

## Monster, Terrorist, Fag: The War on Terrorism and the Production of Docile Patriots

**Jasbir K. Puar  
and  
Amit S. Rai**

How are gender and sexuality central to the current “war on terrorism”? This question opens on to others: How are the technologies that are being developed to combat “terrorism” departures from or transformations of older technologies of heteronormativity, white supremacy, and nationalism? In what way do contemporary counterterrorism practices deploy these technologies, and how do these practices and technologies become the quotidian framework through which we are obliged to struggle, survive, and resist? Sexuality is central to the creation of a certain knowledge of terrorism, specifically that branch of strategic analysis that has entered the academic mainstream as “terrorism studies.” This knowledge has a history that ties the image of the modern terrorist to a much older figure, the racial and sexual monsters of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Further, the construction of the pathologized psyche of the terrorist-monster enables the practices of normalization, which in today’s context often means an aggressive heterosexual patriotism.

As opposed to initial post-September 11 reactions, which focused narrowly on “the disappearance of women,” we consider the question of gender justice and queer politics through broader frames of reference, all with multiple genealogies—indeed, as we hope to show, gender and sexuality produce both hypervisible icons and the ghosts that haunt the machines of war. Thus, we make two related arguments: (1) that the construct of the terrorist relies on a knowledge of sexual perversity (failed heterosexuality, Western notions of the psyche, and a certain queer monstrosity); and (2) that normalization invites an aggressive heterosexual patriotism that we can see, for example, in dominant media representations (for example, *The West Wing*), and in the organizing efforts of Sikh Americans in response to September 11 (the fetish of the “turbaned” Sikh man is crucial here).<sup>1</sup> The forms of power now being deployed in the war on terrorism in fact draw on processes of quarantining a racialized and sexualized other, even as Western norms of the civilized subject provide the framework through which these very same others become subjects to be corrected. Our itinerary begins with an examination of Michel Foucault’s figure of monstrosity as a member of the West’s “abnormals,” followed by a consideration of the uncanny return of the monster in the discourses of “terrorism studies.” We then move to the relationship

between these monstrous figures in contemporary forms of heteronormative patriotism. We conclude by offering readings of the terrorism episode of *The West Wing* and an analysis of South Asian and Sikh American community-based organizing in response to September 11.

## The Monster and the Terrorist

To begin, let us consider the monster. Why, in what way, has monstrosity come to organize the discourse on terrorism? First, we could merely glance at the language used by the dominant media in its interested depictions of Islamic militancy. So, as an article in the *New York Times* points out, “Osama bin Laden, according to Fox News Channel anchors, analysts and correspondents, is ‘a dirtbag,’ ‘a monster’ overseeing a ‘web of hate.’ His followers in Al Qaeda are ‘terror goons.’ Taliban fighters are ‘diabolical’ and ‘henchmen.’”<sup>2</sup> Or, in another Web article, we read: “It is important to realize that the Taliban does not simply tolerate the presence of bin Laden and his terrorist training camps in Afghanistan. It is part and parcel of the same evil alliance. Al-Qa’ida and the Taliban are two different heads of the same monster, and they share the same fanatical obsession: imposing a strict and distorted brand of Islam on all Muslims and bringing death to all who oppose him.”<sup>3</sup>


In these invocations of terrorist-monsters an absolute morality separates good from a “shadowy evil.”<sup>4</sup> As if caught up in its own shadow dance with the anti-Western rhetoric of radical Islam,<sup>5</sup> this discourse marks off a figure, Osama bin Laden, or a government, the Taliban, as the opposite of all that is just, human, and good. The terrorist-monster is pure evil and must be destroyed, according to this view.<sup>6</sup> But does the monster have a mind? This begs another question: Do such figures and such representational strategies have a history? We suggest this language of terrorist-monsters should be read by considering how the monster has been used throughout history in Western discourses of normality. We could begin by remembering, for instance, that the monster was one of three elements that Foucault linked to the formation of the “abnormals.”

The group of abnormals was formed out of three elements whose own formation was not exactly synchronic. 1. The human monster. An Ancient notion whose frame of reference is law. A juridical notion, then, but in the broad sense, as it referred not only to social laws but to natural laws as well; the monster’s field of appearance is a juridico-biological domain. The figures of the half-human, half-animal being . . . , of double individualities . . . , of hermaphrodites . . . in turn represented that double violation; what makes a human monster a monster is not just its exceptionality relative to the species

form; it is the disturbance it brings to juridical regularities (whether it is a question of marriage laws, canons of baptism, or rules of inheritance). The human monster combines the impossible and the forbidden. . . . 2. The individual to be corrected. This is a more recent figure than the monster. It is the correlative not so much of the imperatives of the law as of training techniques with their own requirements. The emergence of the “incorrigibles” is contemporaneous with the putting into place of disciplinary techniques during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in the army, the schools, the workshops, then, a little later, in families themselves. The new procedures for training the body, behavior, and aptitudes open up the problem of those who escape that normativity which is no longer the sovereignty of the law.<sup>7</sup>

According to Foucault, the monster can be both half an animal and a hybrid gender (later in this text Foucault will go on to position the onanist as the third of the abnormals). But crucially the monster is also to be differentiated from the individual to be corrected on the basis of whether power operates on it or through it. In other words, the absolute power that produces and quarantines the monster finds its dispersal in techniques of normalization and discipline. What Foucault does, we believe, is enable an analysis of monstrosity within a broader history of sexuality. This genealogy is crucial to understanding the historical and political relays, reinvestments, and resistances between the monstrous terrorist and the discourse of heteronormativity. And that is because monsters and abnormals have always also been sexual deviants. Foucault tied monstrosity to sexuality through specific analyses of the deployment of gendered bodies, the regulation of proper desires, the manipulation of domestic spaces, and the taxonomy of sexual acts such as sodomy. As such, the sexualized monster was that figure that called forth a form of juridical power but one that was tied to multiform apparatuses of discipline as well.<sup>8</sup>

We use Foucault’s concept of monstrosity to elaborate what we consider to be central to the present war on terrorism: monstrosity as a regulatory construct of modernity that imbricates not only sexuality, but also questions of culture and race. Before we tie these practices to contemporary politics, let us note two things: First, the monster is not merely an other; it is one category through which a multiform power operates. As such, discourses that would mobilize monstrosity as a screen for otherness are always also involved in circuits of normalizing power as well: the monster and the person to be corrected are close cousins. Second, if the monster is part of the West’s family of abnormals, questions of race and sexuality will have always haunted its figuration. The category of monstrosity is also an implicit index of civilizational development and cultural adaptability. As the machines of war begin to narrow the choices and life



Reorienting colonial imagery for the new millennium: “Why the West Has Won.” Courtesy *American Spectator*

chances people have here in America and in decidedly more bloody ways abroad, it seems a certain grid of civilizational progress organized by such keywords as “democracy,” “freedom,” and “humanity” have come to superintend the figure of the monster. We turn now to this double deployment of the discourse of monstrosity in “terrorism studies.”

Today, we find the two figures of the monster and the person to be corrected in some ways converging in the discourse of the terrorist-monster. Which is to say that the terrorist has become both a monster to be quarantined and an individual to be corrected. It is in the strategic analyses of terrorism that these two figures come together. For the past thirty years, since 1968, the Western academy has been involved in the production and implementation of a body of knowledge that took the psyche of the terrorist as its object and target: “terrorism studies.” The strategic analysis of what in the intelligence community is known as “violent substate activism” is at the moment a highly sought-after form of knowledge production. And it has direct policy relevance; hence its uneven integration into the broader field of what Edward Said once named as the disciplinary home of Orientalism: “policy studies.”<sup>9</sup> Our own analysis has been usefully informed by the pioneering work of scholars and activists such as Said, Cynthia Enloe, Ann Tickner, Noam Chomsky, Shirin M. Rai, Edward Herman, Helen Caldicott, Philip Agee, Talal Asad, and others.<sup>10</sup> These writers have opened a space of critique that brings the epistemological and ethical claims of terrorism studies to crisis; their rigorous and impassioned interrogation of U.S. foreign policy has not only enabled subsequent writers to make connections to ongoing domestic wars against people of color and the working poor but crucially, their critiques have enabled the counter-memory of other genealogies, histories, and modes of power: for example, sexuality, colonialism, and normalization. So, for instance, in the discourse of counterterrorism the shared modernity of the monster and the delinquent comes together in the knowledge of cultures, nations, and races. As one editorial in the magazine *Foreign Policy* put it, “The Global Positioning System, unmanned drones, unrivaled databases, and handheld computers—much has been made of the technological resources available to the U.S. military and diplomatic establishments. But what do you do if you’re trying to wage war in or against a country where you don’t know the locals, can’t speak the language, and can’t find any reliable maps? Welcome to the front lines of the war against terrorism, likely to be waged primarily in ‘swamp states’ about which the United States knows little.”<sup>11</sup> The writer ends the piece by drawing a particular lesson from Sun Tzu’s *The Art of War*: “‘If you know yourself but not the enemy, for every victory gained you will also suffer a defeat.’ If any war on terrorism is to succeed, the United States has some serious learning to do.”

Terrorism studies is at the forefront of this knowledge production. In an article in the Rand Corporation–funded journal, *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, Richard Falkenrath notes:

Counterterrorism  
is a form of racial,  
civilizational  
knowledge, but  
now also an  
academic  
discipline that is  
quite explicitly  
tied to the  
exercise of state  
power. This  
knowledge,  
moreover, takes  
the psyche as its  
privileged site of  
investigation.

