects through visibility—David Lyon suggests that we have moved to a "post-panopticon" society. In a society of control, as suggested by Deleuze, there is both a panopticon and a synopticon (with many watching the few), and the media has now made surveillance part of everyday life. Greg Elmer argues that Deleuze enables us to understand how sites of control are themselves multiple and expanded, though even Deleuze assumes a stable object of surveillance rather than the networking process that creates "a range of values to objects" and "seeks to determine the meaningfulness of surveillant objects within the context of networked economies." Surveillance is thus "subject to an economy that constantly seeks to rationalize relationships among people and things to better manage the future."[105] In the US neoliberal security state, the media economy of surveillance is also an economy that manages insecurities and protests through the work of subjects who become exceptional citizens as they do this work. In so doing, however, they become subjects of both the state and of corporations, using media products to securitize themselves as well as the security state.

David Lyon's term "panopticommodity" names the ways people market themselves on the Internet as individuals.[106] As personal computers and tablets have not only become prosthetic but also dynamic repositories that bring

together actions, subjects, and selves into new digital social forms, information stored on private and state websites and servers requires protection. "Networked identities" are now precious commodities. Privacy is bought and sold—desire for protection sells products. "Identity management" has become a business, as corporations manage information, passwords, and log-ins. Similar to embodied selves, digital selves are marked by insecurity. Exhortations that everything in our computers is public and news reports on hacking and corporate security breaches produce privacy as a banal project, producing public selves securitized enough to claim that they have "nothing to hide."

In contrast to normative citizens with "nothing to hide," minorities (racial or otherwise), "terrorists," and "aliens" are constituted as both public and private, having public identities with secrets, and private selves which must be uncovered. Having "nothing to hide" is not a possibility for such subjects who are constituted as already public. As public subjects, they are constructed as threats since they are assumed to have secret private selves that must be surveilled and brought to the surface. In such a context, public selves are assumed to have privacy that requires disclosure, as even the most public subjects require monitoring. Only those constituted as sovereign subjects, such as the exceptional subjects I examine in this book, can experience privacy as a tool for opposing corporate and militarized state intrusion, or are able to deploy privacy in legal and democratic struggles.

Feminist Challenges

The securitizations and insecurities that pervade the United States make feminism relevant in newly urgent ways. How do we understand what is happening when feminist discourses are used to bomb and to liberate, when feminist discourses, strategies, and injuries become available in new and unintended ways to empower, secure, and destroy?[107] How do we explain the American belief that women in the United States are better off than women anywhere else, despite gendered inequalities, cuts in welfare for women with families, and the banality of sexual violence in the United States? American exceptionalism mediates considerations of gendered inequalities and forecloses its geopolitics.[108] While most "security" expertise addresses questions of states and geopolitics while ignoring gender, race, and sexuality, many feminist scholars have critiqued masculinity and militarism by linking feminism and women with peace, victimhood, and innocence.[109] But feminists also have discussed the ways in which women and feminists have participated in

nationalism and militarism as well as the ways in which domestic ideologies have supported national and imperial goals.[110] An enduring and important feminist approach has been to analyze domesticity itself as violent, since its many institutions feminize subordinate subjects.[111] Gender has an important role to play in understanding war and conflict, and women are not simply innocent victims of masculinist militarism.[112] In line with more intersectional and transnational critiques of gender and militarism, I theorize feminisms, patriarchies, masculinities, racialized and militarized violence, and terror as contingent, networked, mediated, and transnational formations that make up the US as empire and as security state. I draw on feminist theory challenging essentialized connections between militarism, the state, and masculinity, as well as those demonstrating the violence of the state, domesticity, home, and the everyday in contexts of neoliberal policies.[113]

Debates about neoliberalism demand feminist intervention because too often they assume that neoliberalism means the privatization of public goods, or that public and private are understood only in terms of states and corporations/individuals, even though the private sphere of liberal thought has been associated with family and the domestic sphere.[114] Many scholars of neoliberalism assert that the protection of the private sphere (and its ownership of property) is a central element of contemporary capitalism. For example, David Harvey has defined neoliberalism in terms of an altered relation between public and private in which contemporary capitalism accumulates by dispossession and eliminates the "commons." Gender, the family, and sexuality appear as superstructural, as consequences of globalization's new mode of production.

Feminists, however, have long argued that "public" and "private" are not useful concepts for understanding how gender works in modern societies. In classical political theory, public/private divisions have been central to the liberal social contract. Feminists such as Carole Pateman point out that the liberal public/private divide is only made possible through the control of women. The liberal "social contract" is a "sexual contract" in which the patriarchal control of the family grounds the liberal state. In liberalism, Pateman claims, women have few privacy rights over their homes or their bodies because they are always regulated by the patriarchal state.[115] Along with Charles Mills, Pateman has argued that sexual violence is also racialized. Yet these divisions are difficult to maintain in the security state.

