

Introduction

Few issues have attracted as much discussion in recent years as that of terrorist violence and how it should be countered. Attacks from 9/11, through to events in Bali, Madrid, London, Mumbai, Woolwich and beyond have ensured that the former is never far from the headlines. Sustained and enormous military commitments in Afghanistan and Iraq, prisoner abuse scandals, high-profile assassinations, the restructuring of security bureaucracies, vast financial expenditure and much else besides have served similarly to keep the latter at the forefront of political debate. Within the UK, but beyond this as well, a concerted attempt to uprate and enhance existing anti-terrorism¹ powers has formed a major part of this dynamic, with four separate Acts of Parliament introduced between 2001 and 2008 alone. These Acts built upon substantial existing legal apparatuses in this policy area, not least the Terrorism Act of 2000,² and have included such measures as the (now repealed) power of detention without charge for foreign nationals, increased pre-charge detention periods, a control orders regime now replaced by a framework of Terrorist Prevention and Investigation Measures (TPIMs), greatly enhanced powers of surveillance and data retention, and a spread of new criminal offences such as glorifying terrorism and attending places of terrorist training. Whatever we think of Tony Blair's (2001) claim that '9/11' was a 'turning point in history' (see also Jackson 2005; Jarvis 2009a), it is difficult to argue that little has changed in this policy context in the years that have now passed since those attacks.

Innovations such as these have not passed without controversy. Advocates of still more muscular anti-terrorism initiatives have tended to invoke a need to revisit the always-precarious balance between liberty and security in times of extreme national duress (for example, Meisels 2005). The UK's former Lord Chancellor, for instance, referred to the importance of 'striking the right balance – between security on the one hand and liberty on the other', arguing that 'Getting that balance right is the common

challenge we face – on both sides of the Atlantic’ (Falconer 2006). David Blunkett (2004), former UK Home Secretary, spoke similarly of ‘striking the balance between the security and liberty of the many and the rights of the individuals’. Critics of this logic and the powers it helped render possible (e.g. Cole 2003; Sivanandan 2006; Waldron 2003) have pointed, in contrast, to the pernicious implications of such measures for fundamental principles of democratic life, decrying those agitating for their sacrifice in a misguided quest for greater security.

Why citizenship? Why security?

For a book concerned with the development and experience of anti-terrorism powers in the UK since 9/11, raising the issue of why we focus on citizenship and security may seem unnecessary. It is tempting to suggest that the connection between anti-terrorism, citizenship and security is obvious. Whilst, to some extent, this is the case, their relations merit explicit exploration. In the first instance, anti-terrorism is, at some basic level, about enhancing the security of citizens: or, at least, this is how it is typically justified. In 2009, for example, then Prime Minister Gordon Brown stated: ‘The first priority of any Government is to ensure the security and safety of the nation and all members of the public’ (HM Government 2009: 6). Furthermore, the aforementioned ‘balancing’ of liberty and security draws an implicit connection between the rights and freedoms citizens enjoy (and thus the formal content of citizenship) and the quality or level of security experienced. Taken together, these two points – that the first duty of government is to protect, but that the freedoms citizenship entails create security challenges – point to an ambivalent, and perhaps dichotomous, relationship between the two phenomena. It seems that citizenship may entail both a right to security but also a threat to security.

This point is picked up by Guillaume and Huysmans (2013a). Emphasising a longstanding view of security as a right of citizenship (evidenced, for them, in documents such as the 1789 Declaration of the Rights of Man and the 1948 United Nations Declaration of Universal Rights), they identify a tension, asking: ‘Is it a right to protection by the state, or a right to be saved from oppression, including from the state? ... Declaring security as a right of citizens, and humanity more generally, opens up various ways in which security is connected to citizenship, implying tensions that require negotiation’ (Guillaume and Huysmans 2013a: 3).

