

DEEPA KUMAR
ARUN KUNDNANI
Racism & Surveillance
Rosemont, Illinois 9 July 2014

Deepa Kumar is an Associate Professor of Media Studies and Middle East Studies at Rutgers University. She is the author of *Outside the Box: Corporate Media, Globalization and the UPS Strike* and *Islamophobia and the Politics of Empire*. She appears on numerous media outlets around the world.

Arun Kundnani is an Adjunct Professor of Media, Culture and Communication at New York University, and teaches terrorism studies at John Jay College. He has been a Visiting Fellow at Leiden University, Netherlands, and editor of the journal *Race and Class*. He is the author of *The End of Tolerance: Racism in 21st Century Britain* and *The Muslims are Coming!*

ARUN KUNDNANI: The analysis of surveillance that you're going to hear from Deepa and me I think brings a perspective that you won't get in the corporate media because there's a number of things that are missing from the mainstream discussion of surveillance that are actually essential if we want to understand how the national security state functions and if we want to build effective movements to oppose it.

The first point here is that we need to be able to understand that racism is central to national security surveillance. It's racist fears that legitimize surveillance to the public, it's racist ideas that form the basis for the ways in which surveillance is organized and deployed, and it's racialized groups who have actually been the most effective in making sense of surveillance and organizing against it. This is as true today as it has been historically. Deepa and I will each be presenting different aspects of how race and surveillance are intertwined in the history of the U.S.

The second point here is that we need to understand that the history of national security surveillance is inseparable from the history of empire. There is a constant flow in the history of the national security state between sites of colonial and neocolonial conquest and sites of oppression within the U.S. We continuously have initiatives and practices and ideologies of surveillance that have emerged in the context of overseas empire coming back home to be used against radical movements within the U.S. and vice versa. So you have this to-and-fro movement.

Unfortunately, the debate that we've seen on surveillance over the last year, since Edward Snowden's whistleblowing, has been conducted in a very abstract and very legalistic and very technical manner. So on the one hand, if you look at what most civil liberties advocates have to say, they tend to be very focused on the technical details of potential legal reforms and new oversight mechanisms. But those kinds of initiatives are likely to bring little change, because they fail to confront the racist and imperialist core of the surveillance system. On the

other hand you have technologists, who believe that the problem of government surveillance can be solved by using better encryption tools. But that kind of argument just avoids the politics of surveillance entirely. Meanwhile, you have the executives of U.S. tech corporations who express concerns about loss of sales to foreign customers, who are concerned about the privacy of their data. So in Washington and in Silicon Valley, what should be a debate about basic political freedoms is simply a question of corporate profits. Part of the difficulty here is that the reporting of national security surveillance that we've had so far in the media has given us more information about what data is collected by the NSA than about how that data is actually used.

But there is, I think, a deeper problem here in some of the images of state surveillance and some of the metaphors of state surveillance that are prevalent and that actually don't quite fit the actual situation that we have right now. So, for example, Edward Snowden himself, like many others, has referred to George Orwell's *1984* as a kind of image of what government surveillance looks like today. And, in fact, sales of Orwell's *1984* are said to have massively soared over the last year. The argument that digital surveillance is a new form of Big Brother is on one level supported by the evidence. So for those in certain targeted groups, whether you think of left-wing campaigners, radical journalists, Muslims, for example, state surveillance certainly looks like it has this character of being something from a kind of classic image of a totalitarian state. We have a situation where the intense scrutiny of particular groups is tolerated by the majority because the majority are able to get on with their lives largely untroubled by government spying.

So in this sense we're confronted with a quite different picture from the kind of image of *1984*, which assumes an undifferentiated mass population subject to government control. What we have instead today in the U.S. is total surveillance not on everyone but on very specific groups of people defined by their race, by their religion, or by their political ideology. So when National

Security Agency officials say things like to they only focus on “the bad guys”—this is the phrase that’s always used—what’s going on with that phrase, “the bad guys”? It’s coding certain groups as suspect, defined by their racial, religious, or ideological affiliations.

There is a line from March of this year by the deputy director of the NSA, Rick Ledgett, who says, “Contrary to some of the stuff that’s been printed, we don’t sit there and grind out metadata profiles of average people.” “Average people,” right? “If you’re not connected to one of those valid intelligence targets, you’re not of interest to us.” Let’s take him at his word. The point here is that in the national security world, that phrase “connected to” can be the basis for targeting a whole community even if “average people,” a phrase that he uses, i.e., people without radical opinions or who do not belong to one of his targeted racial or religious groups, are left alone.

