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The launch of a `global war on terror’ after September 11th 2001 by the only remaining superpower, the USA, against an amorphous and elusive enemy, heightened concern with security and ushered in a new politics of state-civil society engagement. Governments across the world have capitalised on the climate of fear generated by the perception of terrorist threats to introduce a swathe of counter-terrorist legislation, measures and practices. In many countries, human rights lawyers and scrutinising politicians have expressed concern at the hasty introduction of counter-terrorism structures and their effects on citizens’ liberties. In the development context the post-9/11 global security regime has highlighted the strategic relevance of aid to the pursuit of security interests at a time when its ideological rationale in the post-Cold War era had almost disappeared. This in turn has had consequences for how governments and development institutions frame, design and engage with civil society actors. This paper argues that the post-9/11 global security regime has led to the increasing securitisation of civil society, with theoretical and practical implications for civil society actors.

Before proceeding further, it is necessary first to clear the conceptual ground by defining the terms `post-9/11 global security regime’, `civil society’ and `securitisation of civil society’. By the term `post-9/11 global security regime’ we understand a complex weaving of discourses, political alliances, policy and legislative shifts, institutional arrangements and practices. The trope of the global `War on Terror’ so central to the post-9/11 security regime serves as a mobilising discourse, used by political leaders in pursuit of military and political objectives. It embodies a polarising vision of the world, which pits modernity against backwardness, civilisation against barbarism, right against wrong, evil against good and freedom against oppression. This in turn triggers a global political re-ordering, generating new alliances and divisions, within and across states, redrawing the balance sheet of enemies and friends. The militaristic content of the phrase the `War on Terror’ and the depiction of the enemy in extreme terms rationalises extra-ordinary responses such as pre-emptive military intervention and the rolling-back of civil liberties. It also
involves the reconfiguring of institutional and policy arrangements, as reflected in the interweaving of development, social policy and security agendas.

Civil society is a much contested concept. We use the term here to refer to the arena where people deliberate upon, organise and act around shared purposes and concerns. As an ideal-type it is distinct from government, market and family, though in practice the borders between these spheres are blurred and interwoven to varying degrees. Civil society is constituted by organisations with varying degrees of formality and typically includes associational forms such as trades unions, social movements, virtual networks, campaigns, coalitions, faith groups, direct action groups, peace groups and human rights organisations, operating variously at local, national and global levels.

The `securitisation of civil society’ refers to the increasing absorption of civil society actors into global and national security agendas. Specifically, this refers to the dual processes of containment and engagement, whereby elements of civil society become the subjects of surveillance, control and prohibition and/or strategic actors to nurture, engage with and support. Civil society thus becomes a strategic battlefield in the pursuit of national and global security objectives. Whilst liberal democratic interpretations of civil society emphasise its plural and essentially harmonious nature, this paper starts from the Gramscian premise that civil society is a site of contestation and conflict as much as it is a site of unity and consensus. In other words it is a battlefield upon which different values, ideas and political visions are debated, contended and struggle over. As such it is also a site that is used instrumentally by different actors, whether within the civil society realm or without, for different ideological, political and organisational purposes.

The paper traces the changing relationship between civil society and security post-9/11, identifies the continuities and differences with the past and reflects on the theoretical and practical dilemmas these raise. The first section outlines the contours of the increasing securitisation of civil society, highlighting how the state uses the tools of both surveillance and incorporation to respectively control and engage with civil society for security purposes. The second section discusses the continuities and differences in state engagement with civil society groups during the Cold War period, the immediate post-Cold War period and the post-9/11 years. In the final part the
paper explores the dilemmas and challenges this poses for both state and civil society actors. The article builds on research carried out in Afghanistan, Kenya, India, USA and UK between 2006 and 2010, involving over 200 qualitative interviews with informants from governments, international civil society organisations, local civil society actors, development agencies and research institutions.

