in *Fear: critical geopolitics and everyday life* (eds R. Pain and S. Smith) Ashgate

2008

CHAPTER ONE

Fear: critical geopolitics and everyday life

Rachel Pain and Susan J. Smith

Introduction

Fear is on the up. It is the denouement of books diagnosing the ills of western

society; the bread and butter of self-help manuals designed to effect a cure. Fear is

written on the world, in lurid orange embossed letters, in sedate newspaper headers,

embedded in memos, emblazoned on YouTube; it is written on the bodies that police

dark corners, hide underground, that avoid, evade and evacuate multiple landscapes of

risk. As the twenty first century gathers momentum, fear is a motif for the human

condition.

Fear cuts across the personal and societal, welfare and commerce, the emotive

and the rational. Whether linked to scares about cot death, juvenile crime, internet

porn, asylum, avian flu, or terrorism, the place of fear is as salient as material risk as a

driver of political manoeuvring and a constraint on personal well-being. The turn to

risk as a foundational state for civil society has saturated almost every aspect of our

lives and times. Fear is deployed in the marketplace, as various threats are drawn into

the development and advertising of new and old consumer goods – weapons; sports

utility vehicles; child tracking devices; organic food. Moral panics about dangerous

groups, places and behaviours inform policing and community safety policies, and

within urban development unjust fortressing and surveillance strategies clash with rhetoric about inclusive and peopled cities (Gilling 1997; Garland 2001). Such exclusionary tensions and effects spill into everyday life, exacerbating social and spatial disparities, and contributing to the demonisation of those social groups who are at the sharp end of fear (Hopkins 2007; Pain and Shirlow 2003; Poynting et al 2004).

There may have been a period in history when fear was restricted to real and imaginary risks in primarily local settings: but increasingly, risk and fear are experience, portrayed and discussed as globalised phenomena (Pain 2007), particularly since the onset of the 'war on terror'. There may be historical continuities in this 'new' geopolitics of fear; but it is more attention-grabbing now that it has ever been before, not least because it is so politically convenient. Bombarding the world with messages about new and renewed risks allows governments to capitalise on fears by governing through the beliefs, behaviours and assent of the 'neurotic citizen' (Isin 2004). Fear of terrorism and threats around the consequences of global population movements have, for example, been persuasive tools in the recent US and European national elections; and domestically, discourses of fear are now routinely utilised to legitimise more punitive justice, restrictions on workplace rights, and freedom of movement (Robin 2004).

What is perhaps most extraordinary is the extent to which the everyday - the feelings, experiences, practices and actions of people outside the realm of formal politics – has become so invisible in the flurry of interest in the globalised geopolitics of fear. Early work on fear of crime developed an empirical tradition which was almost exclusively 'bottom up', using local events and experiences to formulate theoretical and policy solutions to multifaceted lived experiences of risk. In contrast,

empirical and conceptual work at the interfaces of geopolitical practice, public discourse and everyday life are relatively sparse. Instead there is an uneasy yet taken-for-granted assumption that fear-provoking incidents take place, and fear-inducing discourses are circulated, at one (global) scale/space, inducing people to become fearful at other (more local) sites. This received wisdom is, however, at odds with the recent 'emotional turn' in social and economic research which recognises the complexity, situatedness, sociality, embodied and – critically – constitutive qualities of emotional life. Fear does not pop out of the heavens and hover in the ether before blanketing itself across huge segments of cities and societies; it has to be lived and made. Its making may only in very small ways be about the 'large acts' of terror that are played, replayed, revisited and reconstituted on an almost daily basis in the press. And, as we shall see, it is just one of the emotional geographies at work in the world.

The aim of this book is to critique, disentangle and to an extent re-package the increasingly complex, too often taken-for-granted and rarely seriously unpacked engagement between geopolitics and everyday fears. It traces empirically, and accounts critically, for the inscription into lives, times and societies of everyday fears and practices as well as global discourses and events. How do global insecurities worm their way into everyday life? Where do they figure in local landscapes of risk? What do people do with them? What are the tangible threats to safety and well-being, outside of those fears of 'mainstream' society which grab the headlines, and what are the fears of those who are feared? And while fear may be part of the human condition, you only have to be alive to know it is not the only way of human being: so how does fear survive; can it be resisted; what processes of absorption, resistance or reformulation of fear are possible, and where do they come from? How are collective emotions mobilised to engage political action? How do these affect geopolitical

relations and processes? Following these many threads into a network of politics, power, danger and damage, but encountering also hopes, dreams and the road to repair, the contributors to the book compare, contrast and, most importantly, strive to *connect* the themes of geopolitical and everyday fears in different national, cultural and local contexts.

The motivation for this new collection of essays is, then, our dissatisfaction with the way new accounts of the geopolitics of fear tend to fix the everyday in a hierarchical relationship with more global threats (and thus reproduce the problem they are identifying). While many of these accounts are critical of the state and its work, geopolitical events and processes are nonetheless positioned as leading and influencing what people feel in everyday life (Pain 2007). Our goal, and the impulse driving the chapters which follow, is to splice the two approaches together, to develop a spatial politics of fear that not only includes both, but finds ways to bring them together in one account (see Megoran 2005). This does, inevitably, build from the two strands to analysing fear which have been prominent in social science scholarship to date – the everyday and the geopolitical - but in the end it is an argument against their hitherto separated trajectories. Our point is that there are not two scales which inspire and address fear by variously *relating* to one another; rather there are assemblages of fear built, trained, embedded, woven, wired, nurtured and natured into the way specific times, places, and events work.

