MILITARIZED IZED

GLOBAL

APART HEID

CATHERINE BESTEMAN

MILITARIZED GLOBAL APARTHEID

GLOBAL
INSECURITIES

A SERIES EDITED BY
CATHERINE BESTEMAN
AND DARRYL LI

MILITARIZED IZED GLOBAL APART HEID

CATHERINE BESTEMAN

DUKE

UNIVERSITY PRESS

In recognition that our contributions are vastly different in scale, size, and scope, I note that this modest book is inspired by and indebted to Cedric Robinson's reflection on his masterful *Black Marxism*:

AS A SCHOLAR IT WAS NEVER MY PURPOSE TO EXHAUST THE SUBJECT, ONLY TO SUGGEST THAT IT WAS THERE.

—Cedric Robinson, *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*, xxxii

DUKE
UNIVERSITY
PRESS

CONTENTS

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

THE ARGUMENT

On Tuesday, April 21, 2015, three major stories in the *New York Times* included an article about the disastrous loss of over eight hundred lives in the Mediterranean when a ship filled with hopeful migrants sank on April 18, an article about the arrest of six young Somali Americans in Minnesota who were suspected of attempting to join ISIS, and an article about the hundreds of thousands of "missing black men" across the country who are in prison. These seemingly disparate stories about normal topics of the day in 2015—the upsurge in the number of refugees attempting to reach Europe, security fears about immigrants, and the disproportionate incarceration of Black men in the United States—reflect an emergent new world order in which race and mobility feature as primary variables for which heightened security and militarization are the answer. This book attempts to sketch out some dimensions of this new world order, a militarized form of global apartheid.[1]

Militarized global apartheid is a loosely integrated effort by countries in the global north to protect themselves

against the mobility of people from the global south. The new apartheid apparatus takes the form of militarized border technologies and personnel, interdictions at sea, biometric tracking of the mobile, detention centers, holding facilities, and the criminalization of mobility. It extends deep into many places from which people are attempting to leave and pushes them back; it tracks them to interrupt their mobility, stops them at certain borders for detention and deportation, pushes them into the most dangerous travel routes, and creates new forms of criminality. It stretches across most of the globe, depends on an immense investment of capital, and feeds a new global security-industrial complex. It draws on and remakes historically sedimented racial formations that are highly localized but articulated with global imaginaries of race and racial difference. Because the new apartheid relies on and nurtures xenophobic ideologies and racialized worldviews, it recasts the terms of sovereignty, citizenship, community, belonging, justice, refuge, and civil rights and requires the few who benefit to collectively and knowingly demonize and ostracize the many who are harmed. It is at its most visibly militarized in Israel, and also in Australia, Europe, and the United States, where it serves the purpose of guarding hegemonic whiteness.

A new form of imperialism—security imperialism—is emerging from and shoring up global militarized apartheid. Security imperialism is expressed in the policies and practices used to identify and contain "risky" people throughout the globe, accompanied by interventions to securitize space for militaristic and economic domination. These emergent imperial formations are spatial and technological rather than territorial, and they are taking shape through projects that racialize and incarcerate people while securing cosmopolitan class privilege and capitalist extraction across borders. They tether the concept of security to militarization and make the militarization of everyday life normal.

ON VOCABULARY

Throughout this book I use "the global north" to mean the U.S., Canada, Europe, Israel, Australia, New Zealand, Russia, the Gulf Cooperation Council countries (United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, Oman, Qatar, Kuwait), and East Asia (Japan, South Korea, Singapore, China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan). This list overlaps considerably with the group of states identified by political scientist and Pentagon consultant Thomas Barnett as "the Functioning Core" interconnected through globalization (which he defines as "network connectivity, financial transactions, liberal media flows, and

connective security") in his influential "The Pentagon's New Map."[2] Barnett argues that the Functioning Core should initiate U.S.-led military occupations in the areas he identifies as "The Non-Integrating Gap," places he identifies as existing outside of globalization and that constitute the greatest security threats in the world today: "the Caribbean rim, virtually all of Africa, the Balkans, the Caucasus, Central Asia, the Middle East and Southwest Asia, and much of Southeast Asia," in addition to Central America and most of the countries in South America. Of additional concern to Barnett are the places he identifies as "Seam States"—Mexico, Brazil, South Africa, Morocco, Algeria, Greece, Turkey, Pakistan, Thailand, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Indonesia—that buffer the Non-Integrating Gap from the Functioning Core. He promotes a strong U.S. military presence in the Seam States as a strategy to control mobility and secure the Functioning Core against terrorism. I lead with Barnett's argument not because of his influence in anthropology—he has none, so far as I can tell—but because his model is a potent expression and extension of the homeland security doctrine that has redefined U.S. militarism, militarization, and policing since 9/11 and reshaped security regimes and security empires across the world as part of the global war on terror.

With some exceptions, Barnett's Non-Integrating Gap and Seam States roughly correspond to the global south of this book. But, as will become clear, I do not accept his reasoning about their similarities or why they should be grouped together for heuristic analytical purposes. In their book about why the global south is a harbinger of political futures in the global north, Jean and John Comaroff define the global south as "a polythetic category, its members sharing one or more—but not all, nor even most—of a diverse set of features. The closest thing to a common denominator among them is that many were once colonies, protectorates, or overseas 'possessions,' albeit not necessarily during the same epochs."[3] As they emphasize, the line between the north and the south is not definitive: it "is at best porous, broken, often illegible."[4] Following the Comaroffs, my use of the generalizing phrase "global south" is not meant to imply unity or homogeneity, or—central to my argument—that the global south is in any way disarticulated from the global north. It is also not meant to overlook class divisions that pervade the global south as well as the global north, including the presence across the global south of global cities and the existence of a global class of cosmopolitan elites who share the control of wealth, capitalist interests, access to political power, and the ability to move freely. (Of particular interest is China, which is one of the world's largest exporters of migrants, with

a massive internal migration system of its own, as well as a rising status as a premier global financial lender and capitalist investor, with, some argue, imperialist designs.) Nevertheless, also central to my argument is the claim that it is possible to theorize in general terms an emerging militarized, hierarchical relationship governing the management of migration and labor mobility from those countries I identify as the global south to those countries I identify as the global north, and that this relationship has historical antecedents.