I. INCREASING SECURITISATION OF CIVIL SOCIETY POST-9/11

This section outlines the contours of the increasing securitisation of civil society post-9/11, drawing attention to the dualistic strategic use by the state of the tools of containment and engagement, and civil society responses. The increasing securitisation of civil society post-9/11 can be observed in several ways. First, it has led to greater state circumspection towards civil society in general. Second, it has effectively led to a triadic approach towards civil society that identifies `bad' parts of civil society that need to be contained, surveilled and even prohibited; `good, strategic’ parts of civil society that can be strategically engaged with in pursuit of national and global security interests; and `uncontentious parts’ with no specific strategic value in security agendas that can be left alone to continue with their activities. Third, it has brought different civil society actors into the framing and operationalisation of government policies, both domestically and internationally. Thus, government approaches to civil society in the context of counter-terrorism efforts relate not only to the assessment that civil society could be misused by terrorist networks but also to the expectation that non-governmental public actors can lend legitimacy to counter-terrorism responses and strategy.

Greater circumspection towards civil society

The post-9/11 global security regime marked a turning point in political and public perceptions of civil society that contrasted starkly with the euphoric embrace of civil society in the 1990s. With the end of the Cold War, the overthrow of many despotic and dictatorial regimes in Africa, Asia and Latin America, and the emergence of a `good’ governance agenda, the dualistic, ideologically-informed paradigm of state and market that had dominated since 1945 gave way to a tripartite model of development that included civil society as a key partner (Howell and Pearce 2001). At the same
time a Tocquevillian imagination of civil society as a diverse, plural, liberal, and citizen-inspired realm of associations that co-exist in peaceful harmony and can ‘do no harm’ had come to dominate political and policy discourse, particularly in the USA. Though the UNDP and some bilateral development agencies had begun to work with NGOs in an ad hoc way in the 1980s, it was only in the post-Cold War era that bilateral and multilateral development agencies and foundations began to articulate their strategies for engaging with civil society and develop specific programmes to support the development of civil society (Howell and Pearce 2001, Van Rooy, 1998). They justified this variously in terms of civil society’s assumed contribution to democratisation and poverty reduction through improved governance and service delivery. The rise of new public management theory, which encouraged the outsourcing of service provision to non-profits and the private, also fuelled the growing enthusiasm amongst politicians and liberal democratic governments for civil society.

However by the late 1990s governments, parliamentarians and international development institutions were already beginning to harbour doubts about the assumed efficiencies, legitimacy, accountability and probity of civil society groups. Of particular concern were development NGOs and those organisations clamouring for attention in UN and other global fora. Having set up specialist civil society sections and supported programmes to strengthen civil society, many development institutions were taking stock of their experiences and reviewing their levels and modes of engagement (Howell and Lind, 2009: 79). President Bush’s declaration of the ‘War on Terror’ in late 2001 marked a juncture where these different concerns came together and caused politicians, donors, development agencies, UN officials and government officials to take a more circumspect look at civil society. In this way a shadow of suspicion was cast over civil society organisations. On the one hand the gaze of the War on Terror regime on Muslim communities focussed donors’ attentions on Muslim communities, a previously little noticed part of civil society. On the other hand, donors began to view developmental NGOs, the main type of agencies in civil society that they had engaged with, through the prism of security. NGOs, the main actor in civil society that governments and donors chose to see and engage with, became thus not just bearers of liberal democracy and humanitarianism but agencies that were potentially vulnerable to extremism, radicalism and terrorist abuse.
Dealing with the bad parts: the bad, the worrying and the potentially bad

Whilst the new post-9/11 global security regime disrupted established conceptions of civil society as an arena of agency that could do no harm, the shadow of suspicion did not fall with the same intensity across all elements of civil society. Some parts were singled out for particular attention, namely, charities, NGOs working in the Middle East, conflict countries or Muslim-majority countries, and Muslim organisations. Civil society became fractured into the ‘bad’ parts that needed to be surveilled, contained and prohibited, the ‘good’ parts that could be courted and deployed for security purposes, and the ‘harmless’ parts that were of little strategic interest. Taking first the ‘bad’ parts, these covered a spectrum with at the one end those groups that were prohibited and put on terrorist lists and at the other end those that could potentially be ‘bad’. Inbetween were those organisations that were ‘worrying’.