As terms, public and private are not stable or universal, nor are the related terms of home, privacy, and domesticity. If, in neoliberal times, the term "private" has become associated with the privatization of capital and of the

state, the term "public" has also undergone semantic shifts, as the state has changed through new collaborations with corporations, NGOs, and religious groups. Separations of public and private don't have good explanatory value for the messy processes of contemporary globalization. To call corporations "private," when they are publicly traded, simply exonerates them from accountability and enables corporate leaders to claim legal personhood, as the US Supreme Court confirmed in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*.[116] Definitions of the terms "private," "privacy," and "secrecy," as well as associations between individual freedoms and control over female bodies, have long been debated. What counts as "private" shifts, even within liberal democratic states. The domestic space has never been private but rather constructed by the state and its sovereign masculinities, and not all masculinities have been understood as patriarchal in their control over the private sphere.

As the security state has become dominant in the United States in contrast with the welfare state, feminists' tasks include analyzing the gendering of neoliberal citizenship, understanding how the fuzzy boundaries between public and private produce a militant masculinity and a militant femininity, and critiquing how humanitarian citizenship has replaced rights-based citizenship in a way that most impacts low-income women and those seen as security threats. What I call an advanced neoliberal rearticulation of the public/private divide has consequences for feminists and gendered subjects, as well as for expanded and nonheteronormative notions of family and citizenship. Some critics suggest that neoliberalism reduces the state and abdicates power to private realms.[117] However, feminists interested in transnational and postcolonial analysis have shown that neoliberalism is better understood as a changing and flexible set of practices that produce deeply uneven genders and sexualities across the world.[118] Such insights have led to feminist scholarly debates on terror and terrorism, security, and citizenship under contemporary transnational neoliberalism. Some feminists have argued that the war on terror reveals how "terror" becomes simultaneously a form of regulation, a mode of securitizing populations, and a technology producing gendered subjectivities in hetero- and homonormative ways.[119] However, other feminists suggest that the term provides a useful way to examine particular forms of violence. They resignify the term and use it to examine violence as the purview of the state rather than of nonstate transnational actors and networks. Arguing that "terror" is an appropriate term for the violence to which many bodies, especially those gendered as female, are subjected, they argue that "terror" can be a useful term to describe such subjection.[120] In particular, some feminists argue that violence within the

family, and the failure of the state to control male violence, are examples of the terror with which many women live.[121] Yet terms such as "terror" and "terrorism" are too imbued with imperial and racial power to be repurposed for more progressive politics.

Advanced neoliberalism involves both contemporary manifestations of authority as raced, classed, gendered, and sexualized and the protests to such authority. Critiques of such politics require attention to the relation between powerful masculinities and aspirational patriarchies, white racial sovereignty, and forms of authority dispersed over self-improving and self-commoditizing subjects, "private" corporations, and the security state. These entities collaborate with the state to use violence to assert their power over other groups. The advent of digital technologies, of panics over what is seen as public and private security, and of formations in which entrepreneurial and statist individuals are seen as normative citizens means that feminist approaches to citizenship have to address the ways in which neoliberal capital and the security state have stakes in the production of gender, sexuality, and the family. Feminist critique that is antiracist and anti-imperial, and which incorporates postcolonial and transnational theories of gender and sexuality that attend to the specificities of neoliberal empire, remains necessary. While such critique will examine how feminism can have neoliberal versions, it has to provide possibilities for continuing to struggle against forms of masculine authority that are both national and transnational.

This Book

Examining surveillance and humanitarianism as the governmentalization and securitization of US empire's "soft power," this book's chapters relay interdisciplinary approaches that disrupt the academic compartmentalization of state and security analyses. I draw on postcolonial and transnational theory, media studies, and law and society approaches, as well as critical race and gender studies, to understand the complexity of twenty-first-century US neoliberalism. This is not a "media studies" book, though a concern with media and technology appears throughout. As law is a key way the state becomes present to individuals, I examine how law appears more as "state effect" than simply "the state" itself, as that which regulates sovereignty between fuzzily bounded public and private entities. Studies of colonialism provide tools for understanding empire, and my previous research on the British empire and its cultures, as well as continuing interest in South Asia, provides the vantage point from which I trace the transnationalisms, speci-

ficities, and differences of US politics. Critical race studies and American studies scholarship enable understanding of sovereignty and empire that is both national and transnational.[122] And the fields in which I have been most engaged, transnational and intersectional gender and cultural studies, provide the interdisciplinary spaces to understand cultural politics and the critical engagements with state and security that are often compartmentalized in fields such as security studies.

I begin the book with a chapter about Hurricane Katrina as revealing ruptures that characterize what I see as the condition of advanced neoliberalism. Here, contestations between sovereignties, militarism, and security lead to the rise of humanitarianism as a solution to the crisis of the neoliberal security state. In the aftermath of the hurricane, private individuals and corporations were brought in to provide welfare and support, but many communities and social movements protested, calling for state action instead. The spectacle of racial injustice provides an opening for a mediated geopolitics, as critiques of the United States and its inability to care for its citizens circulated around the world. In this context, the United States appeared banal rather than exceptional, described as a "third world" nation, and its citizens as "refugees."

