2010

Against the State governance, governance from below & governing through terrorism: Analytically investigating the technologies of power within the terrorist arsenal.

Allen Gnanam, *University of Windsor*

Against the State governance from below through terrorism utilizes technologies of governance reflective of 'brainwashing', suicide bombing, and illicit opium production. The governmentality perspective will guide the analytical deconstruction of terrorism governance for the purposes of identifying terrorism governance technologies, analyzing how these technologies are governing technologies, and how these technologies are exerting governance/ control. The governmentality perspective is well equipped to deconstruct terrorism governance referring to the governance/ control exerted by terrorists and terrorism over individuals, populations, and drug production as it is a method of analysis that is capable of demystifying the ways in which groups are governed/ controlled by the utilization of technologies of power, meaning instruments/ tools that are utilized for governing/ control purposes (Garland, 1997). It is important to point out that though the governmentality perspective analyzes both rationalities (ways of thinking about governance (Garland, 1997, p. 174)) and technologies (ways of exerting governance (Garland, 1997, p. 174)), this paper will exclusively focus on the analysis of technologies of terrorism governance. This decision is premised on the assertion that there is a disproportionate amount of governmentality studies focusing on the rationality aspect of governance, which in turn has resulted in the technological aspect of governance being neglected in study (Lippert, 2009, p. 507). In addittion, the primary focus of analyzing the technologies of terrorism governance will contribute to the exploration of the operational functions of terrorists, and in turn generate knowledge that may benefit proactive and high policing counter terrorism initiatives. This paper is also unique as it will be analyzing governance from below which is rarely studied/ analyzed in scholarship (Lippert & Stenson, 2007, p. 1). In close, this paper will provide evidence that supports the assertion that terrorism governance is actually exerting

governance, as the four governing principles identified by Hunt & Wickham (1994) will be linked to terrorism governance.

Prior to the analysis of the above mentioned technologies of terrorism governance concepts such as governance, technologies, and governance from below will be conceptualized. Governance refers to the control or management of things such as individuals, objects, social relations, and other phenomenon (Hunt & Wickham, 1994, p. 78). With that, terrorism governance will refer to the governance/ control exerted by terrorism, meaning violence and destabilization caused by loyal followers of political or religious agendas (terrorists) that hold resent and animosity toward a certain authority/ government (Lin, Liou, & Wu, 2007, pg. 149). Acts of violence (terrorism governance) will be connected to social conflict (sectarian violence) as a result of suicide bombing (technology), acts of destabilization (terrorism governance) will be connected to mind destabilization/ mind control as a result of 'brainwashing' (technology), acts of destabilization (terrorism governance) as result of suicide bombing (technology) will be connected to political instability, and finally acts of destabilization (terrorism governance) as a result of opium production (technology) will be connected to State destabilization. 'Brainwashing' has the ability to destabilize the mind/ ensure mind control, and the illegal opium production in Afghanistan has the ability to destabilize Afghanistan as a result of the insurgency it is financing (General citation- CNN.com). For the purposes of this paper terrorism governance over individuals, socio- political relations of a population, and the Taliban-insurgency through technologies of terrorism governance will be analyzed. Technologies of governance or technologies of power refer to the instruments, tools, or methods that are utilized as a means to exert governance/ control (Garland, 1997, p. 174) over things, objects, people, or phenomenon.

Technologies such as 'brainwashing', suicide bombing, and illicit opium production are the technologies of terrorism governance under analytical investigation, as 'brainwashing' exerts terrorism governance over individuals (Lemon, 2010; Newton, 2010; Damon, 2010; Purefoy, 2010; CBC News.ca, 2010), suicide bombing exerts terrorism governance over socio- political relations (BBC News.com, 2010; 2010; BBC News.com (3), 2010; Robertson, 2010; Wire Staff, 2010; Das, Bushman, Bezemer, Kerkhof & Vermeulen, 2009), and as illegal opium production in Afghanistan exerts terrorism governance over the Taliban insurgency in Afghanistan (Rubin, 2000; Lewis, 2001; Lawrence, 2010).