Mafia-type gangs, criminal organisations, drug-and people-trafficking networks are organisations that most governments would seek to contain, if not legally ban. However the lines become blurred in relation to political groups that advocate racist, fascist or hate-laden ideologies or that use violence to pursue their ends. Since 9/11 governments have expanded their lists of prohibited organisations and specifically terrorist lists. The UN, EU, UK and US and other national governments have their own lists, which do not neatly overlap and make the interpretation of data by NGOs for the purposes of avoiding association with terrorists particularly tortuous. This reflects in part the contentious, subjective quality of the terms ‘terrorism’ and ‘terrorist’ that leads some groups to be branded as terrorist and others as civil society actors engaged in legitimate political struggles. In India, for example, the 173rd Report issued by the Law Commission in preparation for the introduction of a new anti-terror law, took but a partial view of the perceived threats within the country, labelling some Muslim organisations as terrorist but failing to mention threats from right-wing Hindu fundamentalist groups such as the Shiv Sena that had been linked to atrocities against Muslims and might have been referred to in a similar way (Singh, 2004: 150). The discourse of terrorism thus become a useful trope for governments to maintain a climate of fear around an ever-present enemy threat and, as will be seen, can easily lead to the extension of the state’s coercive powers into everyday political life.
Apart from these ‘bad’ parts that need to be prohibited, certain parts of civil society have been constructed as warranting surveillance and monitoring, though do not yet merit being placed on national or multi-national terrorist lists. This new set of ‘worrying’ organisations and individuals was not previously on the radar screen of government security agencies. It include charities, NGOs working in the Middle East, in conflict zones and in Muslim-majority countries, and various kinds of Muslim organisations such as mosques, madrassas, Islamic cultural centres, Islamic bookshops, Islamic charities and indeed Muslim communities. The veil of suspicion cast over charities relates to concerns that they have been unwittingly or otherwise deployed by terrorists to launder money or divert money to terrorist organisations. In October 2006 the former Chancellor of the UK, Gordon Brown stated: “We can address directly three of the most dangerous sources of terrorist finance – the abuse of charities, the abuse of money service businesses and the abuse of financial transactions. We know that many charities and donors have been and are being exploited by terrorists” (quote cited in Quigley and Pratten, 2007: 27). The Home Office and HM Treasury Report on the links between charities and terrorism in the UK published in 2007 endorses this supposition by including charities along with money service businesses as a key route for terrorist financing (see paragraph 3.82).

In fact there is very little evidence to support such claims. The Charity Commission of England and Wales has played a central role in investigating the possible links of charities to terrorism. By May 2002 it reported having investigated ten charities since September 11th, closing two of these and freezing the assets of one (Morris, 2002). One such case was the International Islamic Relief Organisation, which was accused of being linked to terrorist groups. The investigation found it to be inactive and was thus removed from the charity register. The Charity Commission has undertaken three separate investigations into Interpal (Palestinians Relief and Development Fund), which the US has designated as a terrorist organisation. Whilst the first two investigations cleared the charity of any links to terrorist organisations, the third enquiry, which was completed in February 2009, recommended that the charity renounce its membership and association with the Union of Good, given the potential risk that Interpal might be connected to designated entities associated with the Union (Charity Commission, 2009: 31-35). Despite Interpal being absolved of links with
terrorism in these three enquiries, the British bank, Lloyd TSB discontinued its services to Interpal on the basis of the US designation of the charity (Waller 2008). UK charities have continued to come under pressure to demonstrate that they have systems in place to reduce the risk of association with terrorism, despite the fact that there have been very few cases of charities having verifiable links with terrorist groups.iv. By mid-2008 the Charity Commission had found only two registered charities to have any proven links with terrorism, namely, the Tamil Relief Organisation and the Finsbury Park Mosque in North London.