The literature on terrorism is vast. Most of this work focuses on the practitioners of terrorism, that is, on the terrorists themselves. Different strands within terrorism studies consider, for example, the motivations or belief systems of individual terrorists; the external strategies or . . . internal dynamics of particular terrorist organizations; or the interaction of terrorist movements with other entities, such as governments, the media, or social subgroups. . . . Terrorism studies aspires not just to scholastic respectability but to policy relevance. . . . It has helped organize and inform governmental counter-terrorism practices.<sup>12</sup>

Counterterrorism is a form of racial, civilizational knowledge, but now also an academic discipline that is quite explicitly tied to the exercise of state power. This knowledge, moreover, takes the psyche as its privileged site of investigation. As another article in *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* put it,

Models based on psychological concerns typically hold that ‘terrorist’ violence is not so much a political instrument as an end in itself; it is not contingent on rational agency but is the result of compulsion or psychopathology. Over the years scholars of this persuasion have suggested that ‘terrorists’ do what they do because of (variously and among other things) self-destructive urges, fantasies of cleanliness, disturbed emotions combined with problems with authority and the Self, and inconsistent mothering. Articulate attempts at presenting wider, vaguer, and (purportedly) generalizable psychological interpretations of terrorism have been made by, among others, Jerrold M. Post, who has proposed that “. . . political terrorists are driven to commit acts of violence as a consequence of psychological forces, and . . . their special psychologic is constructed to rationalize acts they are psychologically compelled to commit.”<sup>13</sup>

We should note how white mythologies such as “inconsistent mothering” (and hence the bad family structure apparently common in the East) are presented as psychological compulsions that effectively determine and fix the mind of the terrorist.

In this way, psychologists working within terrorism studies have been able to determine and taxonomize the terrorist mind. In a recent article in the journal *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, Charles L. Ruby has noted that there are two dominant frameworks in the interpretation of the terrorist “mindset”: “The first camp includes theories that portray terrorism as the result of defects or disorders in one’s personality structure. This first group of theories uses a broadly psychodynamic model. The second camp consists of theories that approach the phenomenon of terrorist behavior as a form of political violence perpetrated by people who do not have sufficient military resources to carry out conventional forms

of political violence.”<sup>14</sup> The personality defect model of terrorism holds that terrorists have fundamental and pathological defects in “their personality structure, usually related to a damaged sense of self.” Moreover, these defects result from “unconscious forces in the terrorist’s psyche.” And, of course, the psyche is the site of a familiar family romance: “Terrorism is a reflection of unconscious feelings of hostility toward parents and . . . this feeling is an outgrowth of childhood abuse or adolescent rebellion. The terrorist’s hostile focus is so great during childhood and adolescence that it continues into adulthood and becomes very narrow and extreme, ostensibly explaining the terrorist’s absolutist mindset and dedication.”

As a leading light in the constellation of “terrorism experts,” Jerrold Post has proposed that terrorists suffer from pathological personalities that emerge from negative childhood experiences and a damaged sense of self.<sup>15</sup> Post argues for two terrorist personality types, depending on the specific quality of those childhood experiences. First, Post suggests, there is the “anarchic-ideologue.” This is the terrorist who has experienced serious family dysfunction and maladjustment, which lead to rebellion against parents, especially against the father. Anarchic-ideologues fight “against the society of their parents . . . an act of dissent against parents loyal to the regime.” Second, there is the terrorist personality type known as the “nationalist-secessionist”—apparently the name indicates “a sense of loyalty to authority and rebellion against external enemies.” During childhood, a terrorist of this personality type experienced a sense of compassion or loyalty toward his or her parents. According to Post, nationalist-secessionists have pathologically failed to differentiate between themselves and the other (parental object). Consequently, they rebel “against society for the hurt done to their parents . . . an act of loyalty to parents damaged by the regime.” Both the anarchic-ideologue and nationalist-secessionist find “comfort in joining a terrorist group of rebels with similar experiences.”<sup>16</sup> The personality defect model views terrorists as suffering from personality defects that result from excessively negative childhood experiences, giving the individual a poor sense of self and a resentment of authority. As Ruby notes, “Its supporters differ in whether they propose one (Kaplan), two (Post and Jones & Fong), or three (Strentz) personality types.”<sup>17</sup>

What all these models and theories aim to show is how an otherwise normal individual becomes a murderous terrorist, and that process time and again is tied to the failure of the normal(ized) psyche. Indeed, an implicit but foundational supposition structures this entire discourse: the very notion of the normal psyche, which is in fact part of the West’s own heterosexual family romance—a narrative space that relies on the nor-

malized, even if perverse, domestic space of desire supposedly common in the West. Terrorism, in this discourse, is a symptom of the deviant psyche, the psyche gone awry, or the failed psyche; the terrorist enters this discourse as an absolute violation. So when Billy Collins (the 2001 poet laureate) asserted on National Public Radio immediately after September 11: “Now the U.S. has lost its virginity,” he was underscoring this fraught relationship between (hetero)sexuality, normality, the nation, and the violations of terrorism.

Not surprisingly, then, coming out of this discourse, we find that another very common way of trying to psychologize the monster-terrorist is by positing a kind of failed heterosexuality. So we hear often the idea that sexually frustrated Muslim men are promised the heavenly reward of sixty, sixty-seven, or sometimes even seventy virgins if they are martyred in jihad. But As’ad Abu Khalil has argued, “In reality, political—not sexual—frustration constitutes the most important factor in motivating young men, or women, to engage in suicidal violence. The tendency to dwell on the sexual motives of the suicide bombers belittles these socio-political causes.”<sup>18</sup> Now of course, that is precisely what terrorism studies intends to do: to reduce complex social, historical, and political dynamics to various psychic causes rooted in childhood family dynamics. As if the Palestinian *Intifada* or the long, brutal war in Afghanistan can be simply boiled down to bad mothering or sexual frustration! In short, these explanatory models and frameworks function to (1) reduce complex histories of struggle, intervention, and (non)development to Western psychic models rooted in the bourgeois heterosexual family and its dynamics; (2) systematically exclude questions of political economy and the problems of cultural translation; and (3) attempt to master the fear, anxiety, and uncertainty of a form of political dissent by resorting to the banality of a taxonomy.<sup>19</sup>

Our contention is that today the knowledge and form of power that is mobilized to analyze, taxonomize, psychologize, and defeat terrorism has a genealogical connection to the West’s abnormals, and specifically those premodern monsters that Western civilization had seemed to bury and lay to rest long ago. The monsters that haunt the prose of contemporary counterterrorism emerge out of figures in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that have always been racialized, classed, and sexualized. The undesirable, the vagrant, the Gypsy, the savage, the Hottentot Venus, or the sexual depravity of the Oriental torrid zone shares a basic kinship with the terrorist-monster. As we know, in the twentieth century these disparate monsters became case studies, objects of ethnographies, and interesting psychological cases of degeneracy. The same Western, colonial modernity that created the psyche created the racial and sexual monster.



In other words, what links the monster-terrorist to the figure of the individual to be corrected is first and foremost the racialized and deviant psyche. Isn't that why there is something terrifyingly uncanny in the terrorist-monster? As one specifically liberal article in the Rand journal put it, "Members of such groups are not infrequently prepared to kill and die for their struggles and, as sociologists would attest, that presupposes a sort of conviction and mindset that has become uncommon in the modern age. Thus, not only the acts of 'terrorism' but also the driving forces behind them often appear incomprehensible and frightening to outsiders. Terrorism studies emerged as a subcategory within the social sciences in the early 1970s seeking to explain the resurgence of the seemingly inexplicable."<sup>20</sup>

It is the figure of the inexplicable that continues to haunt all the civilizational grids that the Western war machine would deploy in its attempt to "understand the terrorist psyche." We now turn to consider more explicitly the relationship between this will to knowledge and the practices and rituals of heteronormativity.

### **Heteronormativity and Patriotism**

We start by simply noting some obvious factors that constitute the heteronormative character of American nationalism that have been exacerbated in the current political climate. These include, but are not limited to: heterosexual family narratives of trauma and grief (the images of the Cantor Fitzgerald wives come to mind, as well the "families" who are petitioning the government for increased bereavement funds); the problems gay survivors are having accessing relief and disaster funds; "sexually active" gay men being banned from donating blood; the lauding of national "gay heroes" such as Mark Bingham by lesbian-gay-bisexual-transgender-queer conservatives such as Andrew Sullivan; the reevaluation of the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy in the face of military action and enlistment; and finally, even the Miss America beauty pageant, which took place just a few weeks after September 11, emphasized the national pride of the contestants ("There's so much ugliness in the world, we need to see beauty").

Yet again, we could interrogate the way in which patriotism has activated and transformed the historical memory of a militarist, racist, and class-specific masculinity. In the days and weeks following the September 11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, a rapid proliferation of mocking images circulated of a turbaned Osama bin Laden, not to mention of the turban itself. In a photomontage from Stileproject.com, even George Bush has been depicted sporting a bin Ladenesque turban.

American  
retaliation  
promises to  
emasculate bin  
Laden and turn  
him into a fag.  
This promise not  
only suggests that  
if you're not for  
the war, you're a  
fag, it also incites  
violence against  
queers and  
specifically queers  
of color.

Another Internet favorite is a picture of bin Laden superimposed into a 7-Eleven convenience store scene as a cashier (harking back to, among others, Apu of *The Simpsons*).