Similarly, the global north, as used in this book, reflects Michel-Rolph Trouillot's understanding that while globalization has been a fragmented process, the beneficiaries have been North America, Western Europe, and Asia—a list to which I have added Australia/New Zealand, Israel, the GCC states, and Russia. Trouillot's discussion of "fragmented globality" captures the differentiated labor markets that constrain the ability of people in the global south to participate in and benefit from globalization equally with the global north.[5] The central argument I pursue throughout this book is how the "fragmented globality" described by Trouillot is a racialized process with deep historical roots and persistent innovations, which is now being weaponized through militarized security bordering innovations.

ON SOMALIA

Because the outlines of the new world order of militarized global apartheid began to take shape for me through my long association with people from Somalia, I open this book with a short tour through recent Somali history because it contains many of the themes developed in later chapters. Twentieth-century Somali history includes a consistent pattern of foreign interventions and incursions, beginning with the colonial era and continuing with the impact of Cold War–influenced foreign aid, through the 1980s, when Somalia became the second largest recipient of U.S. economic and military aid in Africa and built the largest army in Africa.[6] Foreign support enabled Somalia's dictator Siyad Barre to utilize militarized authoritarian measures to maintain power, culminating in a bombing and strafing campaign in the 1980s against communities in northern Somalia that were contesting his leadership.

In 1990, following the fall of the Berlin Wall, the U.S. Congress acknowledged Barre's record of human rights abuses and voted to withhold further funding for his government. His government collapsed within a month, and the militias that deposed him turned against each other to fight over which could lay claim to the state and its resources, including foreign aid.[7] The

number of people displaced in this catastrophe during 1991–93 tells a grave story of the aftereffects of U.S. support for a brutal dictator: nearly a million people fled Somalia, about 2 million were internally displaced, and at least a quarter million were killed.[8] As refugees poured out of the country, foreign armies moved in, accompanied by foreign NGOs, humanitarian agencies, and multilateral governance institutions attempting to reinstitute governing structures in the standard form of the Westphalian nation-state (e.g., political order based on the principles of state sovereignty and nonintervention by states in the internal affairs of other states, the basis of the contemporary international order of separate, legally equal, territorially bounded nation-states). Their efforts met with repeated failure, leading scholars, humanitarians, and journalists over the subsequent decades to regularly name Somalia "the worst humanitarian crisis in the world," "the most ignored tragedy in the world," "the most failed state," the most corrupt nation on earth, and, simply, "the world's most dangerous place."[9] Somalia became the poster child for trendy political descriptors: "failed state," "mission creep," "protracted refugee crisis."

As Somalia's instability persisted and Somalis continued to flee across the border into Kenya, the Dadaab refugee camp complex in Kenya became the largest in the world. In the years since Dadaab's creation in 1991, and despite (or because of) ongoing interventions by the UN, the African Union, the EU, the U.S., Ethiopia, Kenya, Turkey, and some of the GCC states, which provided humanitarian and development aid, backed particular militia factions, and attempted to engineer a new government through sponsoring twenty peace conferences, Somalia never achieved stability. The immediate post-collapse violence by warring militias competing for territory during the 1990s was followed by another calamitous explosion of violence in 2006 that destroyed a brief period of relative calm when Ethiopia, with U.S. military support, invaded to overthrow the nascent Islamic Courts Union (ICU) government. The invasion prompted the consolidation of Al-Shabaab, a militant group dedicated to opposing foreign intervention in Somalia. The instability created by the invasion, the overthrow of the new government, and Al-Shabaab's violence contributed to a famine, producing another massive flow of refugees and internally displaced people during 2006–12. By the beginning of 2012, Somalia was more insecure than ever before. Al-Shabaab responded to its designation as a terrorist group by the U.S. in 2008 with a pledge to target Western operations within and outside of Somalia and by allying with Al-Qaeda. Many scholars argue that although U.S. foreign policy toward Somalia after 9/11 was oriented toward

quashing terrorism, it in fact enabled Al-Shabaab to emerge as an effective anti-Western terrorist group.[10]

The vast majority of Somalis were left to manage in a devastated environment characterized by violence, famine, and insecurity. In addition to ongoing attacks by Al-Shabaab, repeated incursions by Kenyan troops, and the contested presence of African Union troops, the U.S. began bombarding Somalia with airstrikes—at least 110 drone strikes, airstrikes, and raids in Somalia between March 2003 and November 2018, with a record high of forty-six strikes in 2018 and then fifty-two in 2019—to kill suspected members of Al-Shabaab. Such strikes also caused civilian casualties, displacements, and generalized terror.[11] Somalis still stranded in Dadaab have few options, especially following the 2018 U.S. travel ban against Somalis and immigrants from six other countries, popularly known as the Muslim ban.

The point of recounting this history is to demonstrate that over the past several decades Somalis have experienced a succession of foreign interventions by governments based in the global north whose aim has been to reorient Somalia to their economic and political desires, using increasingly militarized means. The results have been disastrous for Somalis, many of whom found themselves incarcerated in insecure camps, fleeing drone attacks, enduring war-related famines, and impounded by barriers to their legal ability to move. Somalis fleeing Al-Shabaab's violence move to Kenya but are then forced to move from the camps when insecurities flare or their refugee status is revoked; they move between Nairobi and the refugee camps when xenophobic ethnic cleansings sweep Nairobi; they make their way north to get on leaky boats in often-thwarted attempts to cross the Mediterranean; or they make their way south to South Africa, where they face periodic xenophobic violence that leaves them maimed or dead.[12] Their search for safety over the past two decades reveals some of the contours of the global system of militarized apartheid that I aim to describe in the following chapters.