Terrorism governance is framed as a form of governance from below as governance exerted by individuals such as terrorists (e.g.Suicide bombers and terrorist 'brainwashers'), and governance exerted by insurgent groups (specifically the Afghan- Taliban) will be analyzed for the purposes of exploring terrorist oriented technologies of power/ governance. Social actors such as terrorists and insurgency groups are each exerting governance from below as governing from below is linked to the behavioural practices/ functions of non state actors, criminal groups, terrorists, and other individuals (Lipper & Stenson, 2007, p. 2; Lea & Stenson, 2007, p. 9) such as suicide bombers, brainwashers, and insurgents who are embarking on governance/ control over things, objects, and populations (Hunt & Wick, 1994, p. 78). In essence, terrorism governance originates from the bottom/ among non State actors rather than from the top/ among State actors, and for this reason terrorism governance through technologies such as 'brainwashing', suicide bombing, and the illegal opium bastion in Afghanistan are products of non state actors. In addittion, terrorism governance from below is also against the state as news reports on the Iraq bombings, the Afghan- Taliban, and the recent suicide bombings in Russia

document State counter terrorism & counter insurgency rhetoric. Therefore, as a result of States beginning to exert counter governance over non- State governance due to the violence or resistance being generated by non State actors, it is evident that forms of governance such as those involving terrorism are against the State (Lea & Stenson, 2007, p. 14,18- 20).

EXERTING TERRORISM GOVERNANCE THROUGH 'BRAINWASHING':

The first technology of power that will be investigated is 'brainwashing', which can be defined as a technology that psychologically seduces an individual in order to infiltrate their mind/ self- governance, and inject unilateral terrorist rationalities/ ideologies (ways of thinking) for the purposes of destabilizing an individuals mind (terrorism governance). Self governance refers to an individuals effort/ attempt to control or manage themselves/ their life, which entails controlling/ governing their own behaviours and emotions (Hunt & Wickham, 1994, p. 78). 'Brainwashing' is a form of governance from below as terrorists as such Al- Awlaki (renegade individuals) are not affiliated with the State housing the children they are psychologically manipulating, which in turn also makes it a form of against the State governance as States consider such mind manipulators terrorists (Damon, 2010).

'Brainwashing' is one of the many arsenals being administered by terrorists and insurgents as a means to exert terrorism governance over individuals, more specifically psychologically vulnerable individuals and children as a result of their naivete and/or poverty struck life (Lemon, 2010; Damon, 2010; Purefoy, 2010; CBCNews.ca, 2010). Terrorism governance premised on the desire to destabilize the minds (also refers to mind control) of individuals through 'brainwashing' (governance over self- governance), is occurring through pro-terrorist educational institutions that radicalize children through terrorist ideology and

indoctrination (Damon, 2010; Lemon, 2010; Purefoy, 2010; CBCNews.ca, 2010). In West Africa namely the northern area of Nigeria Purefoy (2010) points out that children in small boarding schools are solely engaging in eating, sleeping, and Islamic indoctrination in order to be transformed into foot soldiers that conduct murders and violent acts. It is evident that brainwashing is occurring since unlike educational institutions in the West, children in pro-terrorist schools are being unilaterally exposed to religious teaching with the agenda to transform children into killers/ destabilize their minds (Purefoy, 2010, Damon, 2010). In Western schools children are not unilaterally exposed to religious scholarship as they are exposed to a wide array of educational scholarship and extracurricular activities. In fact, even Catholic and Christian schools do not unilaterally preach religion, and these schools as well as public schools do not have an agenda that embarks on mind destabilization for terrorism oriented tactical operations. The boarding schools in northern Nigeria are only ensuring that children recite the Islamic book constantly each and every day only to stop for eating and sleeping (Purefoy, 2010). 'Brainwashing' through unilateral religious indoctrination is contributing to the governance over the minds of individuals for the purposes of mind infiltration by terrorist ideology, which in turn destabilizes individual minds and transforms children into foot soldiers 'freely' embarking on violence (e.g. Suicide bombing) (Terrorism governance). As close to 90% of suicide bombers are between the ages of 12 and 18 (Damon, 2010) and though it may seem as though a suicide bomber is freely choosing to blow themselves up, this is not the case. As a result of being 'brainwashed' (as a child) a suicide bomber never really has any options they can choose from when deciding how they will exert self- governance, as their knowledge which is utilized in order to decide how self governance will be exerted (Hunt and Wickham, 1994, p. 89- 90)