To develop this argument, we begin by setting out a problematic which, in our view, limits current understandings of fear. In this problematic, work on geopolitics of fear and work on fear in everyday life are disconnected. In the account that follows, we first address the conflicts and disunities that arise when viewing fear through these two alternate lenses. We then go on to set out a new way of envisioning fear. The

argument we put forward, and go on to develop in the book, is that attending to the specific materialities, spatialities, experiences and practices of emotions in particular contexts is more enlightening than vague, utilitarian or hierarchically scaled conceptions of fear. We therefore conclude our overview by presenting an argument for rethinking the connectedness of global and everyday fears, through the lens and practice of moral and material geographies. The final paragraphs of the introduction scroll forwards to the chapters that follow, showing how, in their different ways, each helps to build on and advance this new agenda.

The geopolitics of fear is everyday life...

The literature as it stands contains both a 'top down' and a 'bottom' up take on fear: they look somewhat different, but in the end, we will argue, they are part of the same assemblage.

The first significant strand in the analysis of fear focuses upon everyday life. In this vein, research across the social sciences over more than three decades has emphasised the social and spatial constitution of the micropolitics of fear. Feminist scholars in sociology, criminology and human geography have been especially prominent here, seeking to draw out the way social politics become entwined with the particularities of place to produce emotional landscapes for marginalised groups (e.g. Day et al 2003; Pain 2001; Smith 1989a; Stanko 1990; Valentine 1989). The emphasis in this literature has been on giving voice and credence to the fear-full experiences and practices of everyday life. Many scholars have therefore called for in-depth methodological approaches which allow for appreciation beyond the snapshot of doorstop survey. As a consequence, qualitative and ethnographic research, and, more recently, collaborative knowledge production, with fearful and feared communities,

have become the norm (for example Loader at al 1998; Moser and McIlwaine 1999; Oslender 2007; Panelli et al 2007). Such research has therefore been a political project which involves exposing the partiality or irrelevance of the fears which tend to be publicised by the media or in safety guidance issued by the state. Instead, and alongside political activism, this body of research highlights two things.

First, there is strong relationship between marginality and fear, as the contours of anxiety within cities tend to follow topographies of inequality. Second, and more crucially still, this work points to an extensive catalogue of hidden harm in private and unpoliced spaces stemming from racist violence, domestic violence, child abuse, elder abuse, police brutality against the young, homeless and dispossessed, and latterly Islamophobia (see Section 3 in this volume). Exposing the fears of people who are sometimes more often constructed as fear-provoking in popular discourses has become a defining task in such work. The political bent, as well as the rootedness in experience, of many of these accounts resists presumption about the immutable passivity of fearful subjects, and highlights the many ways of nurturing resilience and resistance to fear.

The second key strand of research on fear concentrates on those political geographies of fear inspired by events which have global and national reach. In this literature fear is most often analysed as a tool of governance, legitimising national and international actions on terrorism, informing issues of national security, restricting immigration and so on. The focus of this literature is fear and the state, and so the emphasis is not so much upon the emotional or experiential aspects of fear for individuals or communities, but rather with the way fear inspires actions which regulate and manipulate everyday life (Robin 2004; Gregory and Pred 2007; Sparke 2007). The active agents here may be terrorists or insurgent groups, competing

national regimes, or layers of domestic governance; the fears they inspire are communicated and mediated through the mass media, popular culture and policy-making. While this spiral of fear-making and fear-mongering is a longstanding area of interest, the conflict between the west and the middle east, and the rise of a terrorist threat against the west in the twenty-first century have meant a sharp rise in interest and expansion of analysis of these kinds of fear. Other concerns about 'global' risks such as disease or immigration have also heightened in recent years, and informed this rising sense of panic.

What is key here is not necessarily the newness of these 'world class' risks, but a gradual realisation of the globalisation of risk – an acknowledgement that perceived threats and dangers are much closer to the west than they used to be (and it is largely western *fears* that this literature is concerned with). Terrorism in response to American bombing in the Middle East, avian flu, the mass movement of people in response to humanitarian crises, the effects of pollution on climate change, all now mean that potential risk travels fast. Places are more intimately connected, and so too follows fear. Any illusion of security by distance has been shattered by the continuing compression of time-space. In this way, the attacks on the United States of September 11th 2001 acted to crystallise the emotional landscapes of the west which had been developing for some time. These fears, while we might think of them in some way as global, are inward-looking: terror and crisis affecting non-western countries does not provoke the same emotions in the west. One effect of the 'war on terror' has been to raise the prominence of the geopolitical almost beyond question, and submerge the everyday – what is actually going on with people's emotions has, by and large, been forgotten.

While these global and local bodies of work have tended to ignore each other, their subjects are clearly linked. Just as the accounts of everyday fear bind wider social and political structures into their explanations (for example, see Betsy Stanko's (1987, 134) insistence on 'what it means to be universally vulnerable, a subordinate, in a male-dominated society' in shaping women's fear), global fears are also inherently, already everyday in their manifestations (witness Corey Robin's (2004) account of the impacts on terror discourses on Muslim workers in the United States). Indeed there is a growing literature, particularly longstanding in feminist international relations, that embraces these dual engagements effectively, as we outline below. More broadly, the scaling of social and spatial phenomena – of which global/local and geopolitical/everyday are two examples – is now more widely recognised as an artificial, hierarchical and essentially political device. Marston et al's (2005) critique of the scalism implicit in the 'globe talk' of some political scientists has resonance here, where the global (as the large, structural, all-encompassing) is seen as a more pressing concern in analysis. It is not always acknowledged that grounding observations at this scale is one way of avoiding assumptions that are sometimes disturbing, and of developing notions of power as complex, dispersed and contested. But the geopolitical and the everyday are unequal partners on a slanted playing field, in academic as well as wider political domains. As Sharp (2007) describes, there is a continuing tendency for the insights of feminist theory and empirical work – and grounded accounts of the everyday, the embodied and the emotional - to be marginalised in the political sciences. In the same way, we suggest (see also Megoran 2005; and Megoran, and Pain, in this volume), it is anomalous that longstanding critical scholarship on the fear of violence has, precisely *because* it is scholarship

rooted in the practices of everyday life, barely been mentioned in recent interest in critical geopolitics of fear.