My second chapter focuses on the humanitarians who become exceptional US citizens. Such humanitarianism is securitized, as the US government and military incorporates these practices into their imperial arsenal. I examine the subjects of humanitarianism: missionaries, "voluntourists," nonprofit organizations, microlending agencies, and armchair/online donors.

Continuing this thread in the third chapter, I trace the US government's crackdown on Muslim charities in the aftermath of 9/11 and argue that humanitarian citizenship becomes a state security project by producing Muslims as outside such citizenship. Here, I focus on the production of race not only though a historical sedimentation of racialized institutions, but also through expanding modes of neoliberal racialization. In the twenty-first century, evangelical Christian missionaries following a neoliberal theology (what John and Jean Comaroff term "millennial capitalism") collaborate with and become part of the state to become the good humanitarians,[123] turning Muslims into "bad" humanitarians. Under George W. Bush's leadership, the US government put evangelical church leaders in charge of disbursing state funding to their own churches.[124] The separation between church and state disappeared when there was little oversight of these funds and little attention to federal laws requiring accountability and nonpreferential hiring. These processes of selective inclusion of Christians existed alongside the selective exclusion of Muslims from neoliberal citizenship, enabled

by a proliferation of legal statutes and policing mechanisms that pervaded so-called public and private entities. Yet this alliance was also provisional, as militarism and imperial war came into conflict with Evangelical missions.

In chapter 4, I turn to the emergence of the "security mom" and "security feminist" as figures of motherhood and female empowerment who attempt the work of state security in the aftermath of 9/11. These figures embody the exceptional individual as one who governmentalizes security in the private realm of the family, leading to a rearticulation of family and gender relations. Motherhood, here, becomes more about surveillance than about other tasks of parenting; the technology industry creates and markets products that enable such surveillance. The security mom and the security feminist thus become figures of power, yet remain conflicted because of their failure to secure the family or gain liberal equality.

In the fifth chapter, I examine the concept of "parental control" technology to show how the technology industry uses moral panics to sell products. Although both state and technology changes suggest that complete security is impossible, I argue that security's impossibility is differently experienced. Privacy is only possible for some families, over others, so these technologies produce their own racial formations differentiating between citizens and Others. As the child becomes rearticulated as a figure to be protected from Internet dangers, it becomes also a "digital native"—one whose generational difference makes it a citizen to be nurtured as well as a neoliberal consumer and a potential threat to parental authority.

In the coda, I bring the themes of the book together to examine the horrific murders at a Sikh temple in Oak Creek, Wisconsin, a killing similar to that which took place in Charleston, South Carolina, some years later. I look at the figure of the exceptional, white, male, Christian citizen—the "shooter"—who polices the nation and embodies the white racial sovereignty that he claims to possess. This figure is contrasted with those nonwhites who are seen as terrorist threats, or those whose possession of guns is seen as a threat. I propose that the transnational connections between white supremacist organizations suggest that these individuals might also be seen as "international" rather than "domestic" terrorists.

I began my career as a postcolonial studies scholar at a time when a critique of colonialism was seen as tendentious. Yet the study of colonialism, whether ongoing or sedimented in everyday life around the world, remains crucial to understanding global conditions. Imperial cultures and projects abound, and become intertwined with national and transnational formations. Contemporary conditions show that colonialism and empire are

diverse and ongoing projects that assert the power of certain entities over others in the continued production of inequalities. Global capital, neoliberalism, heteropatriarchies, and powerful masculinities; continuing settler colonialisms; racial/imperial histories; geopolitics between new and old empires; struggles between transnational insurgencies and national states—all of these require us to engage with the present in light of colonial and imperial technologies and histories. Importantly, the heterogeneous protests, insurgencies, and uprisings of the present warrant such analysis.

Feminist approaches and methods coming from studies of race and empire are necessary to understand neoliberalism in the United States. This book, though about the United States, is also a product of postcolonial and transnational theory as it engages with contemporary cultural politics of gender, race, and capitalism. Written from within the United States but with a concern for the politics elsewhere, this book reflects my engagement with where I live, but also with the enormous power of the United States. I write along with many around the world and in the United States who are critiquing neoliberalism and authoritarian power. I write with the hope that my critiques (and those of my fellow scholars) can shift some of the racialized humanitarianisms and the surveillance regimes of our times to goals that are not just about "giving back" (after one has taken so much), bemoaning how America has lost its power or its "American dream," or claiming that one person "can make a difference." Rather, I write with the conviction that we all need to change the policies of the United States as neoliberal empire that affects so many around the world. If there is work to be done, it is to ensure that authoritarian security regimes lose their power, and that feminist antiracist, antisecurity, and anti-imperial projects proliferate.