originated from only one source (e.g. Radical indoctrination), which has provided them with only one option to chose from (e.g. Acts of terror) which in turn has contributed to terrorism governance (destabilization of the mind). Therefore, 'brainwashing' has shaped the way in which these self governing children will behave in the future, and this in turn has resulted in the governance over an individuals exertion of self- governance through 'brainwashing' (technology). This is evident as 'brainwashed' individuals will 'freely' exert self-governance through violence without realizing that their way of exerting self- governance was unilaterally instilled upon them through a terrorism technology, as they had no other option/ knowledge source to choose from/ be influenced by. Therefore, 'brainwashing' is a viable technology of power for terrorism governance as it strengthens the power of/ contributes to terrorism governance (destabilization of the mind).

CNN's Arawa Damon (2010) also provides evidence that supports the assertion that 'brainwashing' is a technology that is capable of exerting governance over self- governance (an individuals behaviours), which in turn contributes to terrorism governance (mind destabilization). In Nawzot Kot, Pakistan children between the ages of 12 and 18 were systematically transformed into terrorists capable of committing murder and suicide bombings, as a result of free education provided by pro- terrorist groups (Damon, 2010). Moreover, this radical/ terrorist educational institution did not induce 'brainwashing'/ governance over self-governance solely through verbal and written radical religious language, but it also utilized visual stimuli of virgins and rivers of water associated with Islam indoctrination (Damon, 2010). With that, Lin et al (2007, p. 156) states that Islamic radicals for the most part are by-products of religious schools in muslim states that unilaterally teach students to hate through ideological

indoctrination. The fact that children were turned into suicide bombers and murders clearly depicts the power of 'brainwashing' as a technology that exerts governance over self governance, which in turn results in terrorism governance (mind destabilization) since who in their right mind would equip themselves with explosives and murder themselves along with a group of people (rational irrationality). It is clear that 'brainwashing' is clearing exerting governance/ control over self governance as it is unilaterally telling and justifying how individuals (children) should behave in order to exert control over themselves, which in this case reflects acts of violence. Once again, the power and presence of 'brainwashing' is also evident as close to 90% of suicide bombers are between the ages of 12 and 18 (Damon, 2010). Therefore, what kid would choose to embark on a suicide mission or terrorist mission (e.g. Omar Kardar) without some form of terrorist socialization resulting in terrorism governance (mind destabilization), as a result of governance over self- governance.

'Brainwashing'/ governance over self governance as a technology of power does not necessarily occur only among children, as the concept of 'social binding' is another powerful force that contributes to the governance exerted by 'brainwashing' over the self governance of grown individuals (Newton, 2010; Lemon, 2010). The key element associated with self radicalization as a result of 'brainwashing' is 'social binding' (Lemon, 2010), and it is evident that feelings/ emotions linked to 'socially binding' acts are powerful forces that have the potential to reconfigure an individuals ways of behaving (self- governance) (related to research on cults). In addittion, the U.S has called for the capture of Al- Awlaki a terrorist recruiter, propaganda generator, and terrorist mind manipulator (General citation- CNN.com) as Al- Awakai has framed terrorism as an act that is socially binding for all muslims (Newton, 2010).

This represents the power of emotions as a micro technology that is capable of contributing to governance over self governance through "brainwashing', which in turn contributes to terrorism governance as an individuals mind becomes destabilized and they no longer think straight as rational irrationality emergences. Furthermore, Hunt & Wickham (1994) state that that all forms of governance are continually social and continually tie/ bind individuals together (social binding) (Hunt and Wickham, 1994, p. 93, 95), and this will be discussed in the principles of governance section section.