If you’ve been following the legal debate about the NSA, you keep getting this example of the pizza parlor. Have you come across this? This discussion of the surveillance works by what’s called hops. So if you’ve called a phone number that an intelligence target has called, then you’re two hops away from that intelligence target, because that intelligence target has called one number and you’ve called the same number. That’s two hops, it’s called. So the question is, How many hops is a legitimate spread of surveillance? The example that you find in the legal debate, if a terrorist has called a pizza parlor and ordered pizza, everyone else who has ordered pizza from that same place is a target because they’re two hops away. It’s a lovely image, because it captures that idea of, oh, no, the all-American pizza eater is being targeted. The reality is that’s not how surveillance works. Surveillance doesn’t go via the pizza parlor; it goes via the mosque or the political organization. So we’re kind of disavowing the reality of the situation we face here.

A brief survey of the history of national security surveillance in the U.S. is useful here. Obviously, surveillance is as old as the modern state itself. As soon as a population is defined as “the people” and associated with a particular state and a particular territory, which is the birth of the modern state, there is also necessarily a non-people, the population that’s not supposed to be in that territory and is seen as a threat—Native Americans in the case of the United States. So racism and the modern state are born as twins. From the beginning, both the people, and especially the non-people, need to be available to the surveillance gaze of the state and as part of its mechanisms of power. Deepa is going to be looking at how surveillance can be traced back to the early origins of U.S. settler colonialism.

I want to begin with the moment at which I think you first get a specialist agency created within the U.S. state that takes on the responsibility of generating systematic and widespread surveillance of political opponents and using personal information and its manipulation as a form

of political control. That agency emerges not in Washington but in the U.S. colonial regime in the Philippines, when a unit within the police there called the Constabulary Information Section is established in 1901. It’s founded by someone called Henry Allen, who was a former military attaché to the Czarist regime in Russia and probably learned techniques of political intelligence from the Okhrana, the secret police in Russia, in the 1890s.

This unit in the Philippines cultivates hundreds of paid Filipino informants across the country. And Henry Allen, the founder, writes to President Theodore Roosevelt saying that “Through this method it has become scarcely possible for seditious measures of importance to be hatched without our knowledge.” It sounds very familiar. This technique of compiling dossiers on dissidents’ private lives and then spreading disinformation in the media, planting agents provocateurs among militants, this is where you see this come to be deployed systematically the first time, in combating radical nationalist groups in Manila who are fighting against U.S. colonialism. Control over information proves as effective a tool of colonial power as physical force.

Then during World War I, as the historian Alfred McCoy writes, “Police methods that had been tested and perfected in the colonial Philippines migrated homeward to provide both precedents and personnel for the establishment of the U.S. internal security apparatus. After years of pacifying an overseas empire where race was the frame for perception and action, colonial veterans came home to turn the same lens on America, seeing its ethnic communities not as fellow citizens but as internal colonies requiring coercive controls.” So on this basis a domestic national security apparatus emerges, with race and empire at its core.

By the late 1950s, the FBI’s COINTEL program systematized these techniques, using agents provocateurs and informants to infiltrate the left, Puerto Rican nationalists, the student movement, the civil rights movement, and black liberation movements. About 1,500 of the 8,500 American Communist Party members were likely to be FBI informants in the early 1960s. By the end of the decade, agents who had previously worked in U.S. foreign intelligence were transferred to the burgeoning field of domestic intelligence, to spy on the radical movements of the 1960s.

A key part of the strategy was the manipulation of political activists into committing criminal acts so that the FBI could arrest and prosecute them. These agents provocateurs working for the FBI initiated disruptions of meetings and demonstrations, fights between rival groups, attacks on police, bombings, and so forth. Famously, in an attempt to so-called “neutralize” Martin Luther King, who the FBI worried, “might abandon his obedience to white liberal doctrines,” as indeed he did, he was placed under intense surveillance and attempts were made to destroy his marriage and induce his suicide. In various cities the

Black Panther Party was disrupted by using fake letters and informants to stir up violence between rival factions and gangs and, in a number of cases, the direct assassination of Black Panthers by police departments or federal agents was carried out.