NOTES

Introduction

1. My thanks to Srimati Basu for bringing the Tennessee sign to my attention.

2. Jennifer Musto, *Control and Protect: Collaboration, Carceral Protection, and Domestic Sex Trafficking in the United States*, repr. ed. (Oakland: University of California Press, 2016).

3. Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History: Elementary Structures of Race* (London: Verso, 2016).

4. Timothy Mitchell, "The Limits of the State: Beyond Statist Approaches and Their Critics," *American Political Science Review* 85, no. 1 (1991): 77–96; see also Simon Hallsworth and John Lea, "Emerging Contours of the Security State," *Theoretical Criminology* 15, no. 2 (2011): 141–57.

5. My work focuses on both the "unease" that seems to pervade social life in many sites and the desire for security as both a desire for the "private" (through a sense of public/private divide) that recuperates home, nation, territory, and for difference in the making of citizenship and community. The proliferation of theories of insecurity, precariousness, unease, and disposability, though having disparate genealogies, suggest a broader thematic that has emerged in many scholarly works. See, for instance, Judith Butler, *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence* (London: Verso, 2006); Didier Bigo, "Globalized (in)Security: The Field and the Ban-Opticon," accessed July 18, 2016, http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~ces/conferences/muslims/Bigo.pdf; Didier Bigo, "Security and Immigration: Towards a Governmentality of Unease," *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 27 (2002): 63–92; Didier Bigo and Anastassia Tsoukala, eds., *Terror, Insecurity and Liberty: Illiberal Practices of Liberal Regimes after 9/11* (New York: Routledge, 2008).

6. Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1997).

7. One of the most important ethnographies of neoliberalism was carried out by Faye Harrison, who showed how neoliberal policies changed the lives of individuals

and altered their communities: Faye Harrison, "The Gendered Politics and Violence of Structural Adjustment," in *Situated Lives: Gender and Culture in Everyday Life*, ed. Louise Lamphere, Helena Ragoné, and Patricia Zavella, 451–68 (New York: Routledge, 1997). Also see, for instance, Butler, *Precarious Life*; Bigo, "Globalized (in)Security"; Bigo, "Security and Immigration"; Bigo and Tsoukala, *Terror, Insecurity and Liberty*.

8. Nikolas Rose, *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self*, 2nd ed. (London: Free Association Books, 1999).

9. David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 2.

10. Nikolas Rose, "Governing 'Advanced' Liberal Democracies," in *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism, and Rationalities of Government*, ed. Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne, and Nikolas Rose, 37–64 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).

11. Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*; Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000); Ravi K. Roy, Arthur T. Denzau, and Thomas D. Willett, *Neoliberalism: National and Regional Experiments with Global Ideas* (New York: Routledge, 2006).

12. Jean Comaroff and John L. Comaroff, eds., *Millennial Capitalism and the Culture of Neoliberalism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001). Another example: Indian neoliberalism demands efficiency, transparency, and development within a history of discourses of corruption of state bureaucracies that have foundations in the colonial state.

13. Cheryl I. Harris, "Whiteness as Property," *Harvard Law Review* 106, no. 8 (1993): 1707–91. Harris's understanding of property and privilege and passing remains a cogent analysis of the relation between race and class, as does David Roediger's on how groups not seen as white in the early twentieth century become whites. New white groups (Eastern Europeans and those from the former Soviet states) have joined the existing immigrant groups who became white over the twentieth century. Jewish groups remain both white yet targets of anti-Semitism.

14. Paul Amar, *The Security Archipelago: Human-Security States, Sexuality Politics, and the End of Neoliberalism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2013). Amar argues that militarized authority has replaced neoliberalism.

15. Rose, "Governing 'Advanced' Liberal Democracies," 37–64.

16. Nick Maclellan, "From Fiji to Fallujah: The War in Iraq and the Privatisation of Pacific Security," *Pacific Journalism Review* 12, no. 2 (September 2006): 47–65, accessed October 2, 2016, http://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=265314284958675;res=IELNZC; Peter W. Singer, "The Private Military Industry and Iraq: What We Have Learned and Where to Next?," policy paper (Geneva: Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, 2004), accessed October 2, 2016, http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/20034280?uid=3739576&uid=2&uid=4&uid=3739256&sid=21103985333101; Kjell Bjork and Richard Jones, "Overcoming Dilemmas Created by the 21st Century Mercenaries: Conceptualising the Use of Private Security Companies in Iraq," *Third World Quarterly* 26, nos. 4–5 (2005): 777–96, doi:10.1080/01436590500128014; Kateri Carmola, *Private Security Contractors and New Wars: Risk, Law, and Ethics* (New York: Routledge, 2010).

17. Joshua Barkan, *Corporate Sovereignty: Law and Government under Capitalism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013).

18. Amy Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005), 164–70; Alfred W. McCoy, *Policing America's Empire: The United States, the Philippines, and the Rise of the Surveillance State* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009).