Returning to Barnett's model, from the vantage point of my Somali acquaintances who live within Barnett's Non-Integrating Gap, the poverty and insecurity of the Gap looks like an intentional creation of the Functioning Core—a series of militarized borders, proliferating border walls, imprisoning refugee camps, detention centers, tightly policed and dangerous border crossing zones, violent interventions by militaries and agents of the global north, and regions made unsafe by the rise of militias in response to those interventions.[13] While Barnett, much like Thomas Friedman before him, defines the Gap as globally disconnected—which for Barnett is a condition to

be remedied through U.S.-led military intervention—those who live within the Gap might see its insecurity as produced by a combination of militarized interventions by the global north (in support of friendly dictators, to overthrow unfriendly dictators, for resource extraction, and for other corporate interests of the global north) and militarized containment (closed borders, refugee camps, deportations, and detentions of unauthorized border crossers) designed to thwart the border-crossing mobility strategies of residents forced out of the Gap by such interventions.[14]

Their search for security is hardly unique; the global south houses the vast majority of the world's refugees and displaced people—those threatened by climate change, poverty, and war. Barnett's understanding of the Non-Integrating Gap, much like Friedman's earlier definition of "turtles" (by which he meant those countries that resist joining capitalist globalization), mistakenly presumes that the poverty and insecurity in these regions is due to their global disconnection. But the view from the south reveals this to be a myopic argument that ignores global connections that pervade the global south through transnational emigration and diasporas as well as myriad global military, corporate, and NGO interventions.[15]

The life strategies pursued by my Somali acquaintances demonstrate the shortcomings in the available scholarly vocabulary for describing the structures that shape transnational connections and diasporic networks that originate in Barnett's Non-Integrating Gap; the existing vocabulary fails to adequately capture the encounters through which people from the Non-Integrating Gap engage the rest of the world. For the Somali diaspora, "transnational" is inadequate because their connections are not necessarily made between and through national entities or frames; rather, for example, they are made between refugees incarcerated in camps in Kenya and people living in stateless southern Somalia, between refugees living with few civic rights in South Africa and refugees in UNHCR refugee camps, between refugees in camps in Kenya and refugees in camps in Tanzania. The nationalist frame is almost completely irrelevant in the lives of Somalis except for the fact that national governments from the global north, in the name of their own security, regularly intervene in Somalia or to contain Somalis, through attempts either to impose new governmental structures that continually prove irrelevant to people living in Somalia or to impose new security regimes through proxy armies, alliances with warlords, drone strikes, or travel bans. And one of the primary ways in which the nationalist frame is made consistently relevant for Somalis seeking security is through militarized border controls that other nations wield

against their ability to move, in effect incarcerating them in zones of profound and enduring insecurity.

Somalia is but one example of the effect of policies in the global north that incarcerate and traumatize people in the global south in the name of security and profit in the global north. In the globalized contemporary, the emergence of a system of militarized apartheid used by wealthy and powerful countries in the global north against people from the global south is the signature form of globalized structural violence of our era. Other scholars have used the phrase "global apartheid" to describe the historic and current world order, arguing that from the age of exploration to the age of imperialism to the colonial era to the age of the Cold War to the age of neoliberalism and the Washington Consensus to the current moment, the global north has been engaged in projects of racialization, segregation, political intervention, mobility controls, capitalist plunder, and labor exploitation of people in the global south.[16] While terms like *imperialism*, *globalization*, and *transnationalism* have been helpful for highlighting many important dimensions of these global processes, the term *apartheid* shifts the frame to capture the use of race and nativist language to structure mobility, belonging, class inequality, elimination, and extermination, as well as the relevance of border controls and the hierarchical modes of excluding or incorporating racially delineated people into a polity for labor exploitation. My argument builds on this perspective by acknowledging the significance for this emergent world order of new forms of militaristic border security, containment, and empire building.

ON RACE

Race is a human creation constructed in particular locations in particular historical time periods for specific reasons linked to the creation of hierarchies that benefit particular social groups at the expense of others. It is both a structure and a process; it is both specific to localities and global in scope; it is iterative and constantly reinvented; and it is rooted in the particular history of European imperial expansion and the development of capitalism.

Roger Sanjek defines race as "the framework of ranked categories segmenting the human population that was developed by western Europeans following their global expansion beginning in the 1400s."[17] Cedric Robinson goes back further in time, locating the creation of racialism in premodern Europe, arguing that capitalism and racialism co-emerged in feudal Europe through internal ordering structures that later "permeate[d] the social

structures emergent from capitalism."[18] In his view, "The tendency of European civilization through capitalism was, then, not to homogenize but to differentiate—to exaggerate regional, subcultural and dialectical differences into 'racial' ones. As the Slavs became the natural slaves, the racially inferior stock for domination and exploitation during the Middle Ages, as the Tartars came to occupy a similar position in the Italian cities of the late Middle Ages, so at the systemic interlocking of capitalism in the sixteenth century, peoples of the Third World began to fill this expanding category of a civilization reproduced by capitalism."[19]

Racialism and capitalism emerged together in Europe through processes that created forms of differentiation in concert with emerging regimes of ownership, control of property, and profit-seeking. Fundamental to the emergence of racialism in Europe and its global spread through the centuries of imperialism, the slave trade, and colonialism is the centrality of white supremacy. "White supremacy is the unnamed political system that has made the modern world what it is today," writes philosopher Charles Mills in his opening sentence of *The Racial Contract*, in which he theorizes the Racial Contract as a set of agreements among white people that racial hierarchies that benefit white people and ensure white hegemony should remain the norm and be defended on the global stage politically, juridically, rhetorically, and philosophically.[20] "The general purpose of the Contract is always the differential privileging of the whites as a group with respect to the nonwhites as a group, the exploitation of their bodies, land, and resources, and the denial of equal socioeconomic opportunities to them. All whites are *beneficiaries* of the Contract, although some whites are not *signatories*."[21] The Racial Contract is not only global, Mills argues, but foundational to modernity. The modern world was "expressly created as a racially hierarchical polity, globally dominated by Europeans," at its most visible just prior to World War I when about 85 percent of the earth was claimed by Europe as "colonies, protectorates, dominions, and commonwealths."[22] Leading European political philosophers like Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, and Kant all took the Racial Contract for granted in their theories about humanism and democracy, in which equality only applied to white men, Mills notes. Thus, the canon of Western political philosophy emerged within a set of assumptions that accepted white supremacy and a racialized ordering of the world as a given, assumptions that extend through contemporary theorizations of liberalism, modernity, development, and humanitarianism.