In the wake of 9/11 the USA hastily banned several Muslim charities that were deemed to have links with terrorist organisations such as the Holy Land Foundation, the largest Muslim charity in the USA up till 9/11 (Guinane and Sazawal, 2010: 57). Indeed it is only Muslim charities that figure on the post-9/11 terrorist watch-lists. In Kenya several Muslim charities were closed following the 1998 Kikambala bombings (USIP 2006). After 9/11 pressure was put on Muslim charities, particularly in North Eastern Province and in coastal areas where there are substantial Muslim populations, to account for their activities. Fearful that they would draw the attention of security agencies some Middle East philanthropists and charitable groups such as Africa Muslim Agency and the Young Muslims Association became wary of donating funds for charitable purposes in Kenya.v. A philanthropic group based in the Gulf sought reassurance from the US Embassy before it went ahead with funding for a new Islamic University in Coast Province, Kenya (Harmony Project 2007: fn 89).

As a result of these suspicions USAID introduced a policy directive in December 2002 known as the Anti-Terrorism Certification, requiring all USAID grantees to sign such a certificate confirming that they do not support terrorismvi. In order to comply with this certificate, grantees are required to run checks on their staff and partner organisations against government databases of suspected terrorist organisations. Since 2007 USAID has piloted the Partner Vetting System in the Palestinian Occupied Territories, which requires grantees to vet their partner organisations and provide considerable detail on individuals that would be shared with US intelligence agenciesvii. The American Civil Liberties Union has criticised the use of such databases, not only because of the impossibility of challenging inclusion on the database and the input of unreliable information but also because the names of human
rights activists, environmentalists and peace campaigners have been much entered into the databases (Guinane and Sazawal, 2010: 62). This has occurred against a background where governments across the world have been amending or introducing much tighter legislative and regulatory frameworks for NGOs.

Finally, there are also concerns about political organising that is perceived as potentially destabilising and thus deserving the attention of security agencies. Illustrative of this are various protests, demonstrations, and activities in the UK where the police have used anti-terrorist legislation to detain citizens exercising their political rights to protest. Animal rights activists, anti-arms trades protestors, outspoken critics of the invasion of the Iraq war have all fallen prey to anti-terrorist legislation. Whilst protests and demonstrations have always attracted the gaze of security agencies, what is different here is that anti-terrorist legislation is used to detain citizens. In the USA the ACLU exposed in April 2005 the intricate web of surveillance focussing on civil society groups that was sanctioned under the powers authorised in the Patriot Act (OMB Watch/Grantmakers without Borders, 2008).

**Working with the good parts**

Whilst a veil of suspicion has been cast over some parts of civil society, other parts were courted by government or left alone to carry on with their activities within a tighter regulatory and legislative framework. To a large extent voluntary sector organisations or non-profits providing welfare and advisory services have been allowed to carry on as usual in the USA, UK and continental Europe (Sidel 2008). However new anti-terrorism measures and tighter regulatory frameworks governing NGOs in many countries have created a more circumspect environment for them to work in. For example, the introduction of Financial Action Taskforce Special Recommendation VIII that extended the scope of anti-money laundering regulations to include charities and foreign exchange services has increased the work of charities by requiring them to increase scrutiny of money transfers to international partners and to make their procedures more transparent and accountable. Similarly government requirements that NGOs report receipts of funds from foreign donors as has occurred in Uzbekistan, China and India or produce evidence of substantial funds in order to register reflect the tighter conditions prevailing post-9/11 (Stevens 2010). The Charity
Commission of England and Wales by contrast has adopted a risk-led rather than punitive approach and as such has developed a tool-kit for voluntary sector organisations to ensure that their work does not become vulnerable to terrorist abuse.