The COINTEL program was eventually revealed in 1971, when antiwar activists broke into an FBI field office in Media, Pennsylvania, and stole classified documents. But those responsible for the program were never brought to justice for their activities, and similar techniques continued to be used thereafter, right up to the present day. For example, in the 1980s, the same techniques were used against the American Indian Movement and against the Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador.

So it's the radical left, it's antiwar activists, it's racial justice and black liberation campaigners, opponents of U.S. foreign policy in Latin America and the Middle East who have lived this history of national security surveillance and understand its effects most deeply. Crucially, that history is inseparable from the history of state racism and empire. Yet that history and that experience is usually left out of the surveillance debate. Those moments I've been describing are usually seen as at most temporary and exceptional excesses rather than a kind of continuous and ongoing reality.

Now I want to turn to some of my own primary research on surveillance. In 2011, I carried out interviews with FBI agents and other law enforcement officers working on counterterrorism in Texas, Minnesota, Michigan, Virginia. I also interviewed security officials in the Department of Homeland Security, National Security Council in the White House. I was interested in the conceptions that law enforcement agencies have of the Muslim populations that they have under surveillance and how those conceptions shape the surveillance practices they enact.

There are three key points I want to make here: the first is how, through the structures of national security surveillance, Muslims are constructed as a racial "other"; the second is how surveillance of Muslims relates to empire and foreign policy; and the third is what the experience of surveillance actually looks like for, in particular, Muslims who are experiencing it.

Let me begin with the question of race and surveillance in relation to Muslims. Here I think we need to begin by understanding that Islamophobia, if you want to use that word, is part of a longer history of racism in the U.S. When I was in Texas doing research, I visited a restaurant, and on the wall of this restaurant you see a poster, one of those classic images of a lynching that took place in the early 20th century, a body hanging from a tree, a group of people looking quite pleased with themselves in front of that. Where you would normally see a black face in that photograph, a kind of stereotypical image of an Arab had been superimposed, and then underneath, the caption that had been written was "Let's

play cowboys and Iranians." It's a shocking image. But what was striking to me about that image is how it captures the kind of racial history of the U.S. So with the reference to Indians you have a reference implicitly to the genocide of Native Americans, you have the obvious reference to the history of Jim Crow segregation in the South, and then, as it were, the final layer on top of this racial history is the kind of anti-Muslim racism that comes at the end of that.

I think the notion today of the Muslim extremist that recurs in our popular culture as much as in the imagination of the national security state is the latest version of earlier images of so-called extremists. Malcolm X and Martin Luther King were both systematically called extremists. The use of the word "extremist" goes back to British colonialism in India. As far as the English language use of that word is concerned, the first use of "extremist" is a label to demonize people fighting for independence from British colonialism in India. So you have the extremists, who want independence, and the moderates, who are happy with some kind of soft reform that still leaves British colonialism in place.

When I interviewed government counterterrorism officials about how they viewed Muslims, the key concept that they draw on is the idea of radicalization. So if we want to understand national security surveillance today, we need to understand the official so-called models of radicalization that the state uses, which claim to be able to predict which individuals are not terrorists now who might be at some later date. But how do you identify tomorrow's terrorists today? Here I think it's worth recalling Steven Spielberg's 2002 film, *Minority Report*, in which you have and specialist pre-crime unit that's imagined using psychics called "precogs" who can predict the murderers of the future. So this unit in the film is then able to arrest so-called "pre-criminals" before they have committed the crimes for which they're convicted.

This is essentially how the War on Terror works. We don't have a "precogs" capability, but we have security officials who believe they have that ability to predict the future using these kinds of academic models that have come out of terrorism studies departments in universities, with very bogus scholarship, models with which they can identify certain behavioral, cultural, and ideological signals that reveal who is at risk of turning into a terrorist at some point in the future. So, for example, in the FBI's radicalization model, such things as growing a beard, starting to wear traditional Islamic clothing, becoming alienated from one's former life are all listed as indicators, as is "increased activity in a pro-Muslim social group or political cause." It should be apparent how signifiers of Muslimness, if you like, such as facial hair, dress, and so on are being turned into markers of suspicion, how the surveillance gaze is also a racial gaze, and how counterterrorism involves construction of racial "others."