19. Thomas Piketty, *Capital in the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2014).

20. William Julius Wilson, *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor* (New York: Vintage, 1997).

21. Ray Kiely, *Empire in the Age of Globalisation: US Hegemony and Neo-Liberal Disorder* (London: Pluto, 2005).

22. Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power* (New York: Basic Books, 2012).

23. Vivian Jabri, *War and the Transformation of Global Politics* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

24. Lisa Lowe, *The Intimacies of Four Continents* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015).

25. Jean Comaroff and John L. Comaroff. *Theory from the South: Or, How Euro-America Is Evolving toward Africa* (Boulder, CO: Routledge, 2011).

26. India's Terrorism and Detention Act, which was a response to an insurgency in Punjab, India, can be seen as a precursor of the antiterror laws in different parts of the world, including the United States.

27. Comaroff and Comaroff, *Theory from the South.*

28. Achille Mbembe, *On the Postcolony* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001).

29. Amy Kaplan, "'Left Alone with America': The Absence of Empire in the Study of American Culture," in *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, ed. Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease, 3–21 (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1993).

30. Kaplan, "'Left Alone with America.'"

31. Jasbir K. Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books, 2007).

32. Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages.*

33. Inderpal Grewal, *Transnational America: Feminisms, Diasporas, Neoliberalisms* (Durham NC: Duke University Press, 2005), 198.

34. See, for instance, Newt Gingrich, *A Nation Like No Other: Why American Exceptionalism Matters* (Washington, DC: New York: Regnery, 2011).

35. Donald E. Pease, *The New American Exceptionalism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009).

36. See, for instance, Mimi Thi Nguyen, *The Gift of Freedom: War, Debt, and Other Refugee Passages* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012); Chandan Reddy, *Freedom with Violence: Race, Sexuality, and the US State* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011).

37. Seymour Martin Lipset, *American Exceptionalism: A Double-Edged Sword* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1997).

38. David Bromwich, "It's Time to Rethink American Exceptionalism," *Nation*, October 24, 2014, accessed December 7, 2015, http://www.thenation.com/article/its-time-rethink-american-exceptionalism. One is not sure why this "rethinking" did not take place a long time ago, perhaps when the United States supported dictatorships in various regions of the world.

39. Didier Fassin and Mariella Pandolfi, eds., *Contemporary States of Emergency: The Politics of Military and Humanitarian Interventions* (New York: Zone Books, 2013).

40. Charlie Savage, "F.B.I. Casts Wide Net under Relaxed Rules for Terror Inquiries, Data Show," *New York Times*, March 26, 2011, sec. U.S., A19; James Risen and Laura Poitras, "N.S.A. Collecting Millions of Faces from Web Images," *New York Times*, May 31, 2014, accessed May 17, 2017, http://www.nytimes.com/2014/06/01/us/nsa-collecting-millions-of-faces-from-web-images.html; James Glanz, Jeff Larson, and Andrew W. Lehren, "Spy Agencies Tap Data Streaming from Phone Apps," *New York Times*, January 27, 2014, accessed July 6, 2016, http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/28/world/spy-agencies-scour-phone-apps-for-personal-data.html; Savage, "F.B.I. Casts Wide Net."

41. Kirstie Ball and Frank Webster, eds., *The Intensification of Surveillance: Crime, Terrorism and Warfare in the Information Age* (London: Pluto, 2003); Deborah A. Ramirez, Jennifer Hoopes, and Tara Lai Quinlan, "Defining Racial Profiling in a Post–September 11 World," *American Criminal Law Review* 40 (2003): 1195; Junaid Rana, *Terrifying Muslims: Race and Labor in the South Asian Diaspora* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011); Maya Rhodan, "New Federal Racial Profiling Guidelines Worry Civil Rights Groups," *Time*, December 8, 2014, accessed December 7, 2015, http://time.com/3623851/justice-department- racial-profiling-muslims-sikhs-aclu; Sherene Razack, *Casting Out: The Eviction of Muslims from Western Law and Politics* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008); Dorothy Roberts, "Collateral Consequences, Genetic Surveillance, and the New Biopolitics of Race," *Howard Law Journal* 54 (2011): 567; Sunera Thobani, "Racial Violence and the Politics of National Belonging: The Wisconsin Shootings, Islamophobia and the War on Terrorized Bodies," *Sikh Formations* 8, no. 3 (December 1, 2012): 281–86, doi:10.1080/17448727.2012.752681; Moustafa Bayoumi, *How Does It Feel to Be a Problem? Being Young and Arab in America* (New York: Penguin Books, 2008).

42. Natasha Singer, "You for Sale: A Data Giant Is Mapping, and Sharing, the Consumer Genome," *New York Times*, June 17, 2012, BU1, 6.

43. Philip N. Howard, John N. Carr, and Tema J. Milstein, "Digital Technology and the Market for Political Surveillance," *Surveillance and Society* 3, no. 1 (2005): 59–73.

44. Victoria Bernal and Inderpal Grewal, "Introduction," in *Theorizing NGOs: States, Feminisms, and Neoliberalism*, 1–18 (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014).