At the same time Western governments have attempted to identify and court what they perceive as moderate leaders in suspect communities. Domestically and internationally Western governments have deliberately sought out moderate imams, moderate Muslim community leaders, moderate mosque organisers, moderate Muslim intellectuals to engage in dialogue, draw into policy-making and support the promotion of moderate versions of Islam. In this way ‘moderate’ Muslims have been drawn into the frame of security as adjutants of the state. The UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office, for example, sent a delegation to India to exchange with local Muslim leaders about the spread of fundamentalist Islam. Western donors such as the US, UK and Australia, have increased funds to education in countries with large Muslim populations such as Pakistan and Indonesia and provided support for the reform of curricula in madrassas. In this way civil society organisations become strategically relevant in the battle of ideas implicit in the ‘War on Terror’.

In the UK this ‘soft approach’ towards counter-terrorism intensified following the July 7th bombings in London in 2005 when the UK government launched a raft of measures to prevent radicalisation and nurture alliances with ‘moderate’ Muslim leaders and communities. It hastily convened seven community-led working groups to formulate recommendations on prevent extremism. However the process came under fire as being too rushed and reliant on prominent figures, who were not necessarily seen as representative of diverse Muslim communities. In addition the then government’s reluctance to accept the possibility that the UK’s foreign policy undermined feelings of trust amongst UK Muslim as well as the increasing misuse of ‘stop and search’ powers against Asian populations hampered dialogue. In a similar vein the UK government provided funding for moderate imams to tour Britain explaining Islam in mosques and Muslim communities. Following then Prime Minister Tony Blair’s declaration in March 2007 that ‘hearts and minds’ work would be at the centre of the government’s approach to violent extremism, the Department of Communities and Local Government invested £6 m in projects targeted at Muslim communities for the purpose of preventing extremism. However this programme
caused considerable resentment amongst Muslim communities, who suspected the prime intent to be the gathering of intelligence. The new coalition government moved quickly to dismantle this, as part of both its counter-terrorism review process and its moves to cut state expenditure.

The use of ‘soft’ measures to counter radicalisation and cultivate allies amongst populations deemed to be threatening has been a key part of military strategy in the ‘War against Terror’. Specifically the ‘hearts and minds’ approach of militaries in Afghanistan and Iraq assigns civilian development institutions, particularly NGOs, a key role in ‘winning minds’ through the provision of schools, clinics, tube-wells and so on and thereby maintaining military hold of occupied territory. In this way development policy becomes an adjutant to military strategy. This strategic view on the utility of civil society organisations in both military strategy in the War on Terror and in the ideological battle to win minds has underpinned US policy both in the Bush and Obama era. For example, in a speech to NGO leaders in 2001, Secretary of State Colin Powell referred to NGOs as “force multipliers” and members of the “combat team”. Almost a decade later in January 2010, the State Department’s Coordinator for Counterterrorism, Ambassador Daniel Benjamin, said, “[T]here is probably no success in this area that can happen without civil society. So many of the societies we need to engage in it’s the NGOS that have the ground knowledge which is vitally important… We need to confront the political, social, and economic conditions that our enemies exploit to win over the new recruits…”