My second point, how surveillance relates to empire

and foreign policy. The War on Terror, with its vast death toll in Afghanistan, Iraq, Somalia, Yemen, and Pakistan, could not be sustained without the racialized dehumanization of its Muslim victims. So racism at the home goes hand in hand with empire abroad. That coupling comes across very clearly, even in the interviews I was doing with FBI agents. When I visited the FBI field office in Houston, Texas, when you walk into their kind of counterterrorism control room, where they have these kinds of boys' toys of big screens and computers and gadgets and so forth, one of the things you notice is they have a row of clocks along the top of the room with all the different time zones in the U.S., but then also the time zone in Iraq and the time zone in Afghanistan. So in terms of how they conceptualize the very time that they're in, they're locating themselves not just as a domestic law enforcement agency but as part of this wider project of empire.

Many of those FBI agents I interviewed, when I asked the question, "Where do you get the expertise to be able to do this work on counterterrorism?" said, "Well, I'm a former Marine. I used to do counterinsurgency in Somalia, and therefore I know how to do this stuff because of that military experience." When I asked them, "What did you do? What are the skills that you are transferring?" they would say, "When I was in Somalia, I did counterinsurgency, which meant that I was trying to identify which so-called tribal leaders were the enemy and which were the friends, and then building relationships with the friends and going after the enemy. So when I'm now doing counterterrorism in Texas, I do the same thing: I try and identify the tribal leaders of the Muslim community in Houston, Texas, and I try and identify the enemies."

So we have counterinsurgency theory, is what's going on here. Counterinsurgency theory is the theory of how to maintain a colonial regime in the face of popular insurrection. It presents itself as a hearts-and-minds strategy, but it's essentially a tool of power. So when you see these models coming back, you know that we are in a situation where the domestic space is being militarized; the war is coming home. That's obviously something that happened with COINTELPRO as well. COINTELPRO was about the conflicts over the Vietnam War coming home and the war coming home.

The third point, what the experience of surveillance looks like for Muslims. I'm not going to go into a lot of detail here, but essentially, when you put that kind of radicalization model into practice, what you want to do is to be able to collect every aspect of Muslim life, you want to be able to know about it so that you can spot these so-called warning signs that you believe you have. That's why we've seen mass surveillance from the FBI, from the New York Police Department of Muslim communities. We have a situation where the NYPD has deployed very large numbers of informants and undercover agents to

every place where Muslims might meet. We have a situation where the NYPD is effectively subsidizing the Arab American and South Asian restaurant sector in New York by the number of agents they're sending in to sit and have meals there. What about the FBI? As of 2008, the FBI had a roster of 15,000 paid informants.

When you do the numbers, the number of informants and intelligence analysts working on Muslims in the U.S. looks roughly similar to the number that were deployed by the Stasi to surveil the East German population under the Stalinist regime in East Germany. When you have that number of informants, you also then have entrapment, agents provocateurs. I believe there are some of you in the room here who are working on the Justice for Youth campaign in Massachusetts, which is one of the most extreme cases of this kind of attempt to entrapment, where someone's own wife was recruited as an informant. And we have cases where that kind of intent to entrapment ends in the police actually killing someone, like Luqman Abdullah in Detroit, who was killed as the end result of an FBI entrapment operation.

We're also starting to see a growing movement in opposition to this. So we have three cases over the last two or three years where we're starting to see communities organizing effectively against this. It's not from the legal process in D.C. that we're going to get an end to the surveillance state, it's not through better encryption tools. It's through community organizing. In New York, we've had a situation where we're starting to win the argument that this kind of surveillance by the New York Police Department is a form of racist profiling. So we've had something called the Demographics Unit, which was one of the components of that surveillance, shut down in March of this year. In the Bay Area, we've had a successful campaign that has shut down a planned so-called Domain Awareness Center, which would have been one of these hubs of surveillance that would have focused on Muslims, amongst other groups, funded by the Department of Homeland Security. Grass-roots organizing shut it down. And the same in Los Angeles, where the planned Los Angeles Police Department Demographics Unit was shut down because of campaigning a few years ago.

In all of these cases the lesson here in terms of the strategy for campaigning is that these campaigns were successful, or at least partially successful, because they built alliances between different groups. So in New York, by naming the surveillance of Muslims as a form of racial profiling, it became possible to build alliances with other communities who were also experiencing different kinds of racial profiling—African Americans and Latinos experiencing stop-and-frisk policies. Then you're not just one voice; you're part of a much broader movement in trying to take these things on and change all these interlinked structures within the police department. So the lesson here is that while surveillance aims at kind of

creating fear and division and demonization, when communities organize and build these kinds of alliances across different groups, they're able to overcome that fear. Those alliances have to be founded on real shared experiences of oppression, not just on abstract slogans. To the extent that the national security state targeted the Occupy movement and the antiwar movement, radical journalists and campaigners and whistleblowers, these groups are going to be an important part of any movement against the national security state.