Guillaume and Huysmans also note that academic literature, and certainly Security Studies as a discipline, has shied away from examining these tensions, preferring instead to focus either on the security of states (and not citizens)

or on how particular issues become seen as ones of security (see Chapter 2). There is thus (and perhaps surprisingly) a relative lack of consideration of the interrelationship of security and citizenship in both a theoretical and empirical sense. Recent theoretical contributions (Nyers 2009; Guillaume and Huysmans 2013b) have sought to address this lacuna. This volume complements this work with an empirical probing of how citizens themselves think about these phenomena and their relations in the context of anti-terrorism. We thus aim to consider the impact upon citizenship of the UK government's attempts to provide security from terrorism. And we aim to examine the extent to which faith in citizenship and its protections underpins a sense of security from the force of (anti-)terrorism.

To do this, the book concentrates on findings from a series of focus groups we conducted with different communities across the UK, identifying some of the ways in which anti-terrorism powers are understood and evaluated within 'everyday' life. This, in turn, leads us to reflect on the implications of these attitudes for social and political relations; not least, the horizontal relations between different communities in a time of anxiety and suspicion, and the vertical relation between state and citizen in a time of expanding governmental powers. Our reason for attempting to do this is a long-held view that far too much academic and policy debate in this area (and, indeed, beyond it) has been framed in such a way so as to omit – or worse, to preclude – the voices of 'ordinary' people on the dramatic transformations in security politics characterising the post-9/11 period. That this omission may be indicative of more pervasive academic conceits (see Sylvester 2013) is further reason still for researching these otherwise much-studied areas. Our hope, in short, is that this book helps to bring non-elite experiences and understandings of the 'global war on terror' into the centre of discussion thereof.

The chapters that follow seek to do this via an exploration of four related questions. First, and most simply, this book sets out to ask: How are contemporary anti-terrorism powers understood, assessed and discussed by different publics across the UK? Is there, for instance, opposition or support for particular or general measures within this policy area, and can we identify demographic or identity-based dynamics to help explain differences of opinion? Similarly, what types of argument or evidence do people turn to in discussing these powers, and how entrenched are such views in the face of challenge by empirical evidence or counter-argument?

The book's second overarching question is: How do anti-terrorism powers impact on the experience of citizenship within the United Kingdom? Are such powers linked to erosions of civil liberties (for all, or for some), and are other aspects of citizenship – such as the ability to participate in public life – impacted at all by recent initiatives to combat the ostensible terrorist

threat? Third, we ask, how do anti-terrorism powers impact on security in the UK? Do publics feel more or less secure because of anti-terrorism measures, and, if so, why? And how is a complex term such as security even understood within such assessments? Finally, the book seeks to tie these different questions together by exploring how claims about citizenship and security connect to evaluations of anti-terrorism powers. For instance, do people who feel more secure – or more secure in their status as citizens – feel more or less sympathetic towards developments in this area? And how do these three phenomena interact in the everyday life of different UK publics (in their eyes, and in their words)? We thus explore the relations between anti-terrorism powers, citizenship and security as understood and experienced by those potentially subject to the former.

For reasons detailed in the chapters that follow, none of these questions has a straightforward answer that might be applied universally across different publics within the UK. Indeed, the overarching argument we develop is that the relationships between security, citizenship and public policy are far more complex than is frequently recognised in academic debate, irrespective of whether contributors thereto are supportive or critical of anti-terrorism developments. As we attempt to show, while transformations in anti-terrorism frameworks undoubtedly impact on public experiences of security and citizenship, they do not do so in a uniform, homogeneous or predictable manner. At the same time, public understandings and expectations of security and citizenship themselves also seem to shape how developments in anti-terrorism frameworks are discussed and evaluated. In other words, the relationships between these entities are co-constitutive rather than unidirectional. They are also, importantly, multiple, rather than singular. Anti-terrorism powers generate both security and insecurity within different publics; whilst variable feelings of (in)security have variable effects on how such powers are seen. Anti-terrorism powers also, it seems, both diminish and enhance attachment to citizenship across the UK, just as diverse commitments to citizenship shape levels of tolerance to changes to the content or exercise of such powers. To make matters more complicated still, a spread of intervening factors also appear to impact on these relations, including one's prior contact and experience with the state and its policing and legal machineries. Recognising this complexity is vital, we argue, because this illustrates that public support for, dissent toward, or acquiescence in the face of anti-terrorism initiatives is affected by a host of differing experiential, cultural, discursive and other resources. Whether citizens accept, tolerate or resist anti-terrorism powers and changes therein is, in other words, an outcome of active political negotiation.