Before going on to set out a new way of envisioning fear, we want to elaborate on some of the disconnections that arise when viewing fear through these two alternate lenses. For us, it is not enough to identify the everyday and geopolitical components of fear as equal partners in producing or exchanging fear, like pieces of a jigsaw: there are problematics, discontinuities and disconnections that need to be addressed. Geopolitical and everyday accounts often do not map onto each other. Everyday accounts tend to suggest it is the same old longstanding local fears which are most prominent in people's lives, rather than fears about terrorism or new killer viruses: the new 'global' fears simply do not figure that highly in everyday lives (see Alexander in this volume), or else they have more indirect impacts, or affect marginalised groups rather than the wider population (see Hopkins and Smith, Noble and Poynting, and Hörschelmann in this volume). So, while we go on argue that global fears are continually being materialised in a bid to ingrain them into everyday lives, everyday lives are often immersed in more pressing matters .

There is also a concern that analyses of fear as geopolitical sometimes inadvertently reproduce the very state metanarratives about fear they oppose, in failing to question who feels what (see Pain 2007, and in this volume). Further, geopolitical analysis sometimes ignores people and their power, or uses representations as a kind of proxy for people's feelings and actions; yet politics is also made up of actions and practices among ordinary people everyday. What of people's consciousness, criticality and resistance in the face of geopolitical discourses and events? Equally, there are limitations to approaches to fear that overemphasise the everyday and place the local merely as a blank canvas for empirical description of

broader processes. Here too, agency becomes lost, and an inward-looking focus on experiences and practices becomes insulated from its political, social and cultural contexts at a time when fear is rapidly globalising.

Many of the contributors to this book address these disjunctures. They also identify a last crucial disconnection: namely that there seem few means of *connecting* the geopolitical and the everyday in convincing ways. We are quite ignorant of the movement of fear; how it circulates from global to local, or how it moves from discourses/events to the bodies and feelings of individuals.

A well-established feminist critique of critical geopolitics provides a starting point for a new kind of reconnection. In linking the global and the local/intimate, it offers a helpful structure for recognising the entanglement of fear as discursive/intended/manipulative with fear as it is made and played out in local lives. Feminists writing about global/everyday relations, such as Dowler and Sharp (2001), Hyndman (2004), Katz (2004) and Pratt and Rosner (2006) identify some principles for grounding our understanding. In proposing feminist interventions to geopolitical analysis, Dowler and Sharp (2001) make three suggestions which are very relevant to this discussion of fear.

First, they argue that we need to *embody* geopolitics, focusing on how particular bodies are used and represented, in evaluating discourses and in highlighting everyday experience. Feminist analyses have pointed to the ways women's bodies are caught up in international relations – as workers, victims, mothers - at everyday, and so unremarkable, levels (see Hyndman 2003). Secondly, Dowler and Sharp suggest we need to *locate* geopolitical analysis more clearly, to counter previous western (and predominantly white, middle class, male, adult) discourses. For us, this demands giving credence to the accounts of those who are (or

who are labelled) fearful; making space for the voices of those at the sharp end of fear to challenge authoritative/expert accounts (see Askins, Pain, and Wright in this volume). Thirdly, we need to *ground* geopolitics and consider how international representations and processes work out in everyday life.

Various examples of recent feminist work make these connections and insist on a 'microscale' geopolitics of the everyday. A rich case in point is Katz's (2004) 'countertopography' of US and Sudanese childhoods in the context of global restructuring, in which she draws out the ways that processes at different scales, affecting what appear to be very different places, are connected. Such arguments apply as well to fear, as there are contiguous inter-relationships between global processes and local topographies of emotion. As Pratt and Rosner (2006) insist with their collection of feminist work on the intertwining of global and intimate relations, the disruption of grand narratives of global relations and the upending of hierarchies of space and scale are vital. Disturbing the scales of local and global altogether, rather than simply highlighting and reifying the local, is necessary if everyday practices and actions are not simply taken to 'confirm the force and inevitability of certain modes of global capitalist expansion' (Pratt and Rosner 2006, 16).

Building on some of these ideas, we go on to suggest two related conceptual mainstays for understanding fear as simultaneously everyday and geopolitical – remoralising and rematerialising fear. To develop these themes, we want to suggest a change of visual motif for the way global and local fears work. This shift is represented in Figure 1.1. The existing model for thinking about the geopolitics of fear, which we have outlined, can be visualised as in Figure 1.1a. Here the political and the everyday are represented as two distinct realms, fixed in a hierarchical

relationship, with events at one scale directly *relating* to those at another, implying that global risks affect and shape the manifestation of local fear.

Figure 1.1:

FIGURE 1.1a ABOUT HERE

FIGURE 1.1b ABOUT HERE [must be adjacent to Figure 1.1a]

Figure 1.1b offers an alternative visual metaphor for the reconceptualisation of critical geopolitics and everyday life. It is a motif which removes the spatial hierarchy linking large-scale risks with localised anxieties. But it is not so much a 'flat ontology' of fear as a model for the structuring of fear into – and potentially out of – life itself.