Posters that appeared in midtown Manhattan only days after the attacks show a turbaned caricature of bin Laden being anally penetrated by the Empire State Building. The legend beneath reads, “The Empire Strikes Back” or “So you like skyscrapers, huh, bitch?” Or think of the Web site where, with a series of weapons at your disposal, you can torture Osama bin Laden to death, the last torture being sodomy; or another Web site that shows two pictures, one of bin Laden with a beard, and the other without—and the photo of him shaven turns out to be O. J. Simpson.<sup>21</sup> What these representations show, we believe, is that queerness as sexual deviancy is tied to the monstrous figure of the terrorist as a way to otherize and quarantine subjects classified as “terrorists,” but also to normalize and discipline a population through these very monstrous figures.

Though much gender-dependent “black” humor describing the appropriate punishment for bin Laden focuses on the liberation of Afghan women (liberate Afghan women and send them to college or make bin Laden have a sex change operation and live in Afghanistan as a woman—deeply racist, sexist, and homophobic suggestions), this portrayal suggests something further still: American retaliation promises to emasculate bin Laden and turn him into a fag. This promise not only suggests that if you're not for the war, you're a fag, it also incites violence against queers and specifically queers of color. And indeed, there have been reports from community-based organizations throughout New York City that violent incidents against queers of color have increased. So on the one hand, the United States is being depicted as feminist and gay-safe by this comparison with Afghanistan, and on the other hand, the U.S. state, having experienced a castration and penetration of its capitalist masculinity, offers up narratives of emasculation as appropriate punishment for bin Laden, brown-skinned folks, and men in turbans.

It seems to us that what we see happening in America is the active promotion of self-righteous aggression and murderous violence, which have achieved almost holy status in the speeches and comments of our recently enthroned president, George W. Bush (let us not forget the five-to-four Supreme Court decision that gave him the presidency). What all these examples show is that the historical connections between heteronormativity as a process and the monstrous terrorist as an object of knowledge have been obfuscated, and in some cases severed: indeed, aspects of “homosexuality” have come within the purview of normative patriotism after September 11. In other words, what we see in the deployment of heteronormative patriotism is, on the one hand, the quarantining of the

terrorist-monster-fag using the bodies and practices of a queered other, and on the other, the incorporation of aspects of queer subjectivity into the body of the normalized nation.

This dual process of incorporation and quarantining involves as well the articulation of race with nation. M. Jacqui Alexander has written that the “nation disallows queerness,” and V. Spike Petersen locates “nationalism as heterosexism”; yet it is certainly the case that within a national as well as transnational frame, some queers are better than others.<sup>22</sup> The dearth of (white) queer progressive/Left voices is perhaps due to safety issues and real fears that many have about offering up dissenting voices; at the same time, racism and unexamined notions of citizenship seem to be operative here also.<sup>23</sup> Queer Left voices have also pointed out that the treatment of women by the Taliban extends to homosexuality, which is punishable by public stoning in Afghanistan.<sup>24</sup> When a U.S. Navy bomb aboard the U.S.S. Enterprise had scrawled upon it “Hijack This Fags,” national gay and lesbian rights organizers objected to the homophobia of this kind of nationalist rhetoric, but not to the broader racist war itself.<sup>25</sup>

Clearly, a hegemonic struggle is being waged through the exclusionary and normative idioms of patriotism, humanitarianism, and, yes, even feminism. In this context, we see how the dominant media are using the figure of the *burkha*-ed woman in what are often racist and certainly chauvinistic representations of the Middle East. These representations, we should remember, have a very old colonial legacy, one that Gayatri Spivak once characterized as, “White men saving brown women from brown men.”<sup>26</sup> Furthermore, the continuities between Bush’s agenda and queer Left, feminist, and South Asian diasporic and even South Asian queer diasporic positions are rather stunning, especially in the use of “culture” and “cultural norms” to obscure economic and political histories, much in the way that terrorism studies positions the relationship of the psyche to the terrorist.

Now suddenly condemning the Taliban for their treatment of women, Bush’s administration has in essence occupied the space of default global feminists in an uncanny continuity with Western liberal feminists, who also have been using Afghan women as an “easy icon” in need of feminist rescue (as the successor to female genital surgery). The Feminist Majority (headed by Eleanor Smeal), along with first lady Laura Bush and the former duchess of York Sarah Ferguson, represent liberal feminist human rights practices that are complicit with U.S. nationalism as well as older forms of colonialist missionary feminist projects.<sup>27</sup> While initially Afghan women were completely absent from media representation and discussion, now RAWA (Revolutionary Afghan Women’s Association) is being propped up as the saved/savior other: on a speaking tour throughout the



Pin-up: Miss December, 2001. Northrup-Grumman, photo manipulation by Charles Bork. Courtesy *American Spectator*



United States, fully sponsored and paid for by the National Organization of Women, led by Executive Director Patricia Ireland. (This is not to minimize the work of RAWA, but to point out that the fetishizing of RAWA erases other women's groups in the region, ignores the relative privilege and access of resources that RAWA's members have in relation to the majority of women in Afghanistan, and obscures the network of regional and international political and economic interests that govern such organizations as NOW or even RAWA.)<sup>28</sup>

Another historical memory must organize our practice. As we begin to unearth these historical and discursive reticulations, we must not lose sight of the shared histories of the West's abnormals. All of these examples, and more, function to delimit and contain the kinds of responses that LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer) communities can articulate in response to September 11. If we are to resist practically the "war effort" and the Us/Them and "you're either with us or against us" rhetoric, we must disarticulate the ties between patriotism and cultural and sexual identity. We must pose questions that allow us to construct practical solidarities with domestic and international communities and movements. If Western feminism has been complicit with certain forms of imperial and nationalist domination, how can feminists of color in the United States as well as "Third World" feminists (such as RAWA) undermine and displace these dominant agendas? If certain forms of queer and progressive organizing remain tied to forms of nationalist and imperial domination, how can queers of color both here and across the globe disrupt the neat folding in of queerness into narratives of modernity, patriotism, and nationalism?

### ***Docile Patriots I: The West Wing***

Here are two examples of contemporary cultural and community politics that speak to the network of discourses and practices we have analyzed. We have seen thus far that the terrorist-monster has a history, and through that history we can interrogate the norms and practices that aim to quarantine, know, eliminate, and correct the monster. This brings us to our next point: the monstrous terrorist, once quarantined in secret military courts, in prisons, in cells, in caves, in besieged cities or forts—this figure also provides the occasion to demand and instill a certain discipline on the population. This discipline aims to produce patriotic, docile subjects through practices, discourses, images, narratives, fears, and pleasures. One of the central sites for the construction of these docile patriots is the dominant televisual media. On CNN, FOX News, BBC, or ABC we hear

terrorist experts, psychiatrists, state officials, and journalists use the figure of the terrorist-monster as a screen to project both the racist fantasies of the West and the disciplining agenda of patriotism. Infantilizing the population, they scream with what seems to be at times one voice: “The terrorist is a monster. This monster is the enemy. The enemy must be hunted down to protect you and all those women and children that you do not know, but we know.”

We can see this dual infantilization of the citizenry and production and quarantining of the monster on TV shows that have aired or are going to air in response to September 11. These sitcoms, serials, and dramas are in fact more ideologically diverse than the mainstream news media, which have egregiously failed to inform the public of the racist backlash against Arab American and South Asian American communities, as well as anti-war activism. As one *USA Today* article noted:

Producers have been rapidly churning out scripts for future episodes based on the aftermath of last month’s attacks, following an October 3 episode of NBC’s *The West Wing* that attracted the White House drama’s biggest audience yet. *Ally McBeal* will take an allegorical approach in a Christmas episode written by David E. Kelley in which a Massachusetts town official tries to block a holiday parade after a tragedy in which firefighters are lost, and the residents argue whether it is acceptable to be festive. *The Practice*’s law firm represents an Arab-American who argues that he is being unfairly held as a material witness in a fictional terrorist act in an episode of the ABC drama due later this fall. Popular new CBS series *The Guardian* plans a December storyline about a Middle Eastern family in Pittsburgh whose restaurant is vandalized by a white youth. “There’s a lot of knee-jerk rage,” says series creator David Hollander. “I want to touch on the reality that there’s an incredible irrational fear.” CIA-blessed drama *The Agency* originally planned to air a fictional anthrax attack last winter, but pulled the episode two days before it was scheduled to air due to anti-terrorist sentiments. And CBS has been pitched a new romantic comedy about a couple who lost their spouses in the World Trade Center attacks, says network president Les Moonves, who hasn’t ruled out the idea. The interest marks a stark departure from the days immediately after September 11, when anxious censors rushed to excise any signs of the Trade Center or references to planes or terrorists from TV shows. Military drama *JAG* plans references to Afghanistan, and an episode about covert operations there, but producer Don Bellisario is treading carefully.<sup>29</sup>

Consider, as the first of such takes on September 11 to be aired, the October 3 episode of *The West Wing*. “The episode, entitled ‘Isaac and Ishmael,’ was written by the show’s creator Aaron Sorkin, and was completed in less than three weeks. The script made no reference to the events

On CNN, FOX  
News, BBC, or  
ABC we hear  
terrorist experts,  
psychiatrists, state  
officials, and  
journalists use the  
figure of the  
terrorist-monster  
as a screen to  
project both the  
racist fantasies of  
the West and the  
disciplining  
agenda of  
patriotism.

which inspired its creation.”<sup>30</sup> The story line places the show’s fictitious White House staff in a lock-out crisis mode following a “crash” (which “means there has been some kind of security break: no one in or out of the White House”; the Secret Service feared a suspected terrorist might actually be on the premises). We cut to an Arab American man, a White House staff member, smoking a cigarette out of a window in the Old Executive Building; a group of armed white Secret Service agents break down the door and, with guns drawn, arrest him on suspicion of plotting some kind of terrorist activity (he is later found to be innocent). Meanwhile, Josh Lyman, the deputy chief of staff, finds himself locked in a cafeteria with a group of visiting high school children who had won a trip to the White House. According to the BBC Web review, “They look to him for answers to questions similar to those asked by many Americans over the past few weeks.”