45. Singer, "The Private Military Industry and Iraq"; Carmola, *Private Security Contractors and New Wars*.

46. Karen Engle, "Constructing Good Aliens and Good Citizens: Legitimizing the War on Teror(ism)," *University of Colorado Law Review* 75, no. 1 (winter 2004): 59–114.

47. Thomas Blom Hansen and Finn Stepputat, "Introduction," in *Sovereign Bodies: Citizens, Migrants, and States in the Postcolonial World*, ed. Thomas Blom Hansen and Finn Stepputat, 1–38 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005).

48. Michael Denning, "Wageless Life," *New Left Review* 2, no. 66 (2010): 79–97.

49. Wolfe, *Traces of History*.

50. Joseph Nye also argues that neoliberalism is waning. Nye sees US military power as strong but US economic power as no longer paramount, which requires "soft power" through public diplomacy and "co-optive power" in which the US government compels other states to realign their priorities with those of the United States. Joseph S. Nye, "Public Diplomacy and Soft Power," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616, no. 1 (March 1, 2008): 94–109.

51. This literature is far-ranging, going from visual and material culture, to representation, to a historical account of US Cold War history, to knowledge production. Out of this vast literature, some interesting texts include: Charles Geisler, Gayatri Menon, and Shelley Feldman, eds., *Accumulating Insecurity: Violence and Dispossession in the Making of Everyday Life* (London: University of Georgia Press, 2011); John Martino, *War/Play: Video Games and the Militarization of Society* (New York: Peter Lang, 2015); Gretchen Heefner, *The Missile Next Door: The Minuteman in the American Heartland* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012); Laura McEnaney, *Civil Defense Begins at Home* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000); Nicole I. Torres, *Walls of Indifference: Immigration and the Militarization of the US-Mexico Border*, repr. ed. (Boulder, CO: Routledge, 2016); Joy Rohde, *Armed with Expertise: The Militarization of American Social Research during the Cold War* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013); Musto, *Control and Protect*; Marie Gottschalk, *Caught: The Prison State and the Lockdown of American Politics*, rev. ed. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016).

52. Marie Gottschalk, "Democracy and the Carceral State in America," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 651, no. 1 (January 1, 2014): 288–95, doi:10.1177/0002716213503787.

53. By now there is a considerable literature on this topic. See David Lyon, *The Electronic Eye: The Rise of Surveillance Society* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994); David Lyon, *Identifying Citizens: ID Cards as Surveillance* (Cambridge: Polity, 2009); Mark Andrejevic, *iSpy: Surveillance and Power in the Interactive Era* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2007); William G. Staples, *Everyday Surveillance: Vigilance and Visibility in Postmodern Life*, 2nd ed. (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2013); Torin Monahan, *Surveillance in the Time of Insecurity* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2010); Tom Engelhardt, *Shadow Government: Surveillance, Secret Wars, and a Global Security State in a Single-Superpower World* (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2014); Will Thomas DeVries, "Protecting Privacy in the Digital Age," *Berkeley Technology Law Journal* 18, no. 1 (January 2003): 283–311.

54. Muneer Ahmad, "Homeland Insecurities: Racial Violence the Day after September 11," *Social Text* 20, no. 3 (2002): 101–15; Michael Sorkin, ed., *Indefensible Space: The Architecture of the National Insecurity State* (New York: Routledge, 2008).

55. Armand Mattelart, *The Globalization of Surveillance*, trans. Susan Taponier and James A. Cohen (Cambridge: Polity, 2010), 139.

56. Michael Dillon, "Network Society, Network-Centric Warfare and the State of Emergency," *Theory, Culture and Society* 19, no. 4 (August 1, 2002): 71–79, doi:10.1177/02632760201900400 5.

57. Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages*; Rana, *Terrifying Muslims*; Razack, *Casting Out*.

58. Caren Kaplan, Erik Loyer, and Ezra Claytan Daniels, "Precision Targets: GPS and the Militarization of Everyday Life," *Canadian Journal of Communication* 38, no. 3 (September 16, 2013): 397–420, http://cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/2655.

59. Stuart Hall, Chas Critcher, Tony Jefferson, John Clarke, and Brian Roberts, *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order* (London: Macmillan, 1978).

60. Razack, *Casting Out*.

61. Grewal, *Transnational America*.

62. Ananya Roy, Genevieve Negrón-Gonzales, Kweku Opoku-Agyemang, and Clare Talwalker, *Encountering Poverty: Thinking and Acting in an Unequal World* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2016).

63. Thomas L. Ilgen, ed., *Reconfigured Sovereignty: Multi-Layered Governance in the Global Age* (Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2003).

64. Thomas L. Ilgen, "Introduction," in *Reconfigured Sovereignty: Multi-Layered Governance in the Global Age*, ed. Thomas L. Ilgen (Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2003), 3. See also in the same volume Ilgen, "Reconfigured Sovereignty in the Age of Globalization," 6–35.