But once we understand the centrality of race and empire to national security surveillance, we also find a basis for unity across different groups who experience similar kinds of racialized policing: Muslims targeted in the War on Terror, Latinos and Asians targeted in the War on Immigration, and African Americans targeted in the War on Drugs. It's on such a basis that I think we can see the beginnings of an effective opposition to the national security state. Thank you.

DEEPA KUMAR: In 1989, Oscar Gandy, a scholar of communication in an essay titled "The Surveillance Society," argued that electronic communications had dramatically increased the surveillance capacities of corporations as well as the government. So, in other words, already by the 1980s corporations not only surveilled, tracked, and controlled their workers, but found ways to more effectively market to consumers through consumer surveillance. Think of the last time you made a call to a customer service agent and you were told that the call is going to be recorded for quality assurance purposes. This is about controlling the worker and it is about better selling to you, the consumer.

Gandy also talked in this essay about government surveillance. He says, "The U.S. government is both the single largest user and greatest supporter of computer and telecommunications systems surveillance capacity." And within government he identified the key surveillers as the Department of Defense, the CIA, the NSA, and the FBI. He ends the article in the following way: "What hope is there for resistance?" And he answers, "Resistance can be mobilized in response to well publicized cases of abuse. The potential for resistance is always present, and a rather high level of awareness and concern suggests that it rests just beneath the surface waiting to be released."

To me, this is the real significance of the Snowden leaks, because by laying out the extent of NSA surveillance and making public a map of surveillance in the digital era, with real proof, the kind of proof that only an insider who is a whistleblower can actually provide, he has generated alarm and made people aware of the extent of intrusive surveillance in the society today.

The question, then, is how to resist? As Arun mentioned earlier, much of the discussion in the post-Snowden era has focused on questions of privacy. As he argued, this is a very limited way of actually looking at

this issue, and we need to look at it in the context of empire. I think he also made clear how empire is not just something that happens out there, but it's what happens right here as well.

I think that rather than talk about this in terms of hypocrisy and double standards, which it most certainly is, it's more useful to talk about how an imperial nation state develops practices internally as well as externally to further the agenda of empire. With that in mind, I'm going to make three arguments in my presentation. First, I'm going to argue that the current surveillance of Muslim Americans is both a product of counterinsurgency tactics coming back home, as Arun outlined, but also the product of mechanisms of racial control that actually go back to the very foundation of the American nation state. I'll come to what I mean by racial control shortly. U.S. imperialism doesn't begin with the Spanish-American War of 1898 and that, in fact, we need to look at settler colonialism as informing not only the logic of security but the current national security state.

Second, I'm going to argue that to understand the post 9/11 national security state from which the current surveillance regime emerges, it's important to look at the national security state as it develops in the post-World War II era. In 1947, the National Security Act was passed, which set in motion a complete overhaul of U.S. society in such a way that security became the key lens through which American society functioned. And every aspect of life—the social, political, intellectual, the economic—was reconceived on the basis of a consideration of national defense and the drive to build and maintain a massive, permanent security establishment. Of course, some parts of the national security state were modified and even curtailed after the movements of the 1960s and 1970s. In relation to surveillance, for example, the Church Committee report put some limits on government spying, the Handschu Guidelines did the same for the NYPD, and so forth. But 9/11 was the occasion from which to do away with all of these restrictions and to re-launch the new national security state.

The third argument that I will be making is that putting these two strands together, security is the new means by which racism operates in the post-racial era. That is, in a period where it's no longer possible to be blatantly racist, although this certainly doesn't stop the far right, the term "security," at least in mainstream society, becomes the coded means to create racialized threats to the white population. These threats range from petty crimes, drugs, gang violence that black and brown people are supposedly engaged in, or it can be the threat to jobs, that is, jobs lost to illegal immigrants, or the threat to one's life posed by the brown terrorist.