The most prominent institutional realisation of this are the Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) in Afghanistan that involve civilians and military co-operating around development and humanitarian assistance By 2007 there were 25 PRTs under NATO-led ISAF, varying considerably in size, activities, effectiveness, and balance of military and civilian staff. Amongst NGOs there have been different perspectives as to whether or not to engage with the PRTs. Most international NGOs and some Afghan NGOs have been reluctant to work with the PRTs on the grounds that this would both undermine their claims to neutrality and potentially endanger their staff. However, in some areas where the PRTs are viewed more positively, not least because they focus on infrastructural projects for which local leaders can claim credit, some NGOs have welcomed the opportunities to have funds for activities.
Though the primary effects of the ‘War on Terror’ regime have fallen on specific parts of civil society, such as Muslim organisations and communities and international NGOs, there are also a number of secondary effects related to the misuse and over-extension of counter-terrorist measures. First, poor, vulnerable and marginalised groups have in some contexts been at the sharp end of counter-terrorist legislation. For example, in India a fact-finding mission of human rights lawyers and activists in 2003 found that most of the 3,200 cases under the Prevention of Terrorism Act legislation involved poor, landless, tribal and Dalit people (Gonsalves, 2004). Second, some governments have used the language of ‘terrorism’ to justify the expedient crackdown and repression of their opponents, dissidents and secessionist groups, China, Uzbekistan and India being cases in point. Third, some governments have overextended the application of counter-terrorism measures so that the ‘exceptional’ has become the ‘normal’. For example, in the UK amateur photographers have frequently been detained under counter-terrorist measures for taking photos at demonstrations or merely for tourist purposes, whilst local governments have used counter-terrorist regulations to monitor parents suspected of misleading education authorities about their residential address to ensure their children enter the desired state school. Protestors on demonstrations against the arms trade, animal rights, and other causes have been detained under counter-terrorist legislation, whereby ‘exceptional’ measures come to intervene in the normal, everyday life of liberal democracy, ultimately undermining basic civil liberties. The over-extension of counter-terrorist measures further blurs the attempted neat division of civil society into ‘good’ and ‘bad’ parts and inadvertently undermines government attempts to ally with civil society for national security purposes.

Responses of civil society

How then have civil society actors and organisations responded to the effects on civil society of post-9/11 counter-terrorism measures? The responses of civil society have comprised a mixture of critical and creative resistance, quiescence and opportunistic engagement. Critical resistance to counter-terrorism measures has been led by human rights critics, including human rights groups, lawyers and researchers, by Muslim leaders and communities, and by those international NGOs working in conflict areas.
or the Middle East. Human rights lawyers have sometimes had to fend off public criticism for representing terrorist suspects. In the USA lawyers and civil society activists have challenged the vagueness of the notion of ‘material support to terrorism’ which has implications for the activities that development and humanitarian NGOs can engage in. Christian Aid, for example, was one of the first international NGOs to commission a report on PRTs and later on the impact of the War on Terror on their operations (McHugh and Gostelow 2004). In Afghanistan international and local NGOs have hotly debated the military’s use of humanitarian assistance to ‘win hearts and minds’. In particular they are concerned that this undermines their claims to be neutral, impartial and independent. The military’s use of civilian vehicles and dress when doing quick-impact projects as well as their plan to strategically deploy NGOs for militaristic purposes ultimately endangers their lives. Indeed the number of aid workers killed in Afghanistan and Iraq, and worldwide, has increased substantially in the last five years.

This critical resistance has also underpinned the emergence of new groups to monitor the legal, political and social effects of counter-terrorism measures, to examine the interlocking of development and security and to address public knowledge about Muslim charities. Illustrative of the first type of new group is the Charity and Security Network that was founded in 2008 by charities, grant-makers, faith-based groups and advocacy groups. The network emerged specifically to address the impact of counter-terrorist laws, regulations and policies on the US non-profit sector and to remove unnecessary obstacles to charitable activity created by counter-terrorist measures. Concerns over the growing linkages between development and security and its implications for international NGOs working in conflict zones led the British Overseas NGOs for Development to establish a Global Security and Development Network from 2003 to 2005. This sought to scrutinise the effects of and give recommendations on policies and measures that combined development resources with security objectives. In the USA the global Counter-Terrorist Cooperation Centre, an off-shoot of the Fourth Freedom Forum, was founded in 2007 to develop independent research and policy advice on countering terrorism to the international community. Concerns about the public image of Muslim charities led to the creation of the Swiss Montreux Initiative and the Humanitarian Forum. The Montreux Initiative was set up by the Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs in 2005 to
reduce the obstacles facing Islamic charities, to strengthen their capacity and to increase confidence amongst Western donors and security agencies in the legitimacy and activities of Muslim charities. Founded in 2004 by key Muslim charities in the UK such as Islamic Relief and Muslim aid, the Humanitarian Forum has sought to build the governance capacity of Muslim NGOs, promote greater transparency and accountability in their operations, and facilitate closer cooperation between Western humanitarian organisations and NGOs in Muslim-majority countries.