Recognising this space of potential makes the concepts of Figure 1.1b more politically enabling and therefore more satisfactory intellectually than the literature to date. The figure is in the form of a double helix, borrowed of course from the structure of DNA, which contains the genetic instructions for life. It has two equivalent strands (geopolitics and everyday life) that wind into a single structure and form the building blocks of every assemblage of fear. The 'two strands' carry the same information and are bound together by numerous connectors (in DNA, hydrogen bonds pairing complementary bases). We could see these connections as events, encounters, movements, dialogues, actions, affects and things: the materials that connect and conjoin geopolitics and everyday life. But these engagements are fragile - in DNA, the hydrogen bonds unzip and rejoin; that is why, as a safeguard, the genetic information is duplicated on each strand. The breaks and discontinuities that occur – both randomly and in patterned ways – might represent the awkward, unfinished,

disunited, conflicting nature of relations between the geopolitical and the everyday; but ultimately they are inter-reliant and complementary. Our argument is that it is these connections and disconnections which are not just new and interesting, but also politically enabling – it is in these connecting and dynamic spaces and things where the opportunities lie to resist, have dialogue, influence and act. So while there is an inevitability about the fearful human condition, this model holds out also a prospect of designing in other ways of human being. Fear and hope are two sides of a single coin; they cannot be uncoupled but one is often more visible than the other. A new visual motif for the way fear works and is materialised is one route to a more rounded experience of this janus-faced condition.

In the remainder of the chapter, we elaborate on how this newly envisioned relationship might be conceptualised. In particular, we suggest some ideas by which global fears might be grounded, and the scales of everyday and geopolitical at least partially dismantled.

What is 'fear', anyway?

A 'common sense' understanding of fear portrays it as an emotional response to a material threat. People are fearful of individuals, places, actions and events that have inflicted, or are very close to inflicting, physical or psychological harm on themselves or on the people and things they hold dear. This is akin to a 'medical model' of fear, which presumes that risks are objective, that they cause or pass on fear in the way a pathogen causes disease, and that the condition can be both prevented and cured by applying the appropriate formula. Avoiding, evading, or removing real risks is, for this model of life, a logical way to deal with such grounded and immediate fears.

Another way of understanding fear is to regard it as an emotional geography that has somehow acquired a life of its own; a condition that is only loosely related to material risks. Then the challenge becomes one of working out what inspires levels of fear that are disproportionate to real risks, and addressing them in the interests of arriving at a less anxious world. One of the most debated mechanisms this model draws into the amplification of fear is that of 'moral panic' in which media representations, criminal justice scapegoating, and policing crackdowns whip up a frenzy of societal outrage against criminalised people and places. One result is toughened sentencing; another is heightened fear (Hall et al 1978)

Reputations have been made, revised and subdued by a longrunning debate around the 'old chestnut' of just what it is – reality, imagination or moral indignation - that inspires fear, and why. But it is a tired debate which does not take account of the way the world of fear has been changing, and in particular which sheds little light on the vexed question of how to apprehend simultaneously the global fears rewriting the landscape of international (and internal) relations, and the local lives whose fears have hitherto featured most prominently in conventional literatures around, for example, fear of crime, fear for children and fear of sexual predation. In an attempt to move understanding of fear forward through, within, and perhaps despite, the global/local paradox, we flesh out Figure 1.1b by suggesting two rather different ways into the geography of fear-full lives. We offer first a moral, and then a material take on what fear is and how it works

Moral geographies

First, we draw attention to what might be called the moral geographies of fear. Eschewing the narrow confines with which definitions of fear have been scientised or

medicalised, this book is about fear as a condition constituted beyond the pathological or individual. Fear is a social or collective experience rather than an individual state. But it is more than this – it is also a morality play and a product of the power relations that shape the moral codes of everyday conduct as well as those of international affairs. Fear does not just involve a relationship between the individual and a variety of societal structures; it is embedded in a network of moral and political geographies.

We can illustrate this by fleshing out the operation of two linked practices: naming and privileging. The naming and privileging of certain styles of fear implies that one kind of (authoritarian) politics has a grip on the moral geography of anxiety. But wound into the spiral of authoritarian morality is an everyday morality which contains a more radical politics - a politics that can reshape and recast the landscape of fear, a way of going on that could and *should* be interrogated for what it tells us about the way people experience, handle and recast fear.

Naming fear

How do we understand such a wide ranging term as 'fear', with its various nuances in meaning? The answer to this question is much more diverse than today's headlines might suggest. A glimpse into the debate over 'naming' is itself a stark reminder of the extent to which dominant discourses take for granted the privilege routinely afforded to some 'names' over others. So it is worth noting these three things.

First, some critics of 'the fear of crime' have argued that the concept has little meaning at all; that it is a tautological discourse whose circularity is broken when people who are asked about other emotional reactions to crime choose these over

'fear' (Ditton and Farrell 2000). Fear from this perspective is 'misnamed'; it captures a range of experiences about which rather little is known.

Second, at the same time, some of the earliest accounts of fear of assault put forward by feminist scholars and activists (for example Stanko 1987; Wise and Stanley 1987), while countering the dominant individuated image of 'fear' as a physical response to an immediate threat where the heart races, palms sweat and body shakes, also recast gendered fear as far more than isolated moments of affect. These fears were named to capture an ongoing malaise engendered by people's structured position in a hierarchy of power. The wealth of detailed evidence on which these ideas were based told of the ways in which harassment, discrimination and other everyday 'normalised' encounters feed into a generalised sense of insecurity. For these writers the peaks of fear may be created by the threat of sexual or domestic abuse, but the baseline never returns to zero; and the two were not extremes but fundamentally tied to women's (or other marginalised groups') social and political position.

Third, and intriguingly, later work has also questioned the apparent universalism of feminist analysis. Whose label is fear? Do we call it fear before we know it is fear, and is this disempowering - for example identifying women as eternal victims and denying them the possibility of challenging that status (Segal 1990)? Following a predominantly Anglo-American debate, Koskela's (1997) work in Finland raised new questions about the cultural specificity of this malaise of fear, as well as the possibilities of boldness and resistance (see also Pain (1995) on old age and fear).