Most of the episode takes place in one of two rooms. In the White House mess, “gifted” high school students ask questions of various staff members. Simultaneously, the interrogation of the “terrorist” goes on in a darkened room somewhere in the Old Executive Building. The show consists of intercutting between the interrogation of the man—whose name, Raqim Ali, matches one of the aliases used by a terrorist who has just entered the United States—and “the heavy-duty chat session in the mess.”<sup>31</sup> Students ask such questions as “What’s the deal with everybody trying to kill you?” Josh turns the conversation into an interrogation, or better, translation, of the “nature” of the Taliban. He asks the students, “Islamic extremists are to Islam as \_\_\_\_ is to Christianity.” After hearing from the students, Josh writes down his answer: “KKK.” He says, “It’s the Klan gone medieval and global. It couldn’t have less to do with Islamic men and women of faith of whom there are millions and millions. Muslims defend this country in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, National Guard, Police and Fire Department.” When it seems he is running out of things to say, other White House staff members join the question-and-answer session. Toby Zeigler (Richard Schiff), the president’s speechwriter, champions freedom of religion and equates the people of Afghanistan with European Jews under Hitler. “There’s nothing wrong with a religion whose laws say a man’s got to wear a beard or cover his head or wear a collar. It’s when violation of these laws become a crime against the state and not your parents that we’re talking about lack of choice. . . . The Taliban isn’t the recognized government of Afghanistan. The Taliban took over the recognized government of Afghanistan. . . . When you think of Afghanistan, think of Poland. When you think of the Taliban, think of the Nazis. When you think of the people of Afghanistan, think of Jews in concentration camps.” Toby then tells these very attentive



students a story he once heard from a friend who had been in a Nazi concentration camp. “He said he once saw a guy at the camp kneeling and praying. He said, ‘What are you doing?’ The guy said he was thanking God. ‘What could you possibly be thanking God for?’ ‘I’m thanking God for not making me like them.’” Inexplicably, Toby concludes, “Bad people can’t be recognized on sight. There’s no point in trying.”

At least one reviewer of the episode bristled at what he argued were un-American messages hidden in the dialogue of the episode. For this reviewer, the show’s creator Aaron Sorkin was entirely to blame. Writing in the *Washington Post*, Tom Shales lambasted the show for its “tone of moral superiority.”

Terrorism is definitely bad. That was established by the talk with the students. It was pointed out that . . . Islamic extremists are to Islam what the Ku Klux Klan is to Christianity. But the main thrust of the episode was summarized in another line: “Bad people can’t be recognized on sight. There’s no point in trying.” What if they’re carrying guns and have bombs strapped to each limb? That wasn’t asked or answered. What was really on Sorkin’s mind was the mistreatment of the apparently guiltless American-born Muslim who, as played by Ajay Naidu, maintained a tone of suffering moral superiority throughout. Ali, it was revealed, had once been arrested for taking part in demonstrations against the presence of U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia, but he was indignant—and Sorkin was indignant—that investigating such a thing might be considered appropriate for a person working in the same building as the president of the United States. How dare they?

For Shales, “discrimination against Arab Americans and against people who even just look Arabic has been a serious problem in the wake of the terrorist attacks. And is to be deplored and, one hopes, stopped. But the attention given that problem by the *West Wing* episode, as well as by some talk shows and newscasts, seems to suggest that it’s the major issue arising out of the attacks. Viewers of MTV, for instance, have heard more condemnation of discrimination (‘Fight for your rights’) than of terrorism itself.” This passing nod to the massive suspension of constitutional rights for immigrants and noncitizens is overshadowed by Shales’s insistence that not only did Sorkin miss the central moral to be learned from September 11 (terrorism demands a new security state, and true patriots—even when they are the targets of that state, will stand by it, come what may), but that his is not a legitimate voice of morality in the first place. Shales concludes: “It is fair to note that in April, Sorkin was arrested at Burbank Airport and charged with two felony counts of drug possession when cocaine, hallucinogenic mushrooms and pot were found in his carry-on bag. This would seem to have some bearing on his status as

On the other side  
of the frame, a  
dimly lit room,  
an enclosed,  
monitored space,  
managed entirely  
by white men, at  
the center of  
which is a racially  
and sexually  
ambiguous  
figure, a subject  
who at one and  
the same time is a  
possible monster  
and a person to  
be corrected.

moral arbiter for the nation. . . . the implications are unsettling—that even in this moment of pain, trauma, heartbreak, destruction, assault and victimization, Hollywood liberals can still find some excuse to make America look guilty. For what it’s worth, that’s crap.”

Such responses oblige us to recognize that in a moment of what is termed “national crisis,” even platitudinous dissent is beyond the pale of the proper. How does a drug charge disallow a subject from speaking from a space that is morally legitimate—how does any kind of impropriety disqualify a subject who would dissent from the norm? But what this reviewer’s diatribe points to is the subtle and not so subtle forms of normalization that the new patriotism demands of us all. Consider, then, the show’s double frame itself as a kind of technology that is supposed to manage dissent, a technology that demands allegiance even as it produces pluralism. For we see a double-framed reality. On the one side, brightly lit and close to the hearth (invoking the home and the family), is the classroom, a racially and gender-plural space. A space where normal, docile, but heterogeneous psyches are produced, in opposition to the terrorist-monster-fag. A space where the president as Father enters and says that what we need right now are heroes; where the first lady as Mother tells the precocious and sometimes troublesome youngsters a kind of bedtime story of two once and future brothers, Isaac (the Jews) and Ishmael (the Arabs); where male experts regale them with fantastic facts concerning the first acts of terrorism committed back in the tenth century by drug frenzied Muslims; where one woman staff member (C. J. Cregg, played by Allison Janney) declares, “We need spies. Human spies. . . . It’s time to give the intelligence agencies the money and the manpower they need”; and finally, where Josh’s parting advice to the students on how to relate to the terrorists is: “Remember pluralism. You want to get these people? I mean, you really want to reach in and kill them where they live? Keep accepting more than one idea. It makes them absolutely crazy.”

On the other side of the frame, a dimly lit room, an enclosed, monitored space, managed entirely by white men, at the center of which is a racially and sexually ambiguous figure, a subject who at one and the same time is a possible monster and a person to be corrected. A tiny, darkened stage where the ritual of the examination, of the interrogation, is enacted on and through a subject who must perform both his racial and cultural difference and his normality. A subject quarantined, and so secluded, but whose testimony becomes a spectacle through which power will work. A subject whose greatest moment, it seems, comes when, after being terrorized at gunpoint, racially profiled, and insulted, he goes back to work. His interrogator, after stumbling through a kind of apology for his earlier

racist remarks, looks back over his shoulder and says, “Hey kid, way to be back at your desk.”

This double frame stages the two forms of power that we have been marking here: to quarantine and to discipline. It is we who are the school children who must be taught why ‘War means Peace’ in Afghanistan, and certainly some of us match the profile of the monster to be quarantined, corrected, and neutralized. Let us remember that a Hindu South Asian (Ajay Naidu) plays the Arab Muslim in *The West Wing*. We can see the ways in which sexuality, gender, deviancy, normality, and power are knotted together in this TV drama: sometimes in explicit ways, as in the exchange between the interrogator and the Arab American man, or in Shales’s diatribe against the immorality of Sorkin. But what we are in fact suggesting is that the entire double frame comes out of racial and sexual genealogies that imbricate the production of the radical other, as monster, to the practice of producing normalized and docile patriots. These practices, justified in the name of a Holy Crusade against Evil and legitimized through a knowledge of the psyche, follow a simple rule: “Know Thine Enemy.”<sup>32</sup> It recalls what Sigmund Freud once wrote in his famous essay “Thoughts on War and Death.” We should recall these words written in the midst of war, 1915:

The individual in any given nation has . . . a terrible opportunity to convince himself of what would occasionally strike him in peace-time—that the state has forbidden to the individual the practice of wrong-doing, not because it desired to abolish it, but because it desires to monopolize it like salt and tobacco. The warring state permits itself every such misdeed, every such act of violence, as would disgrace the individual man. It practices not only the accepted stratagems, but also deliberate lying and deception against the enemy; and this, too, in a measure which appears to surpass the usage of former wars. The state exacts the utmost degree of obedience and sacrifice from its citizens, but at the same time treats them as children by maintaining an excess of secrecy, and censorship of news and expressions of opinion that renders the spirits of those thus intellectually oppressed defenceless against every unfavourable turn of events and every sinister rumour. It absolves itself from the guarantees and contracts it had formed with other states, and makes unabashed confession of its rapacity and lust for power, which the private individual is then called upon to sanction in the name of patriotism.<sup>33</sup>

In the name of patriotism, a double-framed reality and a double movement of power tie together the production of docile patriots: those monsters who must be quarantined, whose psyches offend the norms of domesticity, of the properly masculine or feminine. Such monsters,

through their very example, provide patriotism with its own pedagogies of normalization. And then we have the space of the national family, inhabited by a plurality of subjects who find their proper being in the heterosexual home of the nation: these subjects are called forth, given being even, by the very figure of the monster, and they are called upon to enact their own normalization— in the name of patriotism. These docile patriots, committed to the framework of American pluralism, are themselves part of a history of racialization that is simply assumed. In our last section, we contextualize both this history and the subjectivities it engenders.