In contrast most non-profit organisations or voluntary sector groups, whether in the UK, Kenya, USA or India, have been quiescent and silent, at least until they themselves were directly affected. Several foundations and non-profit organisations in the USA challenged the Treasury Department’s Anti-Terrorist Financing Guidelines: Voluntary Best Practices for US Based Charities, which were drafted in 2002 without any public consultation. The Guidelines were criticised for confusing good governance with law enforcement and for providing no legal protection against asset seizure or designation as a terrorist organisation. In response various foundations and non-profits formed a networked working group both to call for the withdrawal of the Guidelines and to propose an alternative. Similarly in the UK, it was only when voluntary sector organisations were themselves directly effected that they began to be vocal about the effects of counter-terrorist legislation. In 2006 the UK Treasury and Home Office commissioned a report on terrorism and charities. Once the National Council of Voluntary Organisations, the peak organisation for voluntary organisations in the UK, got wind of this, they set about organising an advisory committee to draw up a shadow report, which was launched in advance of the government’s report.

The post-9/11 security regime has also created new opportunities for funding, dialogue and policy engagement for Muslim groups and communities. Mosque leaders, imams, Muslim community leaders were invited into the corridors of power to discuss with politicians and civil servants on how to counter extremism. After the July 2005 bombings in London the government became acutely aware that some of the leaders they had courted were not representative of all parts of Muslim communities. The above-mentioned Prevent Extremism initiative launched by the UK Department of Local Government and Communities in 2005 sought to address this problem of representation by channelling funding to Muslim communities that had
previously been largely ignored by local authorities and thereby creating opportunities for new groups to form. In particular it gave support to new or existing women’s groups and to young people, constituencies that were not well represented politically in Muslim institutions or previously funded by local authorities. The discovery of Muslim communities and organisations occurred also on the international front. Some development agencies initiated projects targeted at Muslim communities with the goal of preventing extremism. For example, DANIDA in Kenya set up a project to enable coastal communities, which had Muslim-majority populations, to address local conflicts (Howell and Lind, 2009: 144). Though not labelled as anti-radicalisation as such, but rather as ’Peace, Development and Security’, a key project aim was to prevent the radicalisation of Muslim youth and counter-terrorist objectives. This project thus stimulated the emergence of new groups in the community addressing the issues of young people and promoting inter-faith dialogue.

Having explored the contours of the increasing securitisation of civil society post-9/11, and in particular the dual strategy of on the one hand of repression, surveillance and containment and on the other, of strategic incorporation, nurturing and engagement, as well as the responses of civil society actors to these approaches, the next section moves on to consider the continuities and differences in statist approaches to civil society for security purposes.