The fact that 'brainwashing' as a technology of power transforms/ governs the behaviours of any individual into terrorism oriented self-governance, is an example of how this technology contributes to the exertion of terrorism governance which in this case is the destabilization of the mind. However, it is important to point out that there are other factors/ technologies (micro technologies) that contribute to the utilization of 'brainwashing' as a technology (macro technology), such as terrorist educational institutions, emotions/ social binding, and the use of language and visual images. Therefore, emotions, institutions, languages, and visual stimuli as micro technologies can also be seen as technologies/ tools that enabled 'brainwashing'/ governance over self governance to be viably exerted for terrorism governance (mind destabilization).

EXERTING TERRORISM GOVERNANCE THROUGH SUICIDE BOMBING:

In this paper suicide bombing will refer to the killing of ones self (non state agent) by means of explosives that are strapped around ones body, and it will refer to a form of governance from below (non State actor) and a form of against the State governance as States do not embrace attacks against there citizens. When analyzing suicide bombing it is important to

recognize that the human body and the explosives are themselves micro technologies/ tools, that contribute to the exertion of terrorism governance (violence & conflict in society) through the use of suicide bombing (macro technology) that disrupts the socio- political relations of a population. As defined in the introduction technologies refer to the instruments that contribute to the exercise of governance. Furthermore, technologies that contribute to the exertion of governance over populations/ groups of individuals are referred to as technologies that exert biopower (Stenson, 2005) or bio- political technologies.

Suicide bombing is the number one technology terrorists administer when their mission is to cause large scale destruction (Lin et al., 2007, p. 153), and it is a bio- political technology that is capable of exerting governance/ control over the social and political behaviours of a population (BBCNews.co.uk, 2010; BBCNews.co.uk, 2010 (3); BBCNews.co.uk, 2010 (4); Wire Staff, 2010). In terms of the previous analysis of governance over self- governance through 'brainwashing' (technology), it may seem as though the control/ governance over the social and political relations/ behaviours of a population are similar to the control/ governance over self- governance, however, this is not the case. Control over self- governance refers to the total control/ governance over an individuals behaviours, since without terrorism governance over an individuals mind the 'free' desire to participate in mass murder and suicide bombing at any age is extremely low. In the case of bio-political governance through suicide bombing, this bio- political technology merely induces fear and insecurity which in turn governs select aspects of a populations behaviours (e.g. political and social) through emotions (e.g. fear) rather than mind destabilization, which results in social conflict/ violence or political destabilization (terrorism governance). This is in contrast to 'brainwashing' that injects unilateral knowledge that

contributes to governance over self governance which results in mind destabilization (terrorism governance).

Lin et al., (2007) states that acts of unpredictable violence (e.g. Suicide bombing) increases levels of insecurity and fear among the attacked society/ population (p.149). Suicide bombing in Iraq around the time of parliamentary elections can be seen as a bio- political technology utilized by terrorists, in order to exert terrorism governance over the Iraqi population by negatively impacting their social and political relations (BBCNews.co.uk (3), 2010; BBCNews.co.uk, 2010). These election time suicide attacks in Iraq also resulted in many Iraqi deaths and injuries (BBCNews.co.uk, 2010). With that, the Iraqi military and the Iraqi police with a combined force of one million security personnel were put on standby, in order to prevent the country from falling into a time of sectarian violence as result of the experienced bio- political technology (suicide bombing) (BBCNews.co.uk, 2010). This precautionary standby by government forces illustrates the potential social conflict/ violence provoking effect of suicide bombing, and its capability to govern social/ ethnic relations. For example, the standby of one million security personnel indicates the power of suicide bombing as a bio- political technology, as the fear and insecurity it generates increases the risk of terrorism governance (societal conflict/ sectarian violence). Therefore, suicide bombing is a governing technology as it is capable of contributing to the exercise of terrorism governance (social violence), through bio- political governance in the sense that the fear and insecurity it generates are viable micro technologies that contribute to the strength/ power of terrorism governance (Social violence). It is important to realize that for terrorists terrorism governance is not about ensuring peace and cohesion, rather it is about ensuring violence and dis-cohesion (Line et al., 2007, p. 149).