Paul Farmer's seminal work on structural violence in Haiti offers a striking example in his devastating portrait of how Haiti's treatment by the global

north following the 1791 slave revolt amounted to centuries of apartheid policy in the form of unjust trade blockades, the draining of resources, support for dictators, and the unequal barring by the United States of Haitian as opposed to white immigrants.[23] The revolution in Haiti had "filled the liberal world in its entirety with horror and scandal," offering them an object lesson in the importance of ensuring global white hegemony, writes Domenico Losurdo, in his crisp argument that the golden age of liberalism in the U.S., England, and France was fundamentally a project to consolidate white supremacy. The history of liberalism is uncontestably conjoined with the history of imperialism and colonialism—a history of racialized segregation, white supremacy, and resource extraction that underpins the current iteration of global apartheid.[24]

European liberalism emerged in the context of historic connections among white settler colonialism in the Americas, the transatlantic African slave trade, and the East Indies and China trade in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, connections that colonial studies scholar Lisa Lowe argues have been obscured in much historical scholarship by the separation between the liberalism archive and the imperial archive.[25] Reading these archives together allows Lowe to track the "intimate connections" among colonized indigenous peoples, enslaved people, and indentured Asian labor, through which Anglo-American liberal government created racial classifications to facilitate the management of labor throughout the globe. Centuries of dependence on the removal of indigenous people and their replacement with enslaved Africans led British colonizers concerned about slave revolts in the Caribbean to import Asian laborers, who were treated as a separate race from enslaved Africans. Their servitude was part of Britain's move from mercantile colonialism to a system they called "free trade" in East Asia, but managed through imperial rule over populations Britain viewed as unfit for self-governing. Britain did not colonize China, but rather extended what Lowe calls "imperial governmentality" through its management of trade routes and control of port areas, which allowed Britain to manage the "free" movement of labor in the form of indentured workers sent from China to the West Indies. As Britain moved from colonial repression enacted through violence to liberal governance through which populations were categorized and racialized, the management of imperial trade routes that were developed to connect production, manufacturing, and consumption allowed Britain to penetrate markets against the interests of local rulers (such as with the opium trade, which directly opposed Qing sovereignty) and to oversee the movement of people. Older forms

of domination—enslavement, plantation agriculture, trade monopolies—
could be accommodated within liberal ideas of free trade and British
maritime dominance, adding additional layers to imperial power. By "con-
ceptualizing the intimacies between settler colonialism in the Americas,
transatlantic slavery, the East Indies and China trades in goods and people,
and the emergence of European liberal modernity," Lowe shows how the
basic assumptions of liberal modernity—freedom, wage labor, free trade,
representative government—emerged directly from, were shaped by, and
continue to reflect "Europe's colonial imperative."[26]

Europe's "colonial imperative" depended on normalized racism to main-
tain white autonomy and superiority in the global arena. Historians Mari-
lyn Lake and Henry Reynolds document the circulation of books and ar-
ticles during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries among leading
politicians in the U.S. and Britain and the British dominions of Australia,
Canada, New Zealand, and South Africa about how to ensure white su-
premacy in their respective countries. Following Britain's success at open-
ing markets for Asian labor, Chinese and Indians migrated to other parts of
the world in massive numbers: 50 million migrants left China and 30 mil-
lion left India. Chinese migrated to Australia, New Zealand, the Pacific, and
the North American West, as well as throughout Southeast Asia; Indians
migrated to labor in South Africa and to replace formerly enslaved people
in the Caribbean.[27] As their numbers grew, white North Americans in the
West and in the British dominions became agitated with fears about being
overrun by Asian migrants and losing their right to self-govern on behalf
of the white population. Lake and Reynolds document their response in
the letters, speeches, and friendships formed between politicians in these
far-flung places who shared strategies and supported each other's efforts to
maintain whiteness as their central identity and power. Britain itself drew
a clear distinction between those countries in its empire it viewed as fit
for self-government (the white settler colonies of Canada, Newfoundland,
the colonies in Australia, New Zealand, and the Cape of South Africa)
and those Crown colonies in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, and the Pacific
deemed unfit for self-rule. The self-governing colonies insisted on their
right to manage immigration any way they wished, including their right to
block British subjects, such as Indians, from immigrating. "The imagined
community of white men was transnational in its reach, but nationalist in
its outcomes, bolstering regimes of border protection and national sover-
eignty," they write.[28] The writings that circulated among the political elites
in these places entrenched "the emergent racial dichotomy between whites

and non-whites and the related understanding that democracy was a privilege reserved for whites."[29]

Indian migration within the British empire to the Union of South Africa and Canada shows how this worked. South African authorities concerned about the growing presence of Indians engineered ways to discriminate against both contracted Indian workers and Indian elites through various laws that were meant to encourage them to return to India through disenfranchisement, taxes, prohibitions on property ownership, requirements for biometric registry, and the denial of legal recognition for Hindu and Muslim marriages. Within this process, identification of those targeted written into law and policy shifted from "Asiatics" to "Indians," reflecting the emergence of national identity within the bureaucratic efforts of the Union of South Africa to manage migration. This process "enabled a recoding of the racialized logic of the state as a naturalized logic of nationality,"[30] leading to new efforts within white settler British colonies to correlate race and nation in order to preserve whiteness. Just after the turn of the twentieth century, Indian migration to Canada prompted the country's first passport requirement—"a technology that nationalizes bodies along racial lines."[31] Drawing on the Canadian case, Radhika Mongia argues that "control over mobility does not occur after the formation of the nation-state, but that the very development of the nation-state occurred, in part, to control mobility along the axis of the nation/race. In this way 'nationality' comes to signify a privileged relation between people and literal territory."[32] A fundamental political commitment to white supremacy thus weaves through these histories of imperial and colonial connections.[33]