65. Aihwa Ong, *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999).

66. Brenda Chalfin, *Neoliberal Frontiers: An Ethnography of Sovereignty in West Africa* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010); Aihwa Ong, "Powers of Sovereignty: State, People, Wealth, Life," *Focaal—Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology* 64 (2012): 24–35.

67. Hansen and Stepputat, "Introduction."

68. Hansen and Stepputat, "Introduction," 20.

69. Achille Mbembe, "The Banality of Power and the Aesthetics of Vulgarity in the Postcolony," *Public Culture* 4, no. 2 (1992): 1–30.

70. Hansen and Stepputat, "Introduction," 29.

71. Saskia Sassen, *Losing Control? Sovereignty in an Age of Globalization* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996).

72. Anwar Sheikh, "Who Pays for Welfare in the Welfare State? A Multicountry Study," *Social Research* 70, no. 2 (2003): 531–50. Sheikh's study shows, interestingly, that US workers paid for their own welfare throughout the 1980s!

73. Amar, *The Security Archipelago*.

74. Jan Nederveen Pieterse, "Neoliberal Empire," *Theory, Culture and Society* 21, no. 3 (2004): 119–40.

75. Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*.

76. Hall et al., *Policing the Crisis*.

77. Kuan-Hsing Chen and David Morley, eds., *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies* (London: Routledge, 1996).

78. Iris Marion Young, "The Logic of Masculinist Protection: Reflection on the Current Security State," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 29, no. 1 (2003): 2.

79. Young, "The Logic of Masculinist Protection," 4.

80. Colin Gordon, "Governmental Rationality: An Introduction," in *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, ed. Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller, 1–52 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).

81. Thomas Biebricher and Frieder Vogelmann, "Governmentality and State Theory: Reinventing the Reinvented Wheel?," *Theory and Event* 15, no. 3 (2012), http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v015/15.3.biebricher.html. Quotation from Michel Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France*, ed. Michel Senellart (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 247.

82. Miguel de Larrinaga and Marc G. Doucet, eds., *Security and Global Governmentality: Globalization, Governance and the State* (New York: Routledge, 2010).

83. Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages*.

84. Hugh Gusterson and Catherine Besteman, eds., *The Insecure American: How We Got Here and What We Should Do about It* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009).

85. Jennifer Terry, "Significant Injury: War, Medicine, and Empire in Claudia's Case," *WSQ: Women's Studies Quarterly* 37, no. 1 (2009): 200–225.

86. Buzan, Wæver, and de Wilde, *Security*.

87. Thomas Blom Hansen and Finn Stepputat, eds., *Sovereign Bodies: Citizens, Migrants, and States in the Postcolonial World* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005).

88. Nye, "Public Diplomacy and Soft Power."

89. Bigo, "Globalized (in)Security."

90. Monika Barthwal-Datta, *Understanding Security Practices in South Asia: Securitization Theory and the Role of Non-State Actors* (New York: Routledge, 2012).

91. Buzan, Wæver, and de Wilde, *Security*.

92. Amar, *The Security Archipelago*.

93. Mark Duffield, *Global Governance and the New Wars: The Merging of Development and Security*, 2nd new ed. (New York: Zed Books, 2014).

94. Laleh Khalili, *Time in the Shadows: Confinement in Counterinsurgencies* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2012).

95. David Campbell, "The Biopolitics of Security: Oil, Empire, and the Sports Utility Vehicle," *American Quarterly*, 57, no. 3 (2005): 943–72.

96. David Campbell, *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992).

97. Saskia Sassen, "Toward a Sociology of Information Technology," *Current Sociology* 50, no. 3 (2002): 382.

98. Giovanna Borradori, *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogues with Jürgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*, new ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 86.

99. Borradori, *Philosophy in a Time of Terror*, 86.

100. Kayuza Bialasiewicz, David Campbell, Stuart Elden, Stephen Graham, Alex Jeffrey, and Alison J. Williams, "Performing Security: The Imaginative Geographies of Current US Strategy," *Political Geography* 26 (2007): 405–22.

101. Stuart Hall, "Encoding/Decoding," in *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies*, 128–38 (London: Hutchinson, 1973).

102. Jodi Dean, *Democracy and Other Neoliberal Fantasies: Communicative Capitalism and Left Politics* (Durham NC: Duke University Press, 2009).

103. Daniel Trottier and Christian Fuchs, eds. *Social Media, Politics and the State: Protests, Revolutions, Riots, Crime and Policing in the Age of Facebook, Twitter and YouTube* (New York: Routledge, 2014); José Marichal, *Facebook Democracy: The Architecture of Disclosure and the Threat to Public Life* (New York: Routledge, 2016).

104. David Lyon, *Surveillance Society: Monitoring Everyday Life* (Buckingham, England: Open University Press, 2001), 119.

105. Greg Elmer, "Panopticon-Discipline-Control," in *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies*, ed. David Lyon, Kristen Ball, and Kevin D. Iaggerty (Oxon, England: Routledge, 2012), 27.