Underpinning these arguments (and our research questions) are two assumptions which we make explicit at the outset. The first assumption is

that while evaluating the workings or impact of anti-terrorism powers is undeniably difficult – not least given the challenge of accessing relevant information – any assessment thereof requires far more than a balance sheet of successful and thwarted attacks designated ‘terrorist’. In other words, any study of the effectiveness or desirability of recent UK attempts to counter terrorism needs to do more – indeed, perhaps needs to do other – than simply tally up or estimate their role in reducing the occurrence and costs of this form of violence. It is vital, we argue, to undertake a ‘first and second order critique’ (Jackson 2009a: 68) of anti-terrorism powers, in order to develop both an ‘internal’ and ‘external’ assessment of their working. This involves engaging, first, in a critical analysis of anti-terrorism on its own terms: asking whether it achieves its purported ends. And, at the same time, reflecting on ‘the broader political and ethical consequences – the wider ideological and historical-material effects’ (Jackson 2009a: 68) of such powers and their implementation. This critical ethos explains our interest in the impact of anti-terrorism powers on both security and citizenship: an attempt to investigate whether they achieve what they promise, and (if they do so) at what cost.

Our second starting assumption is that the impacts of anti-terrorism powers on security, citizenship or beyond cannot be known objectively. Security and citizenship have a discursive and experiential existence that is neither purely ‘real’ and material nor wholly subjective and limited to the mind of any individual citizen (see Buzan and Hansen 2009: 32–35). Instead, both of these much-discussed entities are better approached, we believe, as articulated, experienced and embodied phenomena. They are brought into being through the perceptions, ideas, language and practices of individual subjects. And, at the same time, these perceptions and ideas are themselves conditioned and made possible by broader social, cultural, political and economic contexts. This is important because it implies that the effects of anti-terrorism powers (or other political frameworks) cannot be known simply by identifying and assessing changes to them (although these are, of course, important). Instead, it is vital, we argue, to engage with those who are, or who might be, or who believe themselves to be, subject to such powers. In seeking to do this, our ambition is to work towards the co-creation of opportunities for those individuals to discuss those impacts – on themselves and on others – in their own terms, and with their own terms of reference.

By exploring these questions, this book attempts to make three broad contributions to contemporary academic debate around anti-terrorism, security and citizenship to which we return at different points in the analysis that follows. In the first instance, the book seeks to add a qualitative depth and complexity to existing studies of anti-terrorism powers and their

impact on public opinions and attitudes. As outlined in Chapter 2, such studies have tended, in the main, to employ quantitative research techniques including survey and polling data, in an attempt to investigate the conditions underpinning support for, or opposition to, specific anti-terrorism measures (for example, Huddy et al. 2002; Davis and Silver 2004; Johnson and Gearty 2007; Joslyn and Haider-Markel 2007). Without diminishing the importance of research of this sort, our approach seeks instead to detail how publics discuss and make sense of developments in this policy area. This, we hope, contributes an empirical richness to existing knowledge that is simply not possible in large-scale statistical exercises. The sacrifice, of course, is any ability to generalise about UK public opinion, or indeed causal relations, within the dynamics we discuss.

Second, this book seeks also to extend recent literature on anti-terrorism policy and citizenship by conceptualising the latter in a far broader manner than existing work in this area. Studies of these two phenomena tend to make two (implicit) assumptions: perhaps for methodological as much as meta-theoretical reasons. The first is that citizenship is associated primarily (or even exclusively) with the possession and exercise of certain rights and liberties that are enshrined and protected within legal frameworks. The second assumption is that transformations in citizenship can be deduced by changes to legal frameworks. Taken together, these assumptions help explain why a straightforward erosion of citizenship is frequently identified in the context of contemporary anti-terrorism powers by critics thereof. Whilst there is much to be lauded in a lot of this work, our approach is one that sees citizenship as an experience that derives from the negotiation of rights but also from the making, meeting or refusal of identity claims, obligations and participation in public spaces (see Delanty 2000). As such, in order to explore the anti-terrorism/citizenship nexus it is vital that publics are offered the chance to describe their own experiences in their own terms, even if these fit poorly with established liberal or republican models of 'the citizen' detailed in Chapter 2. Indeed, as we demonstrate in Chapter 4, for many people in the UK it seems that anti-terrorism powers have impacted upon aspects of citizenship such as participation in public life far more dramatically than they have affected the status of formal rights.