### **Docile Patriots II: Sikhs and Racial Formation**

If in the name of patriotism a certain docility is being demanded of us, we would like to end this essay with a consideration of how communities of color can begin to reframe these discourses, and so articulate the complex pragmatics of solidarity politics. Recent immigration policy and the discourse surrounding it have had an impact on the production of “docile patriotism.” How did the state and its ideological apparatuses prepare “us” for the aftermath of the events of September 11?

In response to increasing mobility of capital across national borders, the anti-immigrant agenda serves to psychically as well as materially prevent the further contamination of the nation. The absence of a concretized external other once embodied by the Soviet Union and other Communist states marks the prime setting for targeting internal others for expulsion or normalization. In advocating the sanctity of the national body through policing of individual bodies, 1990’s anti-immigrant sentiment has been primarily and perniciously fueled by conservative American “family values” rhetoric, aided by the figure of the colored welfare mother as embodying failed heterosexuality as well as compromised production capacity. In fact, many feminist scholars have pointed to the patriarchal family as foundational to the appearance of national belonging as “natural,” much as familial attachments are conceptualized. In the example of post–September 11 organizing by Sikh Americans, once again we see that the underpinnings of nationalism and patriotism are composed not only of demands to produce “good citizenship” status vis-à-vis outlawed undocumented immigrants but also of heteronormativity.

In the racist backlash of the immediate aftermath of September 11, turban-clad Sikhs were “mistaken” for the kin and national compatriots of Osama bin Laden. In fear of being the targets of racist backlash against Muslims and Arab Americans, Sikhs who wear turbans (albeit, as has been repeatedly pointed out by spokespersons for Sikh advocacy groups,

not the type worn by bin Laden) have discovered various counternarratives of respectable turban-hood. Many Sikhs, hearing early reports of turban grabbing and the fatal shooting of turbaned Sikh gas station owner Balbir Singh Sodhi in Mesa, Arizona, have simply abandoned their turbans, for the same reasons that many Sikhs abandoned them when they first migrated to the United States. While turbaned individuals in multicultural America have often been referred to as “towelheads,” the repertoire of sophisticated references has expanded further still: On September 17, U.S. Representative John Cooksey explained to a network of Louisiana radio stations that anyone “wearing a diaper on his head” should expect to be interrogated as a possible suspect in the investigations of the terrorist attacks.<sup>34</sup>

Others have contributed to the current fervor of American patriotic/multicultural exceptionalism by donning red, white, and blue turbans. Organizations such as SMART (Sikh Mediawatch and Resource Task Force, a Sikh American civil rights advocacy group) have released statements, “Talking Points,” and photos explaining the differences between “those” turbans and Sikh turbans.<sup>35</sup> Sikhs are being stopped at airport security and asked to take off their turbans so they can be checked for knives. For this Sikhs are directed by SMART to patiently educate: “The turban is not a hat. It is a mandatory symbol of the Sikh religion. I cannot simply remove it; it must be unwrapped.”<sup>36</sup>

To the average uninterested American eye, however, a turban is just a turban. And it symbolizes the revived, erect, and violent patriarchy of the East, of Islam, and of the Taliban; the oppression of Afghan women; the castration and the penetration of white Western phallic power by bad brown dick and its turban. (Lest one think that the backlash is “over” and that Americans are now educated about Sikhs, a *gurudwara* (temple) in upstate New York that was burned to the ground a few days before Thanksgiving was declared to be arson.)<sup>37</sup>

The turban is a complicated and ambivalent signifier of both racial and religious community as well as of the power of masculine heteronormativity (the shaving of the heads and beards of the suspected Taliban and Al Qaeda nonlegal combatants before being brought to Camp X-Ray at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, is one indication of just how powerful). As such, we are as troubled by the increasing forms of turban profiling and its consequences as we are about the reemergence of cultural nationalism in Sikh and South Asian communities, which often obscures issues of gender and sexuality (for example, the ongoing violence against women in the domestic spheres and the racist backlash against women wearing the *hijab*). The turban becomes a contested symbol for remasculinization and nationalization in the strategies of numerous middle-class Sikh communi-

ties. Such strategies, we should note, respond to and are in conversation with the initial emasculation of the white male state (signaled by the castration of the trade towers on September 11) and the ongoing remasculinization through the war on terrorism.

What these strategies of resistance collude with, however, is precisely the “good psyche” (as opposed to the terrorist psyche) that values and legitimates middle-class domesticity, heteronormativity, and the banal pluralism of docile patriotism. Much mainstream Sikh response has focused on getting the attention of white America, intent on renarrating themselves through American nationalism as respectable, exemplary, model minority citizens who have held vigils, donated blood and funds to the Red Cross, and were quick to cover their *gurdwaras* in American flags. Many national Sikh media outlets, attempting to counter the “mistaken identity” phenomenon, have put out messages to the effect of “we are not them” (Muslims), encouraging Sikhs to use this opportunity to educate people about the peaceful Sikh religion. They are also sending an endless stream of lawyers to Washington, D.C., to meet with senators and other public officials to expound upon Sikh commitments to American civic life.<sup>38</sup> Sikh *gurdwaras* across the country are hiring public relations firms to “deal with this misunderstanding among the American public.” While much of this “damage control” colludes with Hindu nationalist agendas to discredit Muslims and Pakistan, Indian prime minister Vajpayee was actually reprimanded by Sikh groups for both suggesting that women wear *bindis* in order to pass as Hindus and also for asking the U.S. government to protect Sikhs against hate crimes while not mentioning the need to protect Muslim Americans.<sup>39</sup>

There is a complex history that ties Sikh communities to the discourse of terrorism. As is well known, the Indian state throughout much of the 1980s was involved in a massive ideological labor as well as bloody police repression that sought to mark off Sikh groups in Punjab and in the diaspora as terrorist, and to contain the movement for Khalistan (a separatist Punjab). This history positions Sikh identity in an ambivalent relationship to the current war on terrorism: on the one hand, Sikhs in India and in the diaspora, especially *gurdwara* communities, face severe repercussions from the antiterrorist act (known as the Patriot Act);<sup>40</sup> on the other hand, their self-positioning as victims of both state-sponsored terrorism (for example, of the 1984 riots in New Delhi) and, as American patriots, victims of the “Islamic” terrorism of September 11 simultaneously invokes a double nationalism—Sikh and American. For example, Sikhs are holding vigils to mourn September 11 in conjunction with the pogroms of 1984—in other words, to unite with Americans under the rubric of “victims of terrorist attacks.”<sup>41</sup> In this way, we can see how Sikh

Americans face the threat of being quarantined as the terrorist-monster by refashioning themselves as docile patriots.

While the revival of Sikh middle-class “good citizenship” nationalist pride threatens to hinder possible coalitions across class, race, and sexuality, South Asian queer organizations have been relatively quiet about the racist backlash. Turbans have never been viewed as very queer-friendly, at least not in the diaspora. Community-based antibacklash/war organizing efforts—for example, a recent vigil in Jackson Heights, New York, organized by International South Asia Forum—have been conspicuously “straight.” Religious differences have remained largely unaddressed in South Asian queer diasporic organizing contexts, which historically have been predominantly Hindu (and Indian). Unresolved issues of “difference” (class, immigration status, religion, caste) are now coming back to haunt the diaspora, while at the same time, clearly fear around the backlash, outing, and for some, immigration status may prevent many South Asian queers from organizing.

Within the spectrum of towelheads, diapers, and faggotry, the turban is a powerful reminder of the constructions of racial and sexual difference that inform both U.S. discourses of pluralism and South Asian, Middle Eastern, and Arab American community formations. The current climate is an opportunity for Sikhs to rethink the historical fissures among Hindus and Muslims while building stronger coalitions with other communities of color and for South Asian queers to address the pervasive Hindu-centric nature of diasporic organizing in the United States. It is unfortunate, of course, that the class specificity and specifics of violence against brown people are rarely discussed, nor is the perpetuation of this violence by other people of color available for much comment. In light of the fact that Arab Americans historically have not had a racial categorization and as such are coded as white by default, are there new racial formations emerging in response to September 11? What kinds of historically specific racial formations emerging out of model minority/postcolonial privilege and American pluralism and citizenship are South Asians struggling to hold on to or contest?<sup>42</sup>

### **Conclusion: Monster-Terrorist-Fag**

In the contemporary discourse and practice of the war on terrorism, freedom, democracy, and humanity have come to frame the possibility of thinking and acting within and beyond the nation-state. We have sought to show how the uncanny monster-terrorist-fag is both a product of the anxieties of heteronormative civilization and a marker of the noncivilized—in

fact, the anxiety and the monster are born of the same modernity. We have argued that the monster-terrorist-fag is reticulated with discourses and practices of heteronormative patriotism but also in the resistant strategies of feminist groups, queer communities, and communities of color. We suggest that all such strategies must confront the network of complicities that structure the possibilities of resistance: we have seen how docile patriots, even as they refuse a certain racist positioning, contribute to their own normalization and the quarantining of those they narrate themselves against. This genealogy takes on a particular urgency given the present disarray of the antiwar Left, as well as the lack of communication, debate, and connections between white progressives and communities of color, especially those implicated by changing immigration laws, new “border” hysteria, the Patriot Act, and the widespread detention of noncitizens.<sup>43</sup>

Moreover, these questions of discipline and normalization serve to foreclose the possibilities of solidarities among and within communities of color; for instance, between Sikhs and Muslims or among Sikhs who inhabit different class locations. So that even if the long-time surveillance of African American and Caribbean American communities might have let up a bit after September 11, what we see is the legitimation and expansion of techniques of racial profiling that were in fact perfected on black bodies. If contemporary counterterrorism discourses deploy tropes and technologies with very old histories rooted in the West’s own anxieties of otherness and normality, what transformations are we witnessing in the construction of the terrorist-monster? What innovations and reelaborations open new vistas to dominant and emergent forces in the hegemonic politics of the war on/of terrorism? The return of the monster today has enabled a multiform power to reinvest and reinvent the fag, the citizen, the turban, and even the nation itself in the interests of another, more docile modernity.