Far more remains to be said about resistance and hope (see Wright in this volume). For the moment, we raise these questions. Does naming certain groups as

fearful do them a disservice? Does it become difficult to escape these categorisations, which have also been convenient vehicles for further constraining participation in social life (Midwinter 1996; Stanko 1990; Valentine 1996)? For Muslims in North America and Europe during the 'war on terror', is there a danger that the allotment by critical researchers of 'fearful' in addition to 'feared' is not just a means of identifying oppression, but a way of further fixing marginality? And so on. In short, with naming fear comes a presumption about whose experience this is; a presumption about who could and should address fear and how. With the practice of naming comes the politics of privileging.

Privileging fear

The question of who can and does name fear is answered partly by understanding whose voices, and whose labels, are privileged. Successive politicians have played to the 'fears' of middle class, white suburbanites, while validating and reinforcing them, and as explored elsewhere, some recent academic analyses do the same (Pain 2007). Terror fears, reflecting imaginary geographies of western countries as newly risky (Graham and Pred 2007; Katz 2007), are fears of the white, privileged and protected. Analyses of the privileged, such as Gleeson's (2003) account of suburban white Australia, are necessary, exposing exclusionary tensions and the living conditions of less privileged groups by default.

But it is often the quietest fears, holding apparently little political capital but having a more immediate materiality, which have the sharpest impacts (Shirlow and Pain 2003). While these impacts may not be headline seeking, they are moral practices which can have effects: which can jump from strand to strand in the assemblage of fear, potentially changing the way fearful lives are replicated for the

future. A number of authors argue that there are, embedded in the conduct of everyday life – in ordinary people's hopes and fears, in the routines of human being, in the lay practices that make local geographies teem with life – normative themes that are too often overlooked by policy makers and academics alike (Sayer 2003; Smith 2005). In fact, lay practices can differ radically from political assumptions and predictions; they can – quietly, defiantly, routinely, inadvertently or in many other ways – help privilege different takes on fear, and shape different responses to it. If the world does work more in line with our connective model of fear assemblages (Figure 1.1b) rather than with the traditional hierarchical approach (Figure 1.1a), there is a moral prerogative to emphasise people's own accounts of the pattern of their emotional landscapes. Ordinary lives often hold the solution to some of the more intractable political problems.

Material panic

Hitherto, the power relations of naming and privileging fear have been understood through the lens of moral panic. Understanding the way fear works has been about being able to see how isolated events of criminality and victimisation are drawn into a frenzy of demonisation and vulnerabilities, and thereby into a politics of repression. Moral panic is an appealing explanation for the way in which fear becomes detached from material risk and takes on a life of its own. But it presumes too much about the way people come to know about, and react, to risks and threat; it assigns too much power to a press whose content is as likely to be taken with a pinch of salt as it is to be believed. The notion of moral panic might be in line with the understanding of fear represented in Figure 1.1a, but our attempt to unsettle this model points to two other themes. Elaborating the assemblage model depicted in

Figure 1.1b we suggest the practices of knowing and placing fear give it a materiality of its own. Fear is not an abstract moral panic; it is an increasingly ingrained material practice. The uneven materialisation of some versions of fear and fearfulness is what drive the politics of control that have so much currency today.

Knowing fear

How do we know about fear? What frameworks of analysis apply, and what methods allow people to tell it? For a subject so complex, there has been heavy reliance on analysis of media representations and superficial surveys. Material risk is hard to know, as few of those most at risk from crime, abuse and harassment ever report their experiences, but it is downplayed or ignored in many accounts of fear of crime. However, a key theme for this book is the extent to which fear has a materiality of its own. Fears of all kinds are networked, hardwired and signposted into life in ways that variously alert, protect and control. Walk across any hotel lobby in a large US city today, and wait for the lift. There will be a sign warning you that there are carcinogens all around; you are there at your own risk. Walk through security in any UK airport: forget the metal objects that keep the electronic alarms beeping in the background, but remember to put toiletries into a clear plastic bag. That is a material reminder of one airport bomb scare; others will leave different traces. They too will be written onto the innocent bodies that move across borders, and will be carried with them as they travel through space and time (see Abu Zhara, and Van Houtum and Pijpers, in this volume). Fear has a creeping materiality that pervades, constitutes, and binds together the ostensibly separate spheres of geopolitical and everyday life (Figure 1.1). Even though 'real' risks are unknowable and may seem remote, the fear they inspire gains momentum at it is materialised at every turn and in every body.

Placing fear

Imaginaries of fear have always been spatialised: located in certain places rather than others. The ways in which fear is materialised and embodied brings these spatialities to life. In mainstream accounts of fear, in the discipline of criminology and the public policies it services (see Figure 1.1a), imaginary geographies of fear have been encouraged by the focus on fear, crime and violence almost exclusively as problems of public space and strangers (Stanko 1987; Pain 2000). Fear is viewed as a problem of city centres, urban streets and parks, rather than homes, semi-private spaces and people who are acquaintances or relatives. If fear is reduced by reducing risks, then the fact that most attempts at resolving fear are situational and limited to public space is problematic (Gilling 1997).