Third, the book also attempts to contribute to debate around the security implications of anti-terrorism policies by exploring these at the relatively unstudied level of the individual citizen, rather than with reference to national security. As detailed in subsequent chapters, our attempt to do this is inspired by often unrelated efforts to recast the referent and status of security within discussions emanating from Security Studies and International Relations. This means that – for us – just as citizenship is something articulated rather than 'given', so too is security. Security, we

suggest, is not a material condition traceable to particular conditions or attributes, as is frequently assumed. It is instead an experience that is given meaning (and again made sense of) through the interpretation of (in the case of this book) ordinary people. Hence, understanding whether ‘we’ are more or less secure because of contemporary anti-terrorism initiatives involves asking, first, whether citizens feel more or less secure because of these initiatives, and, second, what security means in this context. As we argue in Chapter 6, public conceptions of security are fundamental to the ways in which anti-terrorism powers are understood and evaluated, impacting the terrain upon which they are discussed.

Book organisation

The book begins, in Chapter 1, by sketching the parameters and historical development of UK anti-terrorism policy, comparing its efforts to those of other ‘Western’ states. The chapter explores controversies associated with earlier campaigns – especially in relation to Irish republicanism – as well as the extent to which the recent impetus for renewed anti-terrorism legislation derives from widespread claims that al-Qaeda and associated movements present a radically new form of terrorist threat. Our argument is that the UK’s anti-terrorism experience – especially in relation to its use of legal frameworks – is relatively distinctive in that it is characterised by hasty, repeated and continuous activity in which terrorism is approached as a distinct security problem of exceptional significance (Neal 2012; Lister and Otero-Iglesias 2013). Moreover, whilst the UK is by no means alone in pursuing new powers to counter terrorism, it does represent something of a ‘market leader’ in terms of anti-terrorism legislation around the world (Roach 2007).

This backdrop to the subsequent discussion of our empirical findings is important for three reasons. First, by showing that the UK’s approach differs from that of comparable countries, it becomes clear that there is a politics at work in the area of anti-terrorism. Choices and decisions are continuously made about how to confront this threat (although these are often couched as necessary or self-evident), which renders engaging with their implications and impacts – upon people and communities – an even more urgent task. This is compounded, we suggest, by the robust nature of UK initiatives and the potential they have for particular communities and citizens. Second, the UK’s history of anti-terrorism is also sometimes connected by analysts to citizen expectations in relation to this policy context: the repetitive legislating against terrorism is often seen as a response to public demands upon their executives. Engaging with citizen understandings of (anti-)terrorism, then, offers an opportunity to explore such claims in descriptive detail as a way of assessing

the appetite for particular kinds of governmental initiative. Third, this sketch of the UK's anti-terrorist framework also helps clarify the content of the focus group discussions that we explore in subsequent chapters. Although many of our research participants discussed anti-terrorism in general terms, others did make reference to particular powers therein. As such, there is value in being clear on what these are from the outset.³

The book's second chapter introduces the concepts of security and citizenship that underpin our study and establish its guiding rationale. Beginning with security, we argue that its traditional 'home' for analysis in the field of Security Studies has been radically transformed by important recent interventions within two strands of broadly 'critical' literature. The first concerns efforts to position the individual, rather than the state, as security's referent. The second is a focus on the discursive or socially constituted nature of security, insecurity and security threats (evident, for example, in constructivist and poststructuralist debate). We argue that these interventions, approached together, present a powerful call to take seriously citizens' own efforts to articulate security. Doing so, we suggest, facilitates engagement too with self-consciously critical approaches which seek to move Security Studies beyond its traditional elitism.