## Notes

1. While we are critical of the circulation of imagery that produces the turban as the fetishized signifier of the terrorist, effacing the subjectivities of women and the multiple acts of veiling and unveiling that have predominated media representation of the war in Afghanistan, we acknowledge that in some part we reinscribe this erasure in our attempts to deconstruct the heteronormative masculinities of patriotism. We thank Negar Mottahedeh for her astute observations regarding this point. In future analyses we intend to draw on Frantz Fanon’s “Unveiling Algeria” to further elaborate upon these complex relations of gender.

2. Jim Rutenberg, “Fox Portrays a War of Good and Evil, and Many Applaud,” *New York Times*, December 3, 2001.



3. Rand Green, "Taliban Rule in Afghanistan Is a Horrible Reign of Terror," September 24, 2001, [www.perspicacityonline.com/109/Talibanrule10924.htm](http://www.perspicacityonline.com/109/Talibanrule10924.htm). In a review of a recent art exhibition on the monstrous at the DeCordova Museum, Miles Unger glosses why a meditation on monstrosity is timely: "Having been thrust into a context never imagined by its organizers may perhaps work to the show's advantage, throwing into bold relief many aspects of the monstrous that might otherwise have remained harder to detect. Now, more than ever, it seems important not to neglect our fears and to inspect by daylight the demons that always hide in the recesses of the mind. Psychologists have often suggested a therapeutic role for tales of horror, which allow us to acknowledge real fears in a form made manageable through narrative conventions" (Miles Unger, "When Horror Can Be Healthy," *New York Times*, October 28, 2001).

4. In his Christmas address to the armed forces, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld "drew a comparison between the members of today's armed forces and those who served during earlier wars, such as World War II. 'Like those heroes of that earlier era, you too stand against evil—the shadowy evil of terrorism,' Rumsfeld said. 'And like them, you also will be victorious. Of that, there is no doubt.' He said the hearts and prayers of Americans are with them, according to his statement on the Pentagon's Web site. In his holiday message to the troops, General Richard Myers, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said Americans count the members of the armed forces among the blessings they have 'rediscovered' since September 11" (CNN on the Web, Washington, D.C. Bureau, December 25, 2001, [www.cnn.com](http://www.cnn.com)).

5. As Negri put it in a recent interview, "Indeed this confrontation is being played out between those who are in charge of Empire and those who would like to be. From this point of view it can be asserted that terrorism is the double of Empire. The enemy of both Bush and Bin Laden is the multitude" ("An Interview with Toni Negri by Giuseppe Cocco and Maurizio Lazzarato," trans. Thomas Seay and Hydrarchist, *Multitudes* 7 [December 2001], [www.samizdat.net/multitudes](http://www.samizdat.net/multitudes)).

6. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri have remarked on how the deployment of the "human" and the demarcation of the "terrorist enemy" always seem to be the prelude to American police intervention: "Moral intervention serves as the first act that prepares the stage for military intervention. In such cases, military deployment is presented as an internationally sanctioned police action. Today military intervention is progressively less a product of decisions that arise out of the old international order or even U.N. structures. More often it is dictated unilaterally by the United States, which charges itself with the primary task and then subsequently asks its allies to set in motion a process of armed containment and/or repression of the current enemy of Empire. These enemies are most often called terrorist, a crude conceptual and terminological reduction that is rooted in a police mentality" (*Empire* [Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2000], 37). In many ways, we find Hardt and Negri's argument prescient. Yet we also take issue with their own at times profoundly reductive and grossly overgeneralizing framework: we argue that, far from a "crude conceptual and terminological reduction," the term *terrorist* today references a heterogenous, meticulous, and multiform tactic of power.

7. Michel Foucault, "The Abnormals," trans. Robert Hurley, in *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York: New Press, 1997), 51–52.

8. We would add that our analysis of multiform apparatuses is also indebted to network metaphors—for example, Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s “rhizome”—to situate varied bodies such as the Al Qaeda network of terrorist cells or even the rituals of the body associated with anthrax spores that suggest contamination, penetration, and contact. Thanks to Patricia Clough for foregrounding these connections for us.

9. As Said put it in *Orientalism*, “Modern Orientalists—or area experts, to give them their new name—have not passively sequestered themselves in language departments. . . . Most of them today are indistinguishable from other ‘experts’ and ‘advisers’ in what Harold Lasswell has called the policy sciences” (Edward Said, *Orientalism* [New York: Pantheon, 1979], 107). See Harold Lasswell, *The Political Writings of Harold D. Lasswell* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1951); Harold Lasswell, *A Pre-View of Policy Sciences* (New York: American Elsevier, 1971); and Daniel Lerner, ed., *The Policy Sciences: Recent Developments in Scope and Method* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1951). Later in his critique of Orientalism, Said remarks on how monstrosity was used by such “biological speculators” as Isidore and (his father) Etienne St. Hilaire in the first half of the nineteenth century in France. “Not only were Etienne and Isidore legatees of the tradition of ‘Romantic’ biology, which included Goethe and Cuvier . . . but they were also specialists in the philosophy and anatomy of monstrosity—teratology, as Isidore called it—in which the most horrendous physical aberrations were considered a result of internal degradation within the species-life.” Such anomalies (whether physical or linguistic, let us keep in mind) “confirm the regular structure binding together all members of the same class” (144–45). One can, therefore, link monstrosity to nineteenth-century projects of physical anthropology and comparative linguistics that integrated concerns for “regular” structure within an overall framework of the intrinsic coherence of nature.

10. See Said, *Orientalism*; Edward Said, *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World* (New York: Pantheon, 1981); Philip Agee, *Inside the Company: CIA Diary* (New York: Stonehill, 1975); Edward S. Herman, *The Terrorism Industry: The Experts and Institutions That Shape Our View of Terror* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1989); Edward S. Herman, *The Real Terror Network: Terrorism in Fact and Propaganda* (Boston: South End, 1982); Noam Chomsky, *Pirates and Emperors: International Terrorism in the Real World* (New York: Claremont Research, 1986); Talal Asad, ed., *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter* (London: Ithaca, 1971); Cynthia Enloe, *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women’s Lives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000); Shirin M. Rai, ed., *International Perspectives on Gender and Democratization* (New York: St. Martin’s, 2000); Helen Caldicott, *The New Nuclear Danger: George W. Bush’s Military-Industrial Psychosis* (New York: New Press, 2002). See also Ann Tickner, “Feminist Perspectives on Security in a Global Economy,” in *Globalization, Human Security, and the African Experience*, ed. Caroline Thomas and Peter Wilkin (Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1999), 42. The human security framework emergent in U.N. forums and human rights discourses seeks a new discourse that shifts emphasis from the security of states to the security of persons and that provides a framework for analysis of the obligations of states to ensure “human” security in a context that includes the “globalization” of problems across borders and boundaries. Feminist scholars are beginning to articulate a multifaceted gendered analysis of human security.

11. “Know Thine Enemy,” *Foreign Policy* (November–December, 2001): 2.

12. Richard Falkenrath, "Analytic Models and Policy Prescription: Understanding Recent Innovation in U.S. Counterterrorism," *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 24 (2001): 162. Rand Corporations Web page explains: "Our job is to help improve policy and decision making through research and analysis. We do that in many ways. Sometimes, we develop new knowledge to inform decision makers without suggesting any specific course of action. Often, we go further by spelling out the range of available options and by analyzing their relative advantages and disadvantages. On many other occasions, we find the analysis so compelling that we advance specific policy recommendations. In all cases, we serve the public interest by widely disseminating our research findings. RAND (a contraction of the term research and development) is the first organization to be called a 'think tank.' We earned this distinction soon after we were created in 1946 by our original client, the U.S. Air Force (then the Army Air Forces). Some of our early work involved aircraft, rockets, and satellites. In the 1960s we even helped develop the technology you're using to view this web site" ([www.rand.org/about/](http://www.rand.org/about/)).

13. David Brannan, Philip Esler, and N. T. Anders Strindberg, "Talking to 'Terrorists': Towards an Independent Analytical Framework for the Study of Violent Substate Activism," *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 24 (2001): 6.

14. Charles L. Ruby, "Are Terrorists Mentally Deranged?" *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy* (2002): 16.