Therefore, when violence such as sectarian violence and political destabilization are achieved terrorist may feel a sense of accomplishment/ achievement, as they utilized the tools/ technologies that contributed to the exertion of terrorism governance. This highlights the power of suicide bombing as a bio- political apparatus and its ability to contribute to against the State terrorism governance from below.

Suicide bombing as a bio- political technology is also a viable apparatus that is able to contribute to another form of terrorism governance over the Iraqi population, namely political destabilization (BBCNews.co.uk (3), 2010). Recently in Iraq suicide bombers targeted civilian populations that were in close proximity to electoral polling stations, and it is clear that these terrorists do not want the democratic system in Iraq to succeed (BBCNews.co.uk (3), 2010). Therefore, a botched parliamentary election as a result of suicide bombing is likely to contribute to the exertion of terrorism governance (political destabilization) as was evident during Iraq's first post- liberation election. Therefore, suicide bombing as a bio- political technology that deters voter turnout (BBCNews.co.uk (3), 2010) is able to exert bio-political governance over the Iraqi population and contribute to terrorism governance (political destabilization). This points to the governing power of suicide bombing as it is capable of instilling fear and Iraqi voting deterrence. With that, decreased voter turn out and an unrepresented amount of votes are likely to result in a botched parliamentary election and contribute to both political destabilization and sectarian violence, since this once again was a reality in Iraq during the first parliamentary election post- liberation from dictatorship when the Sunni minority boycotted the election. Das et al., (2009) also states that terrorism governance in the form of politically destabilization due to fear of death, causes individuals to foster prejudice towards an out- group. Therefore, suicide

bombing is a technology of power as it is capable of causing fear and insecurity among large populations, which in turn contributes to the exercise of terrorism governance referring to social violence and/ or political destabilization.

EXERTING TERRORISM GOVERNANCE THROUGH ILLICT OPIUM PRODUCTION:

Globalization has resulted resulted in the constant flow of products and finances across boarders and globalization as a micro technology (in relation to terrorism governance), has contributed to the purchasing of weapons and the financing of terrorism (terrorism governance) (Lin et al., 2007, p.151). In relation to the Afghan context, the Afghan- Taliban and their leader Mullah, Omar have taken advantage of the illegal opium economy in Afghanistan as a means to materially and financially equip the Taliban and propagate their insurgency (Rubin, 2000; Lewis, 2001; Lawrence, 2010), which is an example of against the State (Karzai government) governance from below as the Taliban is a criminal/ terrorist group (non state actor) that the Kazai government is countering. More specially, marines on the ground also acknowledge that opium is a financial micro technology that contributes to terrorism governance (national destabilization) through opium production (micro technology), as a result of the bombs and weapons they enable insurgents to access/ purchase (Lawrence, 2010). It is evident that there are multiple tools/ technologies terrorists and insurgents utilizes for the purposes of bringing about destabilization (terrorism governance). Illicit opium production in Afghan (technology of power) is exerting governance/ control over the Taliban insurgency as it is providing Taliban fighters with the weapons they need to exert terrorism governance (Lawrence, 2010), meaning the destabilization (Lin et al., 2007, p, 151) of Afghanistan. This is evident as NATO forces are continually combating the Taliban in order to keep the Kazi government functioning which in

turn will keep Afghanistan nationally and politically stable. Therefore, opium production as a technology is exerting governance through weapons and bomb access that contributes to the Taliban insurgency and destabilization (terrorism governance).

TERRORISM GOVERNANCE & THE GOVERNING PRINCIPLES & CONCLUSION:

Terrorism governance through the above analyzed technologies of power is a form of governance as it contains all four of the governing principle identified by Hunt and Wickham (1994). The first principle of governance states that governance is always attempted and is always incomplete because permanent governance can never be achieved (Hunt and Wickham, 1994, p. 79, 94). Terrorism governance is continually attempted and the destabilization and violence it provokes among self- governing individuals, populations, and States is never permanent and at times incomplete. This is evident as terrorism governance in the form of mind destabilization comes to an end when the suicide bomber blows themselves up, and though sectarian violence as a result of suicide bombing is a huge likelihood it did not occur after the recent bombing in Iraq (incomplete governance), and in Afghanistan State destabilization has decreased to a large extent since 2001 and this depicts both incomplete terrorism governance of the current Taliban insurgency, and non- permeant terrorism governance of the 2001 Afghan Taliban insurgency.