We then turn to a parallel, yet largely separate, debate around the concept of citizenship and its contemporary 'health' within academic and policy circles. Three general trends relating to the politics of citizenship with particular relevance for understanding anti-terrorism powers are highlighted here. The first concerns political efforts to foster and govern citizenship,⁴ as well as recent academic debate around the responsabilisation (Garland 1996) of citizens. The second concerns claims to the ostensible erosion of citizenship today (for example, Somers 2008; Wacquant 2009) and arguments surrounding the retreat of the state from certain roles and functions. The third refers to questions around heterogeneity, diversity and difference associated (in particular, although not exclusively) with discussions of multiculturalism and the impact thereof upon citizenship. Our aim in considering these debates is to emphasise that in order to assess the effects of anti-terrorism on citizenship, we must situate such measures in prior social, political and economic context. As we show, citizenship, for many authors, has been subject to transformations (which are frequently seen as negative erosions of the category) concerning obligations and rights as well as membership. Thus anti-terrorism powers impact upon a citizenship which, for many authors, is already in the process of being eroded.

Our claim in this chapter is that these developments and the debates they have engendered render an analysis of citizens' understandings of security mechanisms both pressing and urgent, despite the lack of existing research on this (although see Noxolo and Huysmans 2009; O'Loughlin and Gillespie

2012). It is important, we argue, to explore how citizens think about, enact or disrupt citizenship and its associated obligations in their engagement with public policy in areas such as anti-terrorism. This is particularly so if we think that citizenship has a performative and enacted character, such that the erosion of formal rights cannot be taken as a straightforward erosion of citizenship, however pernicious it may be (Isin 2008; Nyers 2010). As we argue, the state–citizen relationship should be understood as a dynamic of negotiation, contest and change to which citizens themselves bring agency. We conclude Chapter 2 by outlining the research design and focus group methodology that underpinned the collection of the empirical ‘data’ on which this book focuses. This includes discussion of epistemological issues surrounding focus group conversations, as well as of the mechanics of how our data was co-constructed with our participants.

Chapter 3 begins the exploration of our empirical findings and reports on the diversity of ways in which citizens evaluate anti-terrorism powers. Sources of scepticism towards these powers include: concerns that they contribute to wider climates of fear, worries that they might drive the alienation of minority communities, questions about their effectiveness, doubts over whether they address the ‘root causes’ of terrorism, suspicions that they are little more than a performative exercise in ‘security theatre’, civil liberties concerns and worries around their application in practice, such that they might be misused by ‘bad apples’ within the police forces or elsewhere. We also, in this chapter, detail more specific public concerns about particular aspects of the anti-terrorism framework including stop and search powers, pre-charge detention and inchoate offences around the glorification of terrorism. The chapter concludes by outlining a range of less-sceptical stances our research uncovered. These included: relief or contentedness that the state is ‘doing something’ to address the threat of terrorism, a perception that robust mechanisms are necessary given the ruthlessness and unpredictability of contemporary terrorism, a sense that sufficient safeguards are in place to prevent abuses of these powers, and ambiguity towards the capacity of ‘ordinary’ citizens to even evaluate such mechanisms.

Chapter 4 builds on Chapter 3 by focusing more closely on the impact of anti-terrorism measures on how citizens understand and enact their citizenship. The chapter begins by arguing for a broad and inclusive approach to citizenship that is characterised by two key features. First, that citizenship is an outcome of the interaction between rights, duties, identity and participation (Delanty 2000). And, second, that it is also subjective and performative, as much as a status that exists formally in law. As Nyers (2010: 96) argues, ‘to understand citizenship it is not sufficient to despair over citizenship’s exclusions; equally important is to investigate the claims about rights, membership and belonging made by excluded populations.’