These racialized threats have seen the emergence of new forms of racial control. So to add to what Michelle Alexander refers to as "the new Jim Crow" or the system of mass incarceration, we have also seen the rise of mass

deportation. Over 2 million people have been deported under the Obama administration, and we've seen the rise of mass surveillance. What brings these different systems of racial control, mass incarceration, mass deportation, and mass surveillance together is the logic of security that says that the imperial state is necessary to keep whites safe from threats abroad and threats right here. It's in this sense that the new psychological wage is security, and it is used to win the support of the white working classes for empire in the age of neoliberalism. Resisting it, therefore, isn't just a question of individual privacy; it's about organizing against the priorities of empire.

Let's start at the beginning of the foundation of settler colonialism. Here I'm drawing on Theodore Allen's two-volume series called *The Invention of the White Race*, which, if you haven't read it, I would highly recommend.

He argues in this book—from the title it must be obvious—that the white race didn't always exist. Historians, actually, who have studied Virginia's colonial records show that there were no white people until the end of the 17th century, and that the people who immigrated to this country from England actually thought of themselves and thought of their children as English, not as white. Whiteness as a racial identity had to be cultivated very carefully over a period of a few decades before it could become synonymous with European American.

The key motivation for the invention of whiteness, Allen argues, was the solidarity between African and Anglo bond workers who, recognizing their common interests as workers, organized collectively and fought back to demand an end to the entire system of indentured servitude. This united working-class rebellion, which is known as Bacon's Rebellion, shook the Anglo elite to their core. Their plantation system was reliant on the need for workers who would toil under arduous conditions and make super profits for them. In this instance, when they saw black-white unity, that threatened not only their profit system but the entire plantation system.

In response to Bacon's Rebellion, and over a period of three decades, the Virginia Assembly passed a series of acts that deliberately sought to drive a wedge between black and white workers. Whites were granted a few benefits by law, and black workers were turned from bond workers, who could therefore expect to be free after the bond expired, into slaves, into property, with absolutely no hope of freedom. So here you have one of the first instances of define and rule, where the law is used to define a whole group of people as different from "us," read white people, which then becomes the basis from which to disenfranchise them, that is, to deny them basic rights. But define and rule really is a corollary to divide and rule, which involves instituting a set of privileges for poor whites as a way to win them to the side of the plantation bourgeoisie.

What are some of these benefits? Allen goes into a whole bunch of them. I'll just say one. White men, in

particular, could rape black women. Black women at the time were slaves, they were property, they had no rights, and therefore if you raped a black woman, it was not a crime. If anything, it was considered a crime to the property of the slave owner, and reparations were paid the owner. These were some benefits that Allen lays out.

W.E.B. Du Bois, in his book *Black Reconstruction*, uses the term "psychological wage" to describe these benefits that were given to whites. He argues that it is through this psychological illusory wage that white working classes, who have absolutely no interest in the system created by white elites, give their loyalty to white elites. Marx, of course, also writes about this, famously, when he says, "The ordinary English worker hates the Irish worker, and in relation to the Irish worker finds himself a member of the ruling nation. His attitude is much the same as that of poor whites to the Negroes."

In Volume 1, actually, Allen does talk about the Irish case, and he does a comparative analysis of British control over the Irish and the ways in which mechanisms of social control established in relation to Ireland traveled to the new world to be applied against African Americans and Native Americans, and vice versa. In a nutshell, what he lays out is that the way in which the British elites secured control over Irish land and labor in the U.K. context and over Native American land and African American labor in the New World was through creating systems of racial oppression. Allen doesn't use the term "racial control." Rather, he talks about social control through racial oppression. But I like that term, "racial control," and I find it useful because it immediately connotes mechanisms of coercive control, which I think is kind of important in this so-called post racial era, where racism is seen as just individual utterances by the likes of Donald Sterling or Paula Deen, what have you, and if you punish those people, that's the end of it, there will be no more racism.

The term "racial control," The way I want to use it, has both an ideological as well as a structural coercive dimension. The way it works is through a process of define and rule that is always and intimately tied to divide and rule. Here's how the logic goes. First, a group of people are racialized and defined as different from us in terms of the law. This becomes the basis, as I said earlier, to disenfranchise them and give "us" rights. In the case of Muslim Americans, the process is one where religion, as Arun mentioned earlier, becomes the basis on which a group of people is literally conjured into being. And this race of people, so defined, is then categorized as prone to violence and to terrorism, which is what, as Arun said, theories of radicalization work to do.