106. David Lyon, *Theorizing Surveillance: The Panopticon and Beyond* (Devon, England: Willan, 2006), 276. See also Greg Elmer, *Profiling Machines: Mapping the Personal Information Economy* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003).

107. Lila Abu-Lughod, "Do Muslim Women Really Need Saving? Anthropological Reflections on Cultural Relativism and Its Others," *American Anthropologist* 104, no. 3 (2002): 783–90; Carrie Rentschler and Carol A. Stabile, "States of Insecurity and the Gendered Politics of Fear," *NWSA Journal* 17, no. 3 (2005): vii–xxv; Cynthia Enloe, *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000). See also Janet Halley, *Split Decisions: How and Why to Take a Break from Feminism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008). While Halley makes a strong argument about the formation of "governance feminism," it is difficult to believe that one can "take a break" from feminism simply because it has become powerful in some ways, since there are numerous other forms of feminism that Halley does not consider, which are not powerful. There is a certain privilege to choosing between what one can stick with and what one can discard. Additionally, many social movements have unprogressive aspects to them, and few can avoid conflicts or contradictions.

108. Postcolonial feminist interventions into this discourse have not made much headway in popular culture, even after three decades of academic research.

109. The tradition of feminism that connects women to pacifism and patriarchy to war is visible even before the second wave. Virginia Woolf in *Three Guineas* (London: Hogarth Press, 1986, c. 1938) makes this connection and argues for pacifism. Feminists from Betty Freidan to Vandana Shiva have continued in this tradition.

110. Claudia Koonz, *Mothers in the Fatherland: Women, the Family and Nazi Politics* (New York: St. Martin's, 1987); Patricia Jeffery and Amrita Basu, eds., *Appropriating Gender: Women's Activism and Politicized Religion in South Asia* (New York: Routledge, 1998); Kathleen M. Blee, *Women of the Klan: Racism and Gender in the 1920s* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008); Antoinette Burton, *Burdens of History: British Feminists, Indian Women, and Imperial Culture, 1865–1915* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994).

111. Kristin Bumiller, *In an Abusive State: How Neoliberalism Appropriated the Feminist Movement against Sexual Violence* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008).

112. Laura Sjoberg, *Gendering Global Conflict: Toward a Feminist Theory of War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013).

113. Young, "The Logic of Masculinist Protection."

114. Aihwa Ong, *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006).

115. Carole Pateman, *The Sexual Contract* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1988).

116. In Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, 558 US 310 (2010), the US Supreme Court declared that corporations have a right to "free speech" because citizens do. In this case, there is little distinction between corporations and citizens.

117. See, for instance, Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*.

118. Ong, *Neoliberalism as Exception*.

119. Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages*.

120. Ann Tickner, "You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagements between Feminists and IR Theorists," *International Studies Quarterly* 41, no. 4 (1997): 611–32.

121. Michael P. Johnson, "Patriarchal Terrorism and Common Couple Violence: Two Forms of Violence against Women," *Journal of Marriage and Family* 57, no. 2 (May 1995): 283–94.

122. A very short list out of a large field: Hazel V. Carby, *Cultures in Babylon: Black Britain and African America* (London: Verso Books, 1999); Nguyen, *The Gift of Freedom*; Reddy, *Freedom with Violence*; Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease, eds., *Cultures of United States Imperialism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1994); Sherene Razack, Malinda Smith, and Sunera Thobani, eds., *States of Race: Critical Race Feminism for the 21st Century* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2010).

123. Jean Comaroff and John L. Comaroff, "Millennial Capitalism: First Thoughts on a Second Coming," in Comaroff and Comaroff, eds., *Millennial Capitalism*, 1–56.

124. David Kuo, *Tempting Faith: An Inside Story of Political Seduction* (New York: Free Press, 2007).

1. Katrina and the Security State

1. Shailaja Bajpai, "Apocalypse Now," *Indian Express*, September 5, 2005, accessed April 23, 2012, http://archive.indianexpress.com/oldStory/77565/.

2. Ambrose Murunga, in *Daily Nation*, excerpted in "Press Dismay at Katrina Chaos," *BBC*, September 3, 2005, accessed December 8, 2015, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/4211320.stm.

3. Philip Ochieng, "Katrina and the Poverty of Development," *Daily Nation*, September 11, 2005, accessed May 23, 2016, http://www.nation.co.ke/oped/-/1192/81058/-/we8vorz/-/index.html.

4. Excerpted in "Press Dismay at Katrina Chaos," *BBC*, September 3, 2005, accessed December 8, 2015, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/4211320.stm.

5. Ochieng, "Katrina and the Poverty of Development."

6. Leon Hadar, "America's Eroding Credibility: Fallout from Baghdad and New Orleans Makes It Difficult for Bush Administration to Mobilise Support," *Business Times Singapore*, September 14, 2005, sec. Views and Opinions.