Similarly, in their corrective critique on silences about race in globalization scholarship, anthropologists Deborah Thomas and Kamari Clarke describe how modern processes of globalization have utilized and reconfigured "deeply embedded social hierarchies and prejudices rooted in a past characterized by territorial concepts of belonging and notions of civilization that both generated and were generated by racial inequalities."[34] They see globalization and racialization as simultaneous and mutually constituting processes, in which "the new transnational political economy . . . has worked through the persistence of an old racial order organized through socially entrenched divisions of labor in which a global working class not only remains in place (as compared to capital, which moves) but also remains segmented along racial, gender, ethnic, and national lines."[35] The shared insistence on racial hierarchy by the United States, Britain, and British dominions had a dramatic global effect. Lake and Reynolds

describe the reverberations in China, India, and Japan of the repeated and insistent performance of white solidarities and kinship across the British empire and the U.S. from the 1870s to the early 1900s: the overthrow of the Qing Dynasty by men seeking to push China to become a modern, racially unified nation in order to confront American and British imperialism; Gandhi's rage that Britain refused to intervene against the appalling treatment of British subjects from India working in South Africa and the demand in India for immediate political reform to create equality with Britain; Japan's fury about the treatment of Japanese immigrants in white settler states and the refusal of those states to accept a racial equity clause in the founding Covenant of the League of Nations following World War I; and the rise of militant forms of nationalism in Japan and elsewhere in reaction to such racial exclusions.[36]

In short, constructions of race and racialized hierarchies created within European feudalism and mercantile capitalism and exported globally through European imperialism and colonialism shaped the creation of modern liberal democracies throughout the world. As the following chapters make clear, these racialized hierarchies are now finding new life within the post-1989 rise of global neoliberalism through processes that differentiate beneficiaries of flexible capital (the global north and the global cosmopolitan elite) from those populations in the global south held in place by border and mobility controls as the global working class. Barnett's presumption that the incorrectly named Non-Integrating Gap lies outside of globalization not only reflects a misperception of the contemporary era but is historically unsupported as well. Later chapters track how these globally connected processes of colonialism, decolonization, and neoliberal globalization unfolded in different parts of the world through the creation of locally specific racialisms within enduring hierarchies.

Throughout these discussions, the argument remains attentive to the malleability of racism—that racism is a process that creates and colonizes difference for its own purposes, using its own essentialisms, even when the categorical constructions embraced by racists are absurd. Take the example of the "coloured" racial category in South Africa, which was created for an explicitly racist purpose as a buffer group to include everyone who the state claimed did not conform to the definition of "whites," "Africans," and "Indians." The coloured category thus included people from widely varied backgrounds, from descendants of the Cape's indigenous populations to people of mixed-race, Malay, and Chinese heritage. The current global war on terror has effected a similar logic in the creation of "Muslim" as a racialized

category subject to racist rhetoric, xenophobia, and specific exclusions. As Ghassan Hage has argued,

> Islamophobic classifications vaguely and continuously fluctuate between the Arab, the Muslim, and "Islam," between the racial phenotypes, the ethnic stereotypes, and the religious generalizations. That is, from the perspective of the racializing subject, it is unclear where the Arab and the Muslim begin and end, where they are separate and where they fuse and where they even go beyond to delineate anyone who in the eyes of the Western racists looks like a "third world person." Both racists and the police, on the lookout for potential "Muslim terrorists," have killed or captured South Americans, Africans, Sikhs, Hindus, Greeks, Southern Italians, and many others. Keeping to the vagueness of racist thought is crucial since it conveys something important about the imaginary nature of the experience itself. Nor is this vagueness, in fact, a problem from a practical perspective. Racists have always managed to be exceptionally efficient by being vague. It could even be said that vagueness, empirical "all-over-the-placeness," contradiction, blocking-of-the-obvious, and even sometimes a totally surrealist grasp of reality, are the very conditions of possibility of the maximal efficiency of racist practices.[37]

Islamophobic classifications that target Muslims as a racialized category to be surveilled, feared, and caricatured have a global reach, promoted through political rhetorics honed in the global north and exported across the world through popular culture and warfare. "The impact of a racialized Islam is a global one," writes Junaid Rana, enlivening border militarization and security regimes around the world, as we shall see.[38]

ON APARTHEID

Before turning to the argument of the book, a very brief review of South Africa's iconic apartheid system, in place from 1948 to 1990, sets the framework. South Africa's apartheid system reflected its particular goals of perfectly aligning race and class and creating a labor regime responsive to the specific needs of industrialized capitalism. Apartheid on a global scale takes inspiration from the original South African model, while accommodating demands for the flexible modes of accumulation inherent to neoliberal capitalism and the creation of a multiracial cosmopolitan elite whose mobility is relatively unfettered because of their class standing. While there

are differences between how global apartheid is unfolding in a context of global neoliberalism and how South African apartheid was linked to industrialized capitalism, the global form iterates the South African model to a striking degree.