This then justifies mechanisms of control through the law. The mechanisms of control include everything from surveillance, which is the subject of today's panel, to arbitrary arrests, indefinite detention, deportation, torture, either physical or mental, through solitary confinement, the use of secret evidence, sentencing for crimes that we

would never be jailed for, such as speech, donations to charitable organizations, and other such things that are considered material support for terrorism and so forth.

The flip side of define and rule is a process of divide and rule, where we, the white majority, are cultivated to think of them as threats to us, threats that the national security state therefore must protect us from.

Now a quick history of the emergence of the national security state in the post-World War II era. Of course, the language of national security doesn't begin in the Second World War period. It goes back at least to the first half of the 20th century. But historians have argued that it's only after Pearl Harbor that national security actually takes on significant policy implications in this country. The historian Paul Hogan, who studied some of the foundational documents that led to the 1947 National Security Act, summarizes the mindset and the thinking that emerged in the post-Second World War era as follows: "There was a conviction that a new era of total war has dawned on the United States. In total war the battle was not confined to the front lines but extended to the home front as well, as did the awesome destruction that modern weapons could inflict not only on military combatants but also on industry, urban centers, and civilian populations. Modern war was total war in the sense that modern armies depended on the output of citizen soldiers in farms and factories behind the battle line."

Here you see the continuation, really, of the settler colonial mentality. In fact, Cold War liberals very deliberately use the Manifest Destiny doctrine. Whereas earlier the Manifest Destiny doctrine meant white American settlers were to expand through the entire continent and they were the special, chosen people and so forth, in the post-World War II era it was about extending Manifest Destiny around the world. This is why, of course, in large part there was very little resistance to the incarceration of over 100,000 Japanese Americans, the vast majority citizens, because it's a very racialized notion of American exceptionalism and U.S. imperialism.

Anyway, to go back to the quote, "In total war, all of the nation's resources and all of its energies and talent have to be mobilized on behalf of the war effort, thereby obliterating the old distinction between civilian and military, between citizen and soldier, between home front and front line. When American leaders talked about total war, they did so in these terms and also in terms that recognized that modern weapons could bring massive destruction from great distances with barely a moment's notice. In the new age, American leaders would no longer have the time to debate the issue of war or peace, or to prepare at a slow pace." So this preparation at a rapid pace for this new world of total war. Which, by the way, really echoes the post-9/11 world-is-a-battlefield doctrine, which you may know about.

Preparation for this era of total war meant the

creation of a permanent national security state. And in 1947, the National Security Act created the office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the National Security Council, the CIA. In 1952, the NSA gets formed. What you see during this period is not just the formation of permanent security-based government agencies like the ones I just mentioned, but also the integration of corporate America, of universities, of research institutions, of the media, and so on and so forth, into the apparatus of the national security state. The end result is that every aspect of American society was reconfigured through the lens of security so that the citizen/soldier, home front/battle front distinction was blurred to create a system of empire at home and abroad.

To sustain such a system, lots of things are needed. One of them is surveillance. So in 1945 the government created a mass spying program, known as Project Shamrock, which the NSA then takes over in 1952, since it was conceived as an organization whose primary task was intelligence gathering. The telecom companies at that time hand over all of the telegrams that came into and went out of the U.S. And if the program starts off as a sort of war intelligence system, and later as a way to stem the Red Menace, by the time the 1960s come around, the NSA is sucking up as many as 150,000 telegrams a month sent, the vast majority sent by ordinary people (fixed).

As you can see, there are clear parallels to what is going on today. In other words, the current national NSA surveillance program is not an anomaly, I want to argue, it's not an abuse of power in an otherwise fair and balanced system, although it is a violation of constitutional rights. Rather, the NSA is doing exactly what it was designed to do by the national security state, which is to monitor and defuse threats to empire. So this is why, as the 1950s become the 1960s and 1970s, another project, Project Minaret, was launched which targeted civil rights leaders, antiwar protesters, and anyone seen as a civil disturbance threat.

I'm going to move on quickly. We come to the era of neoliberalism, which is the era that begins in the 1970s. Social control becomes even more important during this era, because as the 1970s become the 1980s, not only were the gains of the social movements of the previous era attacked, but a one-sided class war was waged against working-class people. The end result of this four decades of class war is a massive class polarization and a new regime of the 1%. If there was something like a social contract back in the decades before the 1970s, where if the white working classes played by the rules and behaved themselves, they could expect to see improvements in their wages and living standards and so on, after the 1970s this is no longer possible, because neoliberalism tore up the social contract.