Yet tackling 'the wrong kind of fear' is still high on the agenda. And this is because these fears acquire a materiality, a facticity, of their own. What may begin as immaterial fears become materialised, for example through the safety industry which supplies technologies of surveillance and defence, supposedly to keep fears at bay, but, as Katz in this volume argues, they create more largely unnecessary concern. Elsewhere Katz (2007) suggests that terror fears have become a normalised part of the material urban environment in the US, as the presence of armed soldiers guarding bridges and streets no longer merits attention. Again, how much protection these materialisations of fear provide is dubious; but they can instil as well as reflect fear, allowing remote global fears to creep into our subconscious minds and rountised actions alongside those everyday fears we already know about and experience. Another example, the growth in popularity and marketing of sports utility vehicles as supposedly capable of keeping our (though not other) families safe (Lauer 2005),

underlines that the materialisation of fear does not just lead to a changing landscape for all, but reflects a sharply unequal distribution of fear, privilege and risk.

Bodies are drawn into this unequal materialisation of fear too: certain people are more or less feared in different places and times, partly depending on bodily markers, and this profoundly affects their own feelings of security, as Hopkins (2004, 2007) has described in relation to young Muslim men. While fear as part of everyday life in poorer, riskier countries is more seldom mentioned (though see Abu Zhara, Megoran, and Wright in this volume), Hyndman (2003) has drawn a powerful contrast between the portrayal of women's and children's bodies in the September 11th attacks and the attacks on Afghanistan which followed.

Recognising the materiality of fear means that there are tracks and traces between the different lives of those who seek to control fear and those whose lives are pervaded by it. It is possible to follow the materialisation of certain fears into local landscapes; and it is important to show how everyday practices might be inspired by this, might tolerate it, could ignore it, will certainly pose alternatives, and may well have other, more pressing, 'things' to contend with – other materialities which could and perhaps should be privileged over the dominant manifestation of fear

Summary

So the moral and material geographies of fear are simultaneously about the ordinary social geographies of everyday life and about the extraordinary (exceptional) geopolitics of the 21st century. We have argued that it is time to shift the emphasis from authoritative, remote, top-down models of fear to more nuanced and grounded approaches. But more than this, the book aims to highlight entwined nature of globalised fears and the processes underlying them; to work with the immediate local

everyday fears that are already there; and to stimulate further thought about their connections and relationships with the wider world.

While it is increasingly acknowledged that political violences and fears are expressed in everyday and intimate spaces (Gregory and Pred 2007: 6), for us the task goes well beyond simply expanding the spaces and scales under consideration when charting the way politics has its effects. Indeed we make the case for rupturing the very idea of these spaces and scales, because they tend to fix commanding notions about emotions, power, human agency and being. Instead, we have suggested a new motif to account for fear – a figure in which geopolitical and everyday processes, events and actions are interwined, building assemblages of fear that are trained, embedded, woven, wired, nurtured and natured into the way specific times, places, and events work. In particular we want to underline the fact that the everyday always and already speaks back, resists, and changes seemingly immutable forces. Reimagining, indeed remaking, the nexus of geopolitical and everyday fears in this way opens up the possibilities for change: in that sense it is an empowering and enabling model of fear potentially resistant to political attempts to manipulate people's emotions. At the same time, it holds out the prospect of 'scaling up' the materialities of fear: small acts and practices can make a difference; the materialities of local geographies can find their way into the circuits of high politics. While materialising fear is substantially a bid to get a particular version of global politics ingrained into the everyday; there is no reason why it cannot also be about the way particular versions of everyday life travel into the geopolitics of fear.

The contents of the book

Taken as a whole, the chapters which follow identify the ways in which fear may be manufactured and manipulated for political purposes, and chart the association of fear discourses with particular spaces, times and sets of geopolitical relations. They relate fear closely to political, economic and social marginalisation at different scales, and explore the more complex social identities of which fear becomes a part. They highlight the importance and sometimes unpredictability of lived experiences of fear: the many ways in which fear is made sense of, managed and reshaped in particular contexts. People's emotional reactions to risk of course go much further than fear, encompassing anxiety, anger, boldness, hope, and so on. People's capacity to resist and act on their fears, rather than passively experiencing them, and the role of emotions in galvanizing this action, resurface as strong themes throughout the book.

The contributors were not asked to contribute uniformly to the model of everyday geopolitics we have mapped out here; some focus more on everyday lives, and some more on geopolitical relations and events. All draw out the connections between the two, some in more depth than others. Moreover, there are contrasts, collisions and controversies between the perspectives and arguments put forward in individual chapters. These point to the fractures in the materials of fear that might in the end open a window into other styles of human being.

The book is split into five sections. The first, 'State fears and popular fears', offers different takes on the relationship. Nick Megoran demonstrates that a fuller understanding of fear must locate it both in geopolitical discourse and popular culture. He describes how politicians and popular culture in Uzbekistan draw on an 'ever-present and all-pervading sense of territorialised danger'. He illustrates the importance of geography to how fear works out: fear discourses play out in different

sites, and people's response to them is embodied, blurring the distinction between the political and the personal and underlining the uniqueness of each national context. Catherine Alexander offers a local, grounded account of how fear of young people, and young people's own fears, construct their citizenship in north east England. Working from a moral perspective that is closely attuned to young people's own perspectives, she identifies that many of their fears may be relatively mundane and deeply embedded in this particular local community, but at the same time closely connected to wider discourses about youth nationally. Deborah Cowen and Emily Gilbert focus on the crucial and underplayed ways in which geopolitics interplays with the private sphere. In examining how the US governs through fear, and governs as fear, they describe the centrality of the home and the familial as constructs in the ideological battles that have shaped domestic and foreign policy since September 11th. Cindi Katz explores one aspect of this relationship in more detail. Drawing parallels between parental hypervigilance and homeland security doctrines in twenty-first century US, she discusses how certain materialities – the technologies of fear - encourage us to focus on certain fears while avoiding attention to the more salient risks for children.