15. Jerrold Post, "Notes on a Psychodynamic Theory of Terrorist Behaviour," *Terrorism: An International Journal* 7 (1984): 243. Accounts of Osama bin Laden's childhood and his psychological makeup reiterate such frameworks even as they defy them. See, for example, Mary Ann Weaver, "The Real bin Laden: By Mythologizing Him, the Government Has Made Him Even More Dangerous," *New Yorker*, January 24, 2000.

16. Post, "Notes on a Psychodynamic Theory." Like Post, Strentz also has offered a personality grid for terrorist psychopathology. Strentz's first type of terrorist is the leader. Such a person has the overall vision and intellectual purpose of the terrorist group. He or she understands the theoretical underpinnings of the group's ideology. Strentz proposes that such a person projects a sense of personal inadequacy onto society (thus the belief that society is inadequate and in need of change). The leader is suspicious, "irrationally dedicated," and uses "perverted logic" (T. Strentz, "The Terrorist Organization Profile: A Psychological Role Model," in *Behavioral and Quantitative Perspectives on Terrorism* [New York: Pergamon, 1981], 88). The narcissist and paranoid personality is attracted to this terrorist position. The second of Strentz's roles is that of the opportunist. Such a person has technical know-how and is the group's "muscle." Strentz suggests such a person has a criminal history that predates involvement in the terrorist group. According to Strentz, the antisocial personality is drawn to the opportunist role. Lastly, there is the idealist. This is the young person who is never satisfied with the status quo and who has a naive view of social problems and social change. Strentz claims that an inadequate personality best describes the person who is attracted to this role.

17. Ruby, "Are Terrorists Mentally Deranged?"

18. As'ad Abu Khalil, "Sex and the Suicide Bomber," November 13, 2001, [professors\\_for\\_peace@yahoo.com](mailto:professors_for_peace@yahoo.com) (originally published in [Salon.com](http://Salon.com)).

19. The questions that are posed in this literature are: "Why does terrorism occur? What motivates terrorists? What strategies and tactics do terrorists employ

to achieve their goals? How do terrorists perceive their external environment? Under what conditions will terrorists abandon their violent struggle? The success of the terrorism studies literature in answering these questions is uneven. . . . the most powerful analyses of the origins of terrorism tend to be highly specific, applying only to a single terrorist movement of an individual terrorist, and rooted in particular social and psychological circumstances” (Richard Falkenrath, “Analytic Models and Policy Prescription: Understanding Recent Innovation in U.S. Counterterrorism,” *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 24 [2001]: 164). We would also add that recent articles in this journal do not indicate a monovocal diatribe against the “terror from the East.” For instance, Peter Chalk, in his “Separatism and Southeast Asia: The Islamic Factor in Southern Thailand, Mindanao, and Aceh,” argues rightly, we think: “The force of modernization pursued so vigorously by Southeast Asian states has, in many respects, aggravated the situation by undermining [older forms of horizontal community solidarity and hierarchical patriarchal sociality] traditional authority and socio-economic structures. This is especially true in remote, outlying areas that have suffered from administrative neglect and, in some cases outright exploitation, as a result of development programs whose prime purpose has been to further the interests and preferences of the dominant community. For these regions, the unifying ethos of secular modernization has not only acted as a major stimulant for the basis of a new sense of communal identity (ethnic, religious, or both); it has also worked to reinforce the separatist ‘credentials’ of local rebel groupings. The tendency of Southeast Asian governments to periodically crack down on outbursts of communal identity with draconian countermeasures . . . has merely served to further heighten this sense of regional alienation” (*Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 24 [2001]: 242).

20. Brannan, Esler, and Strindberg, “Talking to ‘Terrorists,’” 4.

21. See [www.gzero.net/osamatron/osamatron.html](http://www.gzero.net/osamatron/osamatron.html) and [www.funblaze.com/media/osama/osama.shtml](http://www.funblaze.com/media/osama/osama.shtml).

22. See M. Jacqui Alexander, “Not Just (Any) *Body* Can Be a Citizen: The Politics of Law, Sexuality, and Postcoloniality in Trinidad and Tobago and the Bahamas,” *Feminist Review* 48 (autumn 1994): 5–23; and V. Spike Petersen, “Sexing Political Identities: Nationalism as Heterosexism,” *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 1 (June 1999): 34–65. For a discussion of how queerness is produced for and through the nation-state, see Jasbir Puar, “Transnational Configurations of Desire: The Nation and Its White Closets,” in *The Making and Unmaking of Whiteness*, ed. Birgit Brander Rasmussen et al. (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2001), 167–83.

23. See [www.andrewsullivan.com](http://www.andrewsullivan.com), Daily Dish, for responses to Mark Bingham’s heroism as well as the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy of the military. For example, one gay man wrote: “You see, whether I admitted it consciously or not, one of my problems with gays in the military was not only the unit cohesion issue, but also the sense that gays just couldn’t cut it. Well, as we found out last week, Mark Bingham could cut it. He’s a hero, plain and simple. I simply can’t say to myself anymore that gays have no place in the military” (September 22, 2001). On September 14, 2001, Bush authorized but did not compel the secretary of defense to consider a “stop-loss” order that could potentially suspend gay discharges. The “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell, Don’t Pursue, Don’t Harass” order was never repealed nor suspended.

24. See, for example, Michelangelo Signorile, “Like the Taliban, America’s

Middle East Allies Tyrannize Gays and Women Hate Crimes,” [villagevoice.com/issues/0140/signorile.php](http://villagevoice.com/issues/0140/signorile.php).

25. For example, GLAAD protested the homophobic caption, but neglected to voice any concern for the racist implications of the image. See [www.GLAAD.org](http://www.GLAAD.org).

26. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, “Can the Subaltern Speak?” *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, ed. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 271–313. The irony, if not hypocrisy, of George W. Bush coming out against the misogyny of the Taliban has been pointed out by Barbara Ehrenreich in her article, “Veiled Threat”: “Feminists can take some dim comfort from the fact that the Taliban’s egregious misogyny has finally been noticed. For years, the oppression of Afghan women was a topic for exotic listservs and the occasional forlorn Internet petition. As recently as May 2001, for example, President Bush congratulated the ruling Taliban for banning opium production and handed them a check for \$43 million—never mind that their regime accords women a status somewhat below that of livestock” ([www.latimes.com/news/opinion/la-110401ehrenreich.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/la-110401ehrenreich.story)). In this article, Ehrenreich puts forward a number of explanatory models to account for the misogyny of “Islamic fundamentalism.” She notes that the increase of women in unskilled, low-waged labor under globalization and the consequent mass “lumpenization” of men in developing countries have led to a global crisis in masculinity. She argues, rightly, that it would be a mistake to take Islamic fundamentalism out of the context of other fundamentalisms, such as Hindu, Christian, or Jewish, where we can see a reaction to a global, Western modernity that always in specific ways targets women.

27. See Elisabeth Bumiller, “First Lady to Speak about Afghan Women,” *New York Times*, November 16, 2001. In a similar vein, Global Exchange is now offering, in celebration of International Women’s Week, a special tour by and for women to Afghanistan called “Courage and Tenacity: A Women’s Delegation to Afghanistan.” One can meet with Afghan women in refugee camps, visit the underground schools for girls and the newly reopened women’s bathhouses, and meet with female professionals such as doctors and government officials. See [www.globalexchange.org](http://www.globalexchange.org).

28. For an astute analysis of the complexities of feminist organizing, see Sharon Lerner, “What Women Want: Feminists Agonize over War in Afghanistan,” *Village Voice*, November 6, 2001. See also Sonera Thobani, “War Frenzy”; and Paola Bacchetta et al., “Transnational Feminist Practices against War,” both in “Creating an Archive: September 11: A Feminist Archive,” *Meridians: Feminism, Race, Transnationalism* 2 (March 2002): 250–315.

29. Gary Levin, “More TV Shows Work Attacks into Plots,” *USA Today*, October 17, 2001, [www.usatoday.com/life/enter/tv/2001-10-16-plotlines.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/life/enter/tv/2001-10-16-plotlines.htm).

30. “*West Wing* Airs Attacks Show,” [news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/entertainment/tv\\_and\\_radio/newsid\\_1579000/1579439.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/entertainment/tv_and_radio/newsid_1579000/1579439.stm); see also Tom Shales, “*The West Wing* Assumes the Role of Moral Compass,” *Washington Post*, October 5, 2001.

31. Shales, “*West Wing*.”

32. As in the title of the article cited above.

33. Sigmund Freud, “Thoughts on War and Death,” trans. E. Colburn Mayne, in *Collected Papers*, ed. Joan Riviere (New York: Basic, 1959), 4:293–94.

34. See Joan McKinney, "Cooksey: Expect Racial Profiling," *Advocate*, September 19, 2001, [www.theadvocate.com/news/story.asp?storyID=24608](http://www.theadvocate.com/news/story.asp?storyID=24608). McKinney writes: "U.S. Rep. John Cooksey, R-Monroe, told a network of Louisiana radio stations Monday that someone 'wearing a diaper on his head' should expect to be interrogated in the investigation of terrorist attacks on the Pentagon and New York City." Apparently Cooksey did not retract his remarks, stating: "If I see someone [who] comes in that's got a diaper on his head and a fan belt wrapped around the diaper on his head, that guy needs to be pulled over." See also "SMART Calls for Action against Cooksey," [www.sikhmediawatch.org](http://www.sikhmediawatch.org), reporting a national letter-writing and telephone campaign protesting Cooksey's remarks. SMART (the Sikh Mediawatch and Resource Task Force), founded in 1996 to promote the fair and accurate portrayal of Sikh Americans and the Sikh religion in American media and society, is a nonprofit, nonpartisan, membership-based organization. Its mission is to combat bigotry and prejudice, protect the rights and religious freedoms of Sikh Americans, and provide resources that empower the Sikh American community.