The second principle of governance presented by Hunt & Wickham (1994, p. 81- 83) state that power is a major component in the ways in which governance is exerted, as it both contributes to governance and counters governance through resistance such as counter technologies of governance that are in opposition to forms of governance. With that, all technologies of governance and ways of governing are continually in a state of being opposed or

countered, or are continually waiting to be opposed or countered by a counter technology of governance (Hunt & Wickham, 1994, p. 82). It is evident that terrorism governance utilizes powerful technologies/ arsenals that contribute to governance through terrorism, such as 'brainwashing'/ governance over self governance, suicide bombing control/ governance over populations, and opium control/ governance over insurgency financing which all contribute to terrorism governance (violence and/ or destabilization). Secondly, governance always faces counter- governance (Hunt & Wickham, 1994, p. 82) and it is evident that terrorism governance faces strong counter- terrorism governance in the form of surveillance, explosive detection apparatuses, bio-metric identification, and profiling technologies (Lin et al., 2007) such as the U.S VISIT program.

The third governing principle states that that knowledge itself is always linked to governance and it is utilized in order to decide how governance will be accomplished/ attempted (Hunt and Wickham, 1994, p. 89- 90). This idea of knowledge can also be associated with rationalities (ways of thinking), and so it is evident that Al -Awlaki (terrorist) thinks that terrorism governance can be attempted/ can be propagated through mind manipulation that links terrorism with perceptions of social binding (Newton, 2010). In addittion, Taliban fighters think that control over opium profits will provide them with means to cause national destabilization (Rubin, 2000; Lewis, 2001; Lawrence, 2010), suicide bombers as a result of mind manipulation think that they will be able to exert self governance through suicide operations (Purefoy, 2010; Damon, 2010), and terrorist brainwashers (e.g. Osama bin- Laden) think that they can cause political destabilization and violence through suicide bombings (BBCNews.co.uk (3), 2010).

The last governing principle discussed by Hunt & Wickham (1994) refers to social

binding, which states that that all forms of governance are continually social and tie/ bind individuals together (social binding) (Hunt and Wickham, 1994, p. 93, 95). Therefore, this governing principle known as social binding also exists in terrorism governance (exertion of violence and destabilization), as terrorism governance may be able to propagate future terrorism by an inspirational (social binding) influence that provides individuals with an identify they are lacking. This is evident as there is an emerging patterning of 'self'- radicalization (not really 'self' as ones mind is being exposed to manipulation) as a result of grown individuals being seduced through emotions (social binding perceptions), into exerting self- governance through terrorism and conducting attacks in the U.S or traveling to Yemen to join Al- Qaeda cells (Lemon, 2010).

Brainwashing, suicide bombing, and illicit opium production are just a few technologies that are apart of the arsenal for terrorism governance, other technologies include car bombing (BBC News.co.uk (2), 2010), hostage taking, aviation high jacking, nitrogen fertilizer etc. (Lin et al., 2007, p. 151). In addittion, when looking at terrorism itself as a marco technology which is a violent and destabilizing act performed by terrorists, 'brainwashing' and suicide bombing can be framed as micro technologies that contribute to the exertion of terrorism for the purposes of terrorism governance. Therefore, when exploring terrorism governance or other phenomenon through the governmentality perspective, it is essential to keep in mind the vast amounts of technologies that are present and that contribute to the exertion of power/ governance. Foucault himself asserted that governance is existing at all times and this means that technologies do not necessarily enable governance, rather technologies contribute to the exertion of governance that is already occurring to some degree. This means that it is important to

acknowledge that multiple macro and micro technologies of power are in existence and are contributing to governance, which in turn influences the power/ strength of governance rather than weather or nor governance occurs/ exits. With that, terrorism governance is a form of against the state governance, that is equipped with many powerful technologies of power that contribute to governance from below through terrorism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BBC News.co.uk (2010) *Iraq suicide bombers target city of Baquba.* Retrieved on March 8, 2010, from *http://newsvote.bbc.co.uk/mpapps/pagetools/print/news.bbc.co.uk/ 2/hi/middle_east/8546744.stm?ad=1*