Apartheid is a legal edifice that mandates, constructs, and enforces the supremacy of one racial group over another. In South Africa, the apartheid system supported by the National Party after its political victory in 1948 systematized white supremacy through policies and laws designed to manage the "threat" posed by Black people by incarcerating them in zones of containment while enabling their controlled and policed exploitation as workers, upon whose labor South Africa was dependent.[39] The set of policies that came to constitute apartheid in South Africa did not appear in 1948 as a newly designed model of social order; rather, it reflected and expanded colonial-era practices of racial identification and segregation, land dispossession of indigenous people, the restriction of voting rights to white people, divide-and-rule governance practices for Black people, and the exploitation of Black workers—all fundamental components of colonial intervention and control in South Africa that preceded the rise of the apartheid state under the National Party.[40] Apartheid was yoked to white Afrikaner nationalism; apartheid's architects saw their task as a modernist project of statecraft to ensure the system of white supremacy that they believed was their legal (and divinely mandated) right.[41]

Apartheid as a comprehensive, official social system and national policy developed through an unfolding series of policies, laws, and reforms over decades, as the South African government continually refined various dimensions of white supremacy, Black containment, and labor control through legislation, policy, evolving bureaucratic practice, and new security technologies. Although based in a legal edifice, apartheid is also always a process that is continually renewed and refined through law, policy, bureaucracy, and daily engagements. As Deborah Posel explains in her cogent analysis of apartheid's first two decades in South Africa, it was not a "single, coherent, monolithic project," but rather evolved as a mix of dogma and "radical provisionality" to maintain white supremacy in response to shifting contexts and contestations.[42] Over the four decades of its formal existence in South Africa, apartheid's architects continually introduced various tweaks and reforms, as well as altering certain racial categories (allowing for exceptions to rigid racial restrictions for Japanese and African Americans, for example) to manage some of the external and internal pressures produced by the construction of a legal edifice of white supremacy. Apartheid's adaptability and

flexibility was part of its strength, but also a reflection of the enormous work it took to manage the internal contradictions of a system built on hierarchy, exclusion, and oppression.

In brief, South Africa's apartheid order emerged through the creation of mutually exclusive legally defined identities, the sorting of those identities into geographically demarcated areas through mandated residential racial segregation, and the assignment of those identities to different locations in the hierarchical social order. This was accomplished through the creation of four distinct official racial categories (African, Coloured, Indian, and White) into which every single individual was placed, a process accompanied by the delineation of race-based geographical areas and the removal of people rendered "out of place"—because their state-assigned racial identity was not consonant with their residence—in order to create residential zones of racial homogeneity. The removal of people of color from newly designated white space affected 3.5 million Black South Africans, making this process "one of the largest mass removals of people in modern history."[43]

A particularly devious component of the apartheid racial landscape was the creation of new independent "homelands" for Black South Africans identified by the state as "Africans," which enabled their disenfranchisement from areas legally defined as white under the fiction that those in the African racial category could belong to and exercise political rights within their homelands.[44] Created to be ethnic enclaves for Black Africans, the homelands justified the political disenfranchisement of Black Africans from white South Africa and were intended to (re)tribalize Black South Africans, co-opt a resuscitated and traditionalized African leadership, and fragment Black opposition by nurturing distinct ethnic identities: Zulus were assigned to KwaZulu, Xhosa to Transkei or Ciskei, Shangaan to Gazankulu, and so forth. Black South Africans reassigned through removal to one of the homelands found themselves in small, overcrowded, remote, fragmented geographical areas that were far from life-sustaining. Homelands offered little to support their residents: they were infertile places devoid of the modern amenities, education, infrastructure, health care, and service delivery that white South Africans enjoyed, governed through structures and authorities emplaced and managed by the apartheid regime. While the apartheid government promoted the homelands as spaces of cultural authenticity and native belonging for Black people, in reality they functioned as population dumps and labor reserves from which men and women were drawn into white South Africa to work in the mines, on farms, and in domestic service to create profit and comfort for white South Africans.[45] South Africa's famous

mines depended on African labor drawn from the homelands, as well as from neighboring countries, whose extraordinarily poor wages reflected the prohibitions under which they had to offer their labor. African workers were housed in cramped dormitories and forbidden to bring their families; they were not allowed to organize or find paths for upward job mobility; and they were prohibited from settling permanently in their places of employment. Their wages were not intended to support their families left in the homelands, who were instead supposed to be self-sufficient but also responsible for the reproduction of the labor force and the care of the elderly. Influx control policies allowed into white South Africa only those African workers required by South African employers, but the demand for labor was so great that by 1950 58 percent of the African population lived either permanently or part-time in white areas. By 1960 the number had climbed to 63 percent.[46]

The legal presence of all Black workers in white South Africa was contingent on employment. Because the South African economy was heavily dependent on Black workers—"Black life remained the condition of white prosperity," writes Deborah Posel—the government issued passes to Black workers that identified them as employees, and without those passes their presence in white space was illegal.[47] The pass system regulated Black mobility and ensured employer control over workers. The purposeful impoverishment of the homelands and their taxation by the apartheid government ensured a labor supply of Black people who had to seek employment from white people outside the homelands, but as noncitizen guest workers, they lacked the right of democratic participation extended by the state to their white employers.

Black South Africans, of course, refused to comply with removals, border controls, mobility controls, and the pass system, relentlessly moving into white spaces, establishing squatter communities, moving through white spaces without passes, resisting efforts to remove them back to homelands, and, in general, challenging constraints on their mobility and civic rights. The militarized security apparatus required to maintain racial segregation; monitor borders and mobility; catch, detain, and deport people who violated pass laws and residential zoning laws; protect white neighborhoods against Black mobility; watch, police, and supervise the movements of Black people in white territory; and monitor the activities of anti-apartheid activists was not only extraordinarily costly but ultimately unsustainable.

In sum, "apartheid" as it unfolded in South Africa evolved around five key elements. These elements, I argue, are now taking shape systemically on a global scale through a constellation of policies and laws, many of which

have roots in white settler and European colonialism and imperialism. To review, apartheid relies on an essentialized cultural logic that ties people to place through racial and nativist ideologies and discourses (translated globally: just as KwaZulu was for Zulus, Mexico is for Mexicans, Germany is for Germans, Japan is for Japanese, and so forth). Second, ethno-racialized groups and their respective territories created through apartheid practices are unequal because the territories inhabited by people of color are disenfranchised and impoverished by design in order to ensure white supremacy. Third, the delineation of territorial belonging is reinforced by a bureaucratic system of identity documentation (such as passports and visas) and mobility controls that perpetuate racialization. Fourth, in addition to being a system of identity management, racial segregation, and white supremacy, apartheid is also, critically, about the control and exploitation of the labor of people of color. And fifth, because apartheid is exploitive, unfair, and unjust, its maintenance requires a massive, pervasive, continually responsive, and expensive militarized security apparatus. Across all five elements is the role of the state in sanctioning, through law and policy, racial oppression as apartheid's distinguishing feature. As we shall see, a number of specific models of racialized management originating in South Africa's historical experiments with mandated racial hierarchies were adapted in other places for similar purposes, including concentration camps, the pass system, guest worker programs, and biometric registries for risky or undesirable populations.