What emerges from our analysis, we suggest, is a variegated picture. Citizens from a range of ethnic minority backgrounds believe anti-terrorism measures have directly curtailed and diminished their citizenship. This goes beyond simple infringements of rights, to include a retreat from political engagement (or a perception that one's voice does not matter), a declining sense of identification with British citizenship and a lessening sense of duties and obligations to the UK and one's fellow citizens (justified, sometimes, in terms of the British state not upholding its own responsibilities to its citizens). This is in contrast to white participants who, whilst not untroubled about the impact of these measures, generally viewed this as a concern distanced from their everyday lives. This suggests that anti-terrorism measures may be contributing to a condition of 'disconnected citizenship' in the UK. Some individuals enjoy greater confidence in their rights, appear relatively unaffected in terms of their participation and identity, and are content to take up particular duties. For others, in contrast, the perception of diminished rights and targeting by the state contributes to the limiting of political engagement and a declining sense of belonging. The chapter concludes by pointing to several important examples of resistance towards such powers and their impacts that speaks to an exercise of political agency even amongst those who believe themselves targeted by such measures. This further emphasises that, whilst some pernicious effects of anti-terrorism on citizenship can be identified (and were by many of our participants), citizenship is also a category which affords, for some, opportunities and justifications for contesting anti-terrorism measures.

In Chapter 5 we turn to the impact of anti-terrorism policy on public experiences of security within the UK. The chapter begins by reiterating the widespread public scepticism identified in Chapter 3. Reviewing the reasons for this, we argue that a major factor was a pervasive view that security has not been enhanced by recent initiatives in this area. Indeed, some individuals – primarily from ethnic minority communities – believed that their security has been directly diminished by the introduction of new anti-terrorism powers. Understanding this scepticism, we argue, requires a deeper engagement with public understandings of security itself. To demonstrate the importance of this, the chapter explores six distinct ways that participants in our research discussed the concept of security. Here, security was linked to notions of survival, belonging, hospitality, equality, freedom and insecurity, respectively.

Chapter 6 then continues this discussion of the anti-terrorism/security/citizenship nexus. In it, we argue that individuals' underlying conceptions of security have implications for whether they are likely to see security as having been enhanced by anti-terrorism measures. Of greater significance was that the conception of security with which individuals operated strongly influenced

the conceptual and linguistic terrain in which they discussed such measures. Thus, security acted as a frame for discussions of anti-terrorism policy. Those who understood security in terms of social belonging, for example, were primarily interested in the impacts of anti-terrorism measures on community cohesion. This is in contrast to those who conceived of security as 'survival', who discussed anti-terrorism more in terms of effectiveness. Similarly, those who saw security as 'freedom' sought to discuss anti-terrorism measures in terms of whether they enhanced or diminished civil liberties. Thus, in this final chapter, we re-emphasise the interconnections between anti-terrorism, security and citizenship, arguing that security is not simply an end state delivered or otherwise to citizens.

The book's conclusion reviews our findings, arguing that the complex relationships uncovered in the preceding chapters are suggestive of a set of research priorities different to the 'problem-solving' approaches frequently prevalent in research on terrorism. By placing the citizen at the heart of debates around anti-terrorism powers, and by acknowledging the diverse experiences of different citizenships and securities (and the interaction between these), we might move beyond simple binary debates (what is the correct balance between liberty and security; does anti-terrorism policy increase security?) which our research suggests are over-simplifications. In other words, the challenge is to move beyond considering 'how to respond', and instead to ask how anti-terrorism functions, what effects it has, and how experiences of citizenship, security and related phenomena play a significant role in how different publics think about and relate to such powers.

Notes

- 1 Throughout the book, we use the term 'anti-terrorism', rather than 'counter-terrorism'. Whilst there is considerable overlap between the two (and in some instances, they are used interchangeably), we understand the former to refer to defensive, reactive strategies to combat terrorism, and the latter to more proactive, aggressive (often military-led) interventions. The exception to this is if we are citing an author who explicitly uses the term 'counter-terrorism'; in such instances, we preserve the author's original usage.
- 2 These are, in chronological order: 2001 Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Act; 2005 Prevention of Terrorism Act; 2006 Terrorism Act and 2008 Counter Terrorism Act.
- 3 As detailed further in Chapter 2, our research design included providing participants in our research with an information sheet detailing controversial aspects of the UK's post-9/11 anti-terrorism framework.

- 4 Examples include the introduction of citizenship classes in schools to arrest phenomena such as falling electoral turnouts, and the publication of the Cattle Report following civil unrest in northern towns in the summer of 2001: a report designed to promote social cohesion between ethnic groups. As recently as 2007, the government green paper, the Governance of Britain, also invoked citizenship as a means of enhancing and strengthening British identity and values.