BBC News.co.uk (2) (2010) *Baghdad shia areas hit by blasts kills at least 35.* Retrieved on March 8, 2010, from *http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/8604392.stm*

BBC News.co.uk (3) (2010) *Polling stations bombed as Iraq election begins.* Retrieved on March 8, 2010, from *http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8548967.stm*

BBC News.co.uk (4) (2010) *Female bomber kills nine in Iraq.* Retrieved on March 8, 2010, from *http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/7492987.stm*

CBC News.ca (2010) *Somali group added to terrorist list.* Retrieved on March 8, 2010, from http://www.cbc.ca/canada/story/2010/03/08/al-shabab-terrorist-list.html

Damon, A. (2010) *Pakistan: Taliban brainwashes kids with visions of virgins.* Retrieved on March 8, 2010, from http://www.cnn.com/2010/WORLD/asiapcf/01/05/ pakistan.taliban.children/index.html?iref=allsearch

Das, E., Bushman, B., Bezemer, M., Kerkhof, P., Vermeulen, I. (2009) How terrorism news reports increase prejudice against outgroups: A terror management account. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology,* 45 (3), 453- 459

Garland, D. (1997) Governmentality and the problem of crime: Foucault, criminology, sociology. *Theoretical Criminology*, *1*, 173- 214.

Hunt, Alan and Gray Wickham. (1994). *Foucault and the Law: Towards a Sociology of Law as Governance*. London: Pluto Press.

Lawrence, C. (2010) *Inside the life of troops in Afghanistan.* Retrieved on April 16, 2010, from http://www.cnn.com/video/#/video/world/2010/04/16am.lawrence.afghanistan.recap.cnn? iref=videosearch

Lemon, D. (2010) *New twist in homegrown terror.* Retrieved on April 11, 2010, from http:// www.cnn.com/video/#/video/us/2010/03/14/nr.homegrown.terrorism.cnn?iref=allsearch

Lewis, R. (2001) Opium past, opioid futures: Imperialism, insurgency and pacification in a global commodity market. *International Journal of Drug Policy,* 12(1),107- 112

Lin, C., Liou, D., Wu, K. (2007) Opportunities and challenges created by terrorism. *Technological forecasting & Social Change,* 74 (2), 148- 164

Lippert, R. (2009) Signs of the surveillant assemblage: Privacy regulation, urban CCTV, and Governmentality. *Social & Legal Studies,* 18 (4), 505- 523

Loza, W. (2007) The psychology of extremism and terrorism: A Middle- Eastern   perspective. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour,* 12 (2). 141- 155

Newton, P. (2010) *Jihad against U.S. "binding".* Retrieved on March 30, 2010, from http://www.cnn.com/video/#/video/world/2010/

Purefoy, C. (2010) *Quran schools in Nigeria.* Retrieved on March 8, 2010, from http://www.cnn.com/video/#/video/world/2010/01/10/purefoy.nigeria.quranic.kids.cnn?iref=allsearch

Robertson, N. (2010) *Why Moscow? Why Now?* Retrieved on March 29, 2010, from http://www.cnn.com/video/#/video/world/2010/03/29/robertson.moscow.subway.blasts.cnn?iref=videosearch

Rubin, B. (2000) The political economy of war and peace in Afghanistan. *World Developement,* 28 (10), 1789- 1803

Stenson, K. (2005) Sovereignty, Biopolitics and the local government in Crime in Britain. *Theoretical Criminology,* 9 (3), 265-287

Wire Staff, CNN (2010) *Female suicide bombers blamed in Moscow subway attacks.* Retrieved on April 13, 2010, from http://www.cnn.com/2010/WORLD/europe/03/29/russia.subway.explosion/index.html?hpt=T1