Ending the social contract necessarily meant the intensification of social control. I think this is the context in which we can understand the increasing militarization

of American society: things like metal detectors in schools, airport security that looks more like a military checkpoint, police departments using military equipment, counterinsurgency tactics developed in war zones being used for crowd control back at home. So, for instance, Israeli tactics developed to control Palestinians under occupation are now routinely used by private security firms at sporting events, at football games, at the Olympics, and so forth. The nonlethal weapons used by Israel in Gaza are now used in public demonstrations against citizens in major cities around the world. Security zones, like the U.S.'s Green Zone in Baghdad, become models for security zones being constructed around financial centers in London and New York City. The new national security state that has emerged in the aftermath of 9/11 is really version 2.0, because not only does it carry over many of the features of the old Cold War national security state, but it has been amped up to cater to the intensified need for social control in a massively class-polarized neoliberal era.

Of course, given the privatization of many of the state's military functions, the military-industrial complex that Eisenhower warned about famously, has now become even more integrated and ubiquitous, so that one scholar argues that the system is better described as "the military-industrial technological entertainment academic scientific media intelligence homeland security surveillance national security corporate complex." In this new world, everyone is surveilled and controlled, because any of us could pose a threat to the system. But the way that it's justified, as we've argued, is through creating fears of racialized threats and then producing systems of racial control that work to divide the working class in ways similar to previous chapters in American history.

I don't have the time to go into the history of the civil rights movement, how it was coded as a law-and-order issue, the emergence of the "Southern strategy" or how, for instance, from the 1970s programs like Operation Boulder were constructed that saw Arabs, and then later Iranians, as terrorist threats, brown people as terrorist threats, and so on. Suffice it to say that the work that has been done over the last three decades ideologically and structurally is to create several mechanisms of racial control: mass incarceration, mass deportation, and mass surveillance. Of course, who is being protected in all of these cases? We read white people are being protected against these racialized others.

One indication of the success of this security mentality, I think, is the response some people have to the NSA's surveillance program when they say, "Oh, I have nothing to hide. It's okay, I have nothing to hide." The assumption behind a statement like this is that the law works in a just and equitable manner, and if you've done nothing wrong, you have nothing to fear. Of course, this illusion can only be maintained if your actual experience in the world doesn't contradict it. If you're a person of

color, you quickly realize through your experiences or through the experiences of those you know that the security mentality actually doesn't apply to you. Most people of color encounter the security state as a coercive apparatus rather than a protective one, and this is especially true of working-class people of color. This is not to say that brown and black people don't accept the logic of the national security state or that they don't see each other as threats or that sections of people of color aren't co-opted by the national security state, but that the primary subject of the security mentality is still white, just as it was back during settler colonialism.

Take the Trayvon Martin case, for instance. The fact that close to 50% of white people were satisfied with the verdict that let George Zimmerman go free gives you a sense of how deep the security mentality actually is. Zimmerman, who himself is of mixed race, justified what he did by saying he was part of the Neighborhood Watch and he was simply following and then shooting people deemed not to belong in a particular community. So in his own mind, he was enacting in his gated community the larger surveillance and security mentality cultivated by the national security state. **When 60% of white people said that race is getting too much attention in this case, they showed how color-blindness obscures racism, and in fact how deep the security mentality actually is. It's in this sense that security is the new psychological wage that elicits the consent of the white working classes for empire in the age of neoliberalism.**

I'm going to come to a close with this. The fact of the matter is that the white working class does not benefit from neoliberalism. Empire does not keep the white working class safe, and racialized others are not a threat to the material interests of the white working class. Just a snapshot of the system we live in: about 5,000 people die each year from workplace-related injuries, 45,000 die every year because they lack access to adequate health care, tens of thousands have either died or suffered injuries in the wars in Afghanistan and in Iraq, and a record number of people in this country today, tens of millions, suffer from depression and anxiety-related disorders. This is the kind of rotten system that we live in today, and the white working class has every interest in fighting back against it. But the only way that it can be successful is if it challenges the racism at the core of the system. Thank you.

For information about obtaining CDs, MP3s, or transcripts of this or other programs, please contact:

David Barsamian/Alternative Radio
P.O. Box 551, Boulder, CO 80306-0551
(800) 444-1977 - info@alternativeradio.org
www.alternativeradio.org

©2014