THE BOOK

To build my argument that we are living in an age of militarized global apartheid, the following chapters show how the contemporary iteration of a racialized world order and a hierarchical labor market dependent upon differential access to mobility on the basis of origin replicates each dimension of apartheid. Chapter 1 offers a set of observations about the co-creation of racialized nativisms in different parts of the world over the past century, with particular attention to the centrality of whiteness to American, European, and Australian governance and national identities, and racial purity to Middle Eastern and East Asian countries. Chapter 2 turns to the question of plunder. Along with imperialist and military interventions, the expansion of systems of "capitalist plunder" engineered by agents of the global north into the global south renders localities in the global south unsustainable or unpromising for ordinary life and provokes out-migration, forcing people from the global south to confront the apparently contradictory demand for

their labor and the militarized borders of the global north in their search for security, employment, and a sustainable life.[48] Containment regimes such as refugee camps, detention centers, and offshore holding facilities designed to interrupt the mobility of those displaced by plunder, military intervention, and other factors are detailed in chapter 3, which focuses most specifically on the effects of policies that criminalize unauthorized immigrants in the U.S. and the EU. Chapter 4 investigates how the global north allows for the controlled and policed border crossing of laborers, even while investing in ever-new forms of containment, drawing attention in particular to the huge importation of labor in Israel and GCC and East Asian countries. Chapter 5 chronicles the massive investments by the global north in militarized border technologies that reach far beyond their territorial borders to manage the movement of people from the global south, both to contain those considered "undesirable" or expendable in detention centers or refugee camps far from the borders of the global north, as described in chapter 3, and to create an exploitable labor force, as described in chapter 4. It also suggests the emergence of new security empires built on regimes of militarism and surveillance that link risky people across borders with risky domestic subjects. Chapter 6 offers reflections on what the demise of apartheid in South Africa might suggest about the global future. The chapters bring different parts of the world into focus—more attention is given to the criminalization of migrants in the EU and the U.S., while the discussion of imported labor turns more to the GCC states and East Asia—but the intention is to build, step by step, a complex and layered portrait of our emerging world order.

Before moving on, it is important to acknowledge that this book takes a much more global and overarching view than the usual focus on nuance that anthropologists typically embrace. This is purposeful. I wish to make visible a totalizing system coming into existence, in the same way that apartheid came into existence: piecemeal, uncoordinated, accretive, iterative, through resonating logics and systemic resonances. I am not suggesting militarized global apartheid was conceived and implemented by a singular group of actors making decisions in common and controlling the world. I am suggesting that an overarching set of logics founded in capitalism, racism, and militarization is moving the world toward a particular overarching structure of mobility controls that, even while the local expressions may be different, nevertheless form part of a broader pattern. One of my goals is to identify and map out these patterns in order to locate weaknesses, points of contradiction, and failures where resistances against militarized global apartheid and new political imaginaries might find success.

Similarly, this broad-brush portrait is not intended as a homogenizing project of the global south. The experiences of people in the global south are not interchangeable or identical. In making a case that the emerging security apparatus across the global north is creating a new militarized global apartheid based on racism I am not arguing that people from the global south experience the apartheid apparatus in the same way. Emplacement matters.[49] Modes of mobility matter. Context matters. History matters. The local significance of Blackness, for example, is made through local meanings and struggles in each place.[50] My effort to highlight a broad, global agenda on the part of the global north to incarcerate, contain, and police those from the global south is not intended to ignore these truths. To the contrary, the diverse accounts about how people from the global south encounter, endure, trick, struggle against, overcome, or get killed by their encounters with the security regimes of the global north reveal the contours across the world of the militarized global apartheid apparatus, but it is these contours and not the diversity of experiences of those struggling against those contours that are the focus here. Just as Black South Africans contested segregation and apartheid throughout the twentieth century, migrants all over the world act in defiance of militarized apartheid, insisting on their right to mobility, demanding political representation and recognition, working with collaborators to build movements demanding justice. The focus of this book is not on their agency; it does not address the creative, persistent energy of people subverting, challenging, overcoming, manipulating, or slipping through the imperial webs of control. Again, this is intentional. The strategies, agency, emotional lives, heartbreaks, and victories of the mobile have been thoroughly plumbed by ethnographers, including myself. Instead, the book responds to challenges by postcolonial scholars to locate and analyze imperialism and to the reminder by Shahram Khosravi of "migrants' fundamental right to opacity, that is, that not everything [about their migratory experiences] should be seen, explained, understood, and documented."[51] My decision to avert my gaze from their lives should not be mistaken for disinterest or ignorance—quite the contrary. My hope is that by bringing the structures of imperialist oppression into relief, those of us committed to a saner, healthier, hopeful world in which people have the opportunities they need for fulfillment and joy can find targets to aim for and dismantle.

INTRODUCTION THE ARGUMENT

1. Besteman 2019 presents a short version of this argument.

2. First circulated as a PowerPoint, the argument later became the basis for an *Esquire* article and a book of the same name (2003, 2004). Barnett also includes in the Functioning Core some of South America, India, and South Africa. He does not include the Gulf states, which are presumably lumped into the Middle East, placed within the Non-Integrating Gap.