The second section, 'Fear of nature and the nature of fear', comprises two essays which explore ideas about 'natural' fear and fear of nature, in rather different ways. Alan Ingram shows how the re-emergence of infectious disease is being harnessed to a politics of international migration. The re-emergence of malaria, the re-internationalisation of TB, the spectre of new diseases from AIDs to Ebola, from SARS to MRSA, has whipped up a new style of panic and a new generation of politics. Ingram points to the awful irony that infectious disease are a major cause of human suffering and mortality (so should logically engender more fear and attract

more attention than terrorism), but that recognising this is more likely to fuel a politics of conflict and control than a compassionate co-operation. Similar ambiguities in the way fear works, and in the networks of ideas, feelings and materials fear mobilises, are drawn out by Jo Little in her discussion of the way ideas and encounters with nature both buffer and mobilise fears of all kinds. Being in and of nature is a way of distancing certain people, places and ways of life from fearful things. It is in also, in some sense, a way of resisting, reworking and revising fear; about a way of human being that is not always inspired by and defined in relation to risk.

The four chapters in 'Encountering fear and otherness' offer different conceptual angles on the fears of the feared. All come to focus on the intensification of racist abuse in different western contexts, as terror fears overlay older insecurities and prejudices. Peter Hopkins and Susan Smith explore the recent recasting of relations of race and religion: how religion is becoming increasingly racialised and the politics of fear are rescaled. This, they argue, is causing more harm in everyday life and redefining and retrenching segregation in the west. Michael Haldrup, Lasse Koefoed and Kirsten Simonsen examine how racism and discrimination are enabled through the 'mooding' of Orientalist and hegemonic geopolitical discourses, which are resultingly '(re) produced and negotiated in banal, bodily and sensuous practices'. For Greg Noble and Scott Poynting too, it is not a generalised (and predominantly white) culture of fear we should be addressing, but specific material experiences of threat that are racialised. They identify how the 'little things' of uncivil behaviour from neighbours and police towards migrants to Australia 'disenfranchise them from full participation in spaces of local and national belonging'. Kathrin Hörschelmann also argues for the inclusion of everyday voices into our understanding of the

geopolitics of fear. She challenges the common accusation that young people are

disinterested in politics, or hold merely self-centred or insular fears. In fact, their

concerns about the 'war on terror' include the safety of distant others in the countries

the UK government has launched attacks on.

The fourth section, 'Regulating fear', contains the most fully worked overview

of how fear is powerfully inspired and manipulated in order to legitimise political

strategies which, while ostensibly designed to tackle problems that might be real, do

so in ways which have little effect on the lives of those at risk, yet do meet wider,

unstated, political goals. See Smith (1989b) for a more general discussion of this style

of politics. Henk van Houtum and Roos Pijpers elaborate this most explicitly,

showing that what used to be thought of as 'Fortress Europe' operates more like a

'gated community'. Europe is not closed to immigration; it is closed to a certain type

of immigrant, and the selectivity of this closure is policed by fear. Policing by fear is

one of the most enduring themes in human life, especially at a time when political

intent is not just represented in the bodies and actions of the police themselves and in

the laws they enact, but in a host of linked materials: communications technologies,

biometrics, and human documentation of all kinds. The material legitimation for a

strategy of policing by fear is starkly set out by Nadia Abu Zhara in her moving

account of the way the possession and dispossession of idenitity cards is routinely

used to monitor the position, control the movement, and inhabit the personality of

Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Finally in this section, Peter Shirlow

focuses on the contested residential boundary between Catholics and Protestants in

Belfast, Northern Ireland. It has been clear for decades that sharp patterns of social,

spatial and behavioural separation in Belfast have to do with strategies of safekeeping:

it is a defensive tactic as well as an expression of religious solidarity (Boal 1982). But

times have changed for Northern Ireland, and it might be that this sets the scene for a less marked policing of boundaries along sectarian lines. Shirlow finds that an emerging mindset is not enough to unthread the fears that have materialised into the fabric of Protestant and Catholic neighbourhoods; the fears built into daily life have as much inertia as the landscape itself – they are part of the art and architecture of living, and changing these will take time.

In the last section, the three papers discuss diverse fears, surrounding children in the west (Rachel Pain), farmers' livelihoods in the Philippines (Sarah Wright), and efforts to increase the access of black and minority ethnic groups to the English countryside (Kye Askins). All relate everyday experiences of fear and insecurity to wider social and political discourses and events. They move beyond the analysis of fear, however, to emphasise how this particular emotion is bound up with others, and never passive. Rachel Pain emphasises resistance to global fear metanarratives, critiquing expert knowledge about fear for children's safety (e.g. 'paranoid parenting') that ignore children's own experiences and knowledge of risk. She argues that, in a similar way, expert accounts of terror fears are riddled with assumptions, and ignore people's subjective agency in assessing and dealing with fear. Sarah Wright emphasises hope, arguing that it always exists even in the most oppressive situations, particularly the global south, and is a radical response to fear that galvanizes and is generated through social action. Finally, Kye Askins emphasises social change, and maps out what she calls the possibilities for what she calls 'a transformative geopolitics'. We take up these three issues of resistance, hope and transformation in our Afterword.

References

Boal, F. (1981), [Chapter] in Peach. C., Robinson, V. and Smith, S. J. (eds) *Ethnic Segregation in Cities* (London: Croom Helm).

Day, K., Stump, C. and Carreon, D. (2003), 'Confrontation and loss of control: Masculinity and men's fear in public space', *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 23, 311-322.

Ditton, J. and Farrall, S. (2000), *The fear of crime* (Aldershot: Ashgate)

Dowler, L. and Sharp, J. (2001), A feminist geopolitics? *Space and Polity* 5, 3, 165-76

Garland, D. (2001), *The culture of control: crime and social order in contemporary society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Gilling, D. (1997), *Crime Prevention* (London: UCL Press).