35. See "Understanding Turbans," [seattletimes.nwsources.com/news/lifestyles/links/turbans\\_27.html](http://seattletimes.nwsources.com/news/lifestyles/links/turbans_27.html).

36. See "SMART Initiates Airport Educational Campaign, Requests Community Involvement"; and "SMART Encourages Community Members to Educate Local Airport Security Personnel about Sikhs," November 16, 2001, [www.Sikhnet.com/s/AttackonAmerica](http://www.Sikhnet.com/s/AttackonAmerica). Stating that many cases of "turban-removal have occurred at small or mid-size airports" like Raleigh-Durham, Albany, and Phoenix, but also at larger airports such as JFK, SMART urges Sikhs to initiate educational forums for security personnel and airline employees about turbans and Sikhism and has developed presentations and other resources for this purpose. See also "Federal Aviation Administration to Ensure New Security Procedures That Preserve and Respect the Civil Rights of All Americans," November 19, 2001, [www.Sikhnet.com](http://www.Sikhnet.com). The FAA (Federal Aviation Administration) issued a set of directives detailing methods for conducting airport security based on information presented by the Sikh Coalition and other Sikh organizations (SCORE, Sikh Communications, SMART, and USSA) "about the racial profiling that has caused turban-wearing Sikh Americans to be denied air transportation while being publicly humiliated and embarrassed." "This kind of treatment to loyal Americans makes many feel humiliated, naked in public, victimized and most important, unwelcome in the country that many of us were born in," said Harpreet Singh, director of community relations of the Sikh Coalition. "It is especially upsetting since terrorists take great pains to wear typical American clothing in order to not stand out. We are grateful that the FAA has taken such a firm stand against this type of racial profiling as it is against everything America and Americans stand for." See also [www.sikhcoalition.org/FAAGuidelines.pdf](http://www.sikhcoalition.org/FAAGuidelines.pdf); [www.sikhcoalition.org/airports.ppt](http://www.sikhcoalition.org/airports.ppt); and "Your Rights and Avenues of Action as a Victim of Airport Profiling," [www.sikhcoalition.org/AirportProfiling.pdf](http://www.sikhcoalition.org/AirportProfiling.pdf).

37. For example, the Sikhs of Richmond Hill held a parade (*Nagar Kirtan*) on December 1, 2001, stating: "After September 11, 2001, many people have mistaken Sikhs for Muslims and Arab Americans with the attacks on New York and Washington. This is one way for Sikh Americans to educate their communities about themselves and Sikhism." See "National Sikh Group Adds to Reward," Associated Press state and local wire, November 29, 2001: "A national Sikh organization has added \$5,000 to a reward fund in the case of a Sikh temple

destroyed by arson. The money from the Washington, D.C.–based Sikh council brings to \$15,000 a reward fund for information leading to an arrest and conviction in the case. The main building of the religious center, a 100-year-old converted farmhouse, was destroyed by fire early November 18. Officials last week determined the fire was deliberately set and are considering the fire a possible hate crime, a federal offense.” Since September 11, the Justice Department’s Civil Rights Division, the FBI, and U.S. attorneys’ offices have investigated over 250 “backlash” incidents involving violence or threats against Arab Americans, Muslim Americans, Sikh Americans, South Asian Americans, and individuals perceived to be members of these communities. As of December 3, there were 217 pending FBI investigations—121 (56 percent) were incidents that had occurred within the first seven days after September 11, and 179 (82 percent) within the first eighteen days after September 11. In the month of November, there were only four reported incidents that resulted in FBI investigations. See [www.usdoj.gov/crt/nordwg.html](http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/nordwg.html) for other information on the division’s Initiative to Combat Backlash Discrimination and [www.eeoc.gov](http://www.eeoc.gov) for statements from the participants at the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission’s public hearing on employment discrimination since September 11. See also Orith Goldberg, “Valley Sikh’s Beating Branded As Hate Crime,” *LA Daily News*, December 8, 2001.

38. See “Sikh Representatives Meet U.S. Congressional Leaders,” [www.sikhnet.com/s/SikhMemorialDC](http://www.sikhnet.com/s/SikhMemorialDC). On December 11, three months to the day after the tragedy, Sikh leadership from across the United States and Canada gathered under the dome of the U.S. Capitol Building for the first annual “One Nation United Memorial Program” sponsored by the Washington–based Sikh Council on Religion and Education. The program included senators, members of Congress, government officials, and top leadership from commerce, labor, and the interfaith communities. This was the first event of its kind hosted by the Sikh community in Washington. New York senator Hillary Rodham Clinton stated: “We will always remember the sacrifices that were made by the Sikh Community in the wake of the terrible terrorist attacks of September 11. No community suffered greater loss as a reaction to the terrible losses” of September 11.

39. For examples of Hindu nationalist lobbying against financial aid to Pakistan, see Online Resource for Indian-Americans, [www.indiatogether.org/us/lobby.htm](http://www.indiatogether.org/us/lobby.htm). See also [www.usindialobby.net](http://www.usindialobby.net). “Sikhs Respond to Representative Saxby Chambliss on Bigoted Comments,” December 22, 2001, [www.sikhnet.com/s/Chambliss](http://www.sikhnet.com/s/Chambliss). Sikhnet, Sikh American Association, Sikh Coalition, Sikh Council on Religion and Education (SCORE), SMART, and the Sikh Communications Council state: “As Sikhs and as Americans, we are deeply distressed about the comments that Representative Saxby Chambliss made November 19 to a group of law enforcement officers in Valdosta, Georgia. He alluded to ‘turning the Sheriff loose to arrest every Muslim that crosses the state line.’ We in America look to our elected officials for responsible leadership and guidance.” About SCORE: Founded in 1998, the Sikh Council on Religion and Education, a think tank based in Washington, represents Sikhs in various forums and venues. From the group’s inception, its leadership has been invited repeatedly by the White House, Congress, and various nongovernmental organizations to present the Sikh perspective. The Sikh Council fosters understanding through education and interfaith relations, promoting the concept of community and working to secure a just society for all.

40. "Anti-Terrorism Bill Could Impact Nonprofits," November 14, 2001, [www.ombwatch.org/article/articleview/288/1/18](http://www.ombwatch.org/article/articleview/288/1/18). The USA Patriot Act (PL 107-56) could pose big problems for nonprofits, especially those that advocate changes in U.S. foreign policy or provide social services to individuals who become targets of government investigations. The central problem is a vague, overbroad definition of a new crime, "domestic terrorism." In addition, greatly expanded search and surveillance powers can be invoked under a lowered threshold, requiring only that investigators assert that the information sought is relevant to a foreign intelligence investigation. For praise of the Patriot Act by Sikh organizations, see [www.Sikhnet.com](http://www.Sikhnet.com) (October 31, 2001); and "Measure Supporting Sikh Americans Becomes Law," [www.sikhcoalition.org](http://www.sikhcoalition.org). This law states: "The Civil Rights And Civil Liberties Of All Americans, Including Sikh Americans, Should Be Protected." S. Con. Res. 74 and H. Res. 255 condemn crimes against Sikh Americans in the wake of the September 11 terrorist attacks and mandate that acts of violence against Sikh Americans are to be prevented and prosecuted. "This law represents a significant milestone for Sikh Americans as it addresses the unique nature of the issues faced by Sikhs in the aftermath of September 11, and calls for protection of our civil liberties, along with those of all Americans," said Gurpreet Singh Dhillon, member of the advisory board of the Sikh American Association. (About the Sikh Coalition: "The Sikh Coalition was started as an effort to educate the greater North American community on Sikhs and Sikhism, the coalition seeks to safeguard the rights of all citizens as well as to promote the Sikh identity and communicates the collective interests of Sikhs to the community at large. The coalition serves as a resource for all organizations and individuals as well as a point of contact to Sikh people.")

41. USSA held a candlelight vigil in memory of the 1984 pogroms and September 11 on December 8, 2001, at Madison Square Park, New York City. See [www.sikh.org/vigil](http://www.sikh.org/vigil); "Are Kashmiri Sikhs Next on India's Hit List—Again?" August 7, 2001, *Khalistan Calling*, [www.khalistan-affairs.org/main/k\\_calling/kc08072001.htm](http://www.khalistan-affairs.org/main/k_calling/kc08072001.htm); and "Thirty-five Sikhs Murdered in Chitthisinghpura, Kashmir, by the Indian Army," March 21, 2000, [www.khalistan-affairs.org/main/k\\_calling/kc03212000.htm](http://www.khalistan-affairs.org/main/k_calling/kc03212000.htm).

42. On South Asian racial formation, see Vijay Prashad, *The Karma of Brown Folk* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000). For more nuanced analyses of gender, sexuality, and transnationalism, see Inderpal Grewal, *South Asian Transnationalities: Gender, Class, Ethnicity, and Diaspora* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2002).

43. On the detainees and the connections between the 1996 Detention Act and the USA Patriot Act, see Mark Dow, "The New Secret War against Immigrants," January 30, 2002, [www.gothamgazette.com/citizen/feb02/haiti-progres.shtml](http://www.gothamgazette.com/citizen/feb02/haiti-progres.shtml), as well as a special edition of *ColorLines*, "War on Terrorism: Profiled and Punished" (December 2001).