3. Comaroff and Comaroff 2012: 45.

4. Comaroff and Comaroff 2012: 46.

5. Trouillot 2001: 128.

6. For details, see Besteman 1999, 2016, 2017.

7. A large literature exists analyzing Somalia's collapse. See Adam 1995; Besteman 1999; Besteman and Cassanelli 1996; Harper 2012; Kaptiejns 2013; Menkhaus 2009; Samatar 1992; Warah 2014.

8. Hammond 2013.

9. Anderson 2009; BBC News 2008; Fergusson 2013; Foreign Policy 2008, 2009; Garvelink and Tahir 2011; Menkhaus 2010; Minter and Volman 2009; Refugees International 2009; Transparency International 2015.

10. See, e.g., Elmi 2010; Harper 2012; Menkhaus 2009.

11. New America Foundation (n.d.). According to New America's International Security Data website, these strikes killed an estimated 1,265–1,443 people, with a marked uptick in strikes over the past few years, from five in 2015 to 52 in 2019 (Bureau of Investigative Journalism 2018, 2019).

12. See Steinberg 2015; see also Abdi 2015; Rawlence 2016.

13. On the proliferation of border walls, see Brown 2010; Miller 2017.

14. Friedman 1999.

15. For anthropological critiques of Thomas Friedman's *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, see Haugerud 2005 and Nordstrom 2005.

16. See Balibar 1999; Booker and Minter 2001; Bowling 2013; Feldman 2012: 115; Hage 2016, 2017: 38; Harrison 2002, 2008; Jacobs and Soske 2015; Lloyd

2015; Marable 2008; Mills 1997; Mullings 2009; Nevins 2008; Richmond 1994; Van Houtum 2010. Booker and Minter define global apartheid as "an international system of minority rule whose attributes include: differential access to basic human rights; wealth and power structured by race and place; structural racism, embedded in global economic processes, political institutions and cultural assumptions; and the international practice of double standards that assume inferior rights to be appropriate for certain 'others,' defined by location, origin, race or gender" (2001: n.p.). Klein (2007: 513) writes of "disaster apartheid" emplaced in zones of militarized occupation, such as the Green Zone in Iraq, where some bodies are offered protection while others are excluded. Kalir (2019) suggests the term *dep‑artheid* as an apt name for policies in Western states that illegalize migrants and cause them to be subjected to violence and mortal danger. Walia uses the phrase *border imperialism* to capture the processes I explore in this book: "Border imperialism is characterized by the entrenchment and reentrenchment of controls against migrants, who are displaced as a result of the violences of capitalism and empire, and subsequently forced into precarious labor as a result of state illegalization and systemic social hierarchies" (2013: 38).

17. Sanjek 1994: 1.

18. Robinson 2000: 1.

19. Robinson 2000: 26.

20. Mills 1997: 1.

21. Mills 1997: 11, emphasis in the original.

22. Mills 1997: 27, 29.

23. Farmer 2004.

24. Losurdo 2011: 219; see also James [1938] 1963; Lowe 2015; Thomas and Clarke 2006; Wilder 2005.

25. Lowe 2015.

26. Lowe 2015: 136.

27. Lake and Reynolds 2008: 23.

28. Lake and Reynolds 2008: 4.

29. Lake and Reynolds 2008: 72.

30. Mongia 2018: 110.

31. Mongia 2018: 113.

32. Mongia 2018: 139.

33. In his revisionist reading of the history of European liberalism, philosopher Domenico Losurdo (2011) offers hundreds of examples from period writings of leading European liberals whose words demonstrate their belief that those outside the white settler world—enslaved people, Indigenous peoples, contract laborers, indentured workers, the colonized—were barbarians over whom a system of white supremacy was justified. The writers tracked by Lake and Reynolds (2008) in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries drew on a long history of liberal discourse that presumed the necessity of racial hierarchy and white superiority.

34. Thomas and Clarke 2013: 306. This point is also echoed by Ann Laura Stoler in her discussion of varied explanations offered by students of colonial history, empire, and modernity about the origins of racialism and racism: that the social and political crafting of racial differences betrays its "capacity and potential to work through sedimented and familiar cultural representations and relations of subjugation that simultaneously tap into and feed the emergence of new ones. Thus, the very 'relevance' of racial distinctions, what makes them speakable, common sense, comfortably incorporated, and ready to be heard, may derive from the dense set of prior representations and practices on which they build and that they in turn recast" (2017: 249).

35. Thomas and Clarke 2006: 7.

36. On the efforts by Chinese revolutionaries and reformists "to mold the nation into a homogeneous, cohesive, monoracial body politic" in reaction against Western imperialists and the Manchu Qing rulers who had colluded with them, see Duara (1997: 52). See also Chan's (2018) nuanced study of the relationship between Chinese migrants and Chinese nationalism, sovereignty, and identity over the past 150 years.

37. Hage 2017: 8–9.

38. Rana 2007: 149. See also Rana (2016) and Selod and Embrick (2013) on the racialization of Muslims.

39. In South Africa, "Black" has historically been used to include people defined as ethnically Black African, Indian, and Coloured, a legal category created for everyone else who does not qualify as "White" (such as people with Khoi, Malay, Chinese, and mixed-race ancestry).

40. The literature on South African apartheid is voluminous. See Frederickson 1981; Mamdani 1996; Thompson 2014; Wolpe 1972. Gordon (2017) offers a very useful and succinct historical overview plus excerpts of the most important documents of the apartheid era. Beinart and Dubow (1995) include key papers explaining the rise of apartheid.

41. Posel 2011.

42. Posel 2011: 319.

43. Michigan State University n.d.

44. The South African government removed people categorized as Indians and Coloureds to separate residential zones, not homelands.

45. This statement is not intended to imply that the homelands did not carry emotional and affective meaning for those who lived there. See Dlamini 2009.

46. Frederickson 1981: 244.

47. Posel 2011: 324.

48. On plunder, see Clarke 2010: 59.

49. Englund 2002.

50. The large literature on Blackness is evidence of this, but see in particular Makalani's argument about intradiasporic racial differences and the essays in Thomas and Clarke (2006).

51. Khosravi 2018.