Gleeson, B. (2003) What's driving suburban Australia? Fear in the tank, hope on the horizon. *Dreams of Land: Griffith Review 2* Griffith University, Brisbane

Gregory, D. and Pred A. (2007) *Violent geographies: fear, terror, and political violence*, New York: Routledge

Griffin, S. (1986), *Rape: the politics of consciousness* (New York: Harper and Row).

Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T., Clarke J. and Roberts, B. (1978), *Policing the crisis: mugging, the state, and law and order* (London: Macmillan)

Hopkins, P. (2004), 'Young Muslim men in Scotland: inclusions and exclusions', *Children's Geographies* 2:2, 257-272.

Hopkins, P. E. (2007), 'Global events, national politics, local lives: young Muslim men in Scotland', *Environment and Planning A* 39:5, 1119-1133.

Hyndman, J. (2003), 'Beyond either/or: a feminist analysis of September 11th' *ACME* 2, 1, 1-13

Isin, E. F. (2004), 'The neurotic citizen', *Citizenship Studies* 8:3, 217–235.

Katz C (2004), *Growing up global: economic restructuring and children's everyday lives* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press)

Katz, C. (2007), Banal terrorism in D. Gregory and A. Pred (eds.) *Violent Geographies: Fear, Terror, and Political Violence* (Routledge: New York).

Koskela, H. (1997) ''Bold walk and breakings': women's spatial confidence versus fear of violence', *Gender, Place and Culture* 4:3, 301-319.

Lauer, J. (2005), 'Driven to extremes: fear of crime and the rise of the sport utility vehicle in the United States' *Crime, Media, Culture* 1:2, 149-168

Loader, I., Girling, E. and Sparks, R. (1998) 'Narratives of decline: youth, dis/order and community in an English 'Middletown'', *British Journal of Criminology* 38:3, 388-403.

Marston, S., Jones, J. and Woodward, K. (2005), 'Human geography without scale' *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30: 416-432.

Megoran, N. (2005), 'The critical geopolitics of danger in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan' *Environment and Planning D: Society & Space*, 23, 555-580.

Midwinter, E. (1990), *The Old Order: Crime and Older People* (London: Centre for Policy on Ageing).

Moser, C. and McIlwaine, C. 1999: Participatory urban appraisal and its application for research on violence. *Environment and Urbanization* 11, 2, 203-26.

Oslender, U. 2007. Spaces of terror and fear on Colombia's Pacific coast: the armed conflict and forced displacement among black communities, *In* D. Gregory & A. Pred (eds), *Violent geographies: fear, terror, and political violence*, New York: Routledge, pp.111-132

Pain, R. H. (1995), 'Elderly women and fear of violent crime: the least likely victims?', *British Journal of Criminology* 35: 4, 584-98

Pain, R. (2000), 'Place, social relations and the fear of crime: a review', *Progress in Human Geography* 24:3, 365-388.

Pain, R. (2001), 'Gender, race, age and fear in the city', *Urban Studies* 38:5-6, 899-913.

Panelli, R., Pain, R., Kindon, S. and Little, J. (2007), *Moments in everyday/distant geopolitics: young people's fears and hopes.* Unpublished paper.

Panelli, R., Little, J. and Kraack A (2004) A community issue? Rural women's feelings of safety and fear in New Zealand. *Gender Place and Culture* 11, 3, 445-67

Panelli, R., Pain, R., Kindon, S and Little, J. (2007), *Moments in everyday/distant geopolitics: young people's fears and hopes.* Unpublished paper.

Poynting, S., Noble, G., Tabar, P. and Collins, J. (2004), *Bin Laden in the Suburbs: Criminalising the Arab Other* (Sydney: Federation Press/Institute of Criminology).

Pratt, G. and Rosner, V. (2006), Introduction: the global and the intimate. *Women's Studies Quarterly* 34:1&2, 13-24.

Robin, C. (2004), *Fear: the history of a political idea* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Sayer, A. (2003), '(De)commodification, consumer culture and moral economy' *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 21: 341-357.

Segal, L. (1990), *Slow motion: changing masculinities, changing men* (London: Virago).

Sharp, J. (2007), 'Geography and gender: finding feminist political geographies' *Progress in Human Geography* 31, 3, 381-88.

Shirlow, P. and Pain, R. (2003), 'Introduction: the geographies and politics of fear', *Capital and Class* 80, 1-12.

Smith, S. J. (1989a), 'Social relations, neighbourhood structure, and the fear of crime' in Britain, in D. Evans and D. Herbert (eds.) *The geography of crime* (London: Routledge).

Smith, S. J. (1989b), 'The politics of race and a new segregationism' in J. Mohan, (ed.) *The Political Geography of Contemporary Britain* (Basingstoke: Macmillan).

Smith, S. J. (2005), 'States, markets and an ethic of care' *Political Geography* 24: 1-20.

Sparke, M. (2007), 'Geopolitical fears, geoeconomic hopes, and the responsibilities of geography' *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 97:2, 338–349.

Stanko, E. A. (1987), Typical violence, normal precaution: men, women and interpersonal violence in England, Wales, Scotland and the USA, in J. Hanmer and M. Maynard (eds.) *Women, Violence and Social Control* (London: Macmillan).

Stanko, E. (1990), *Everyday Violence: Women's and Men's Experience of Personal Danger* (London: Pandora).

Valentine, G. (1989), 'The geography of women's fear', *Area* 21:4, 385-390.

Valentine, G. (1996), 'Angels and devils: moral landscapes of childhood', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 14, 581-599.

Wise, S. and Stanley, L. (1987), *Georgie Porgie: sexual harassment in everyday life* (London: Pandora Press).