II. SECURITISATION OF CIVIL SOCIETY: CONTINUITIES AND DIFFERENCES

To what extent then is any of this actually different to what governments have previously done, or is it simply a case of ‘plus ca change, plus c’est le meme?’ Has not foreign aid always been linked to national economic, political and security interests? Have not governments always tried to deploy civil society organisations for their purposes? Have they not always repressed organisations deemed to be threatening? Have not governments always created a climate of fear, played up the enemy, to further their security and military ends? We argue here that there are both continuities with the past, which pave the way for the relatively smooth promulgation and implementation of counter-terrorist measures that affect civil society but also differences in the substance and scale of what has happened post-9/11.
The appropriation of culturally and politically familiar symbols, language, behaviours, political metaphors and strategies is a crucial basis for manipulating processes of change. This becomes particularly relevant when governments seek to introduce changes that are potentially unpopular, such as in this case, the clawing back of civil liberties for the sake of declared national and global security interests. Symbolic, strategic, political and behavioural continuities thus make possible future actions and are integral to the Gramscian notion of contesting power through the struggle over ideas. What then are some of the continuities with the past that have made the invocation of the need to curb civil liberties to guarantee security in the post-9/11 security regime more palatable?

First, Western governments have drawn on an armoury of symbolic, political and strategic devices inherited from the Cold War era and further developments in the 1990s to prosecute the War on Terror. Essential elements of this armoury were the discursive construction of a common enemy in devastating terms, the ‘othering’ of any individuals or groups suspected of links to this enemy, the glorification of one’s one way of life and the cultivation thereby of a climate of threat and fear. These indeed were tactics that both communist and liberal democratic governments cultivated with finesse during the long four decades of the Cold War. Perhaps most emblematic of that period was the notorious McCarthy era in the late 1950s in the USA. Whilst in both eras the enemy was ideologically defined in terms of a totalising belief, in the Cold War period this related to the perceived threat of the political ideology of communism and in the post-9/11 era to an extremist brand of Islam. The spectres of the ‘red communists’ and ‘the Islamic extremists’ have haunted both epochs. Both are constructed in the media as shadowy figures, unpredictable, irrational and extreme, perched to disrupt the status quo through the use of violence and ideological propaganda.

In response the government turned first to unilateral military action both in the Cold War period and in the War on Terror. Military actions dressed in a language to terrify the local population such as “Shock and Awe” in Iraq and “Rolling Thunder in Vietnam” proved counter-productive in both these conflicts. Rather than cowing the populace into submission, they served rather to recruit more insurgents. Furthermore,
such actions as well as fabrications about hostile incidents or intent by the enemy to justify military intervention, such as the Weapons of Mass Destruction in the Iraq War or the Gulf of Tonkin incident in the prelude to the Vietnam War similarly undermined the US’ self-proclaimed image as a defender of freedom and democracy (O’Brien, 2009: 130-131). The establishment of a detention facility in Guantanamo Bay similarly has tarnished America’s moralistic depiction of itself as the global upholder of human rights.

A key difference in the post-9/11 era is that the enemy is no longer a state but an amorphous collection of globally networked individuals with no central point, and therefore requiring ideally a different counter-terrorist response. Just as Western governments viewed the liberal left as susceptible to radicalisation by communists, so too they viewed Muslim communities as vulnerable to capture by Islamic fundamentalism. As risky ‘others’ they both therefore had to be surveilled and monitored. O’Brien (2009: 132) refers to the re-invigoration of techniques targeted at stereo-typed enemies. In particular he draws attention to the book published by Michelle Malkin in 2004, ‘In Defense of Internment: the Case for “Racial Profiling”’, which justifies interning Japanese during World War II to safeguard domestic security and in turn deploys this experience to justify the use post-9/11 of racial, religious and ethnic profiling.

In both the Cold War era and post-9/11 the US administrations constructed a propaganda machine that served to dampen protest by equating opposition to anti-patriotism, and thus by default, to support for communism or terrorism. There were few US academics in the immediate post-9/11 years who dared to voice their concerns about the invasion of Iraq or the growing anti-Muslim rhetoric, Noam Chomsky and Susan Sonntag being prime exceptions. Human rights lawyers, campaigners and activists who raised issues around the rights of suspects detained under counter-terrorist legislation came under pressure in both eras to relinquish their efforts and were often, as mentioned above, accused themselves of being sympathisers of communism and later so-called Islamic terrorism. Similarly, charities, and particularly Muslim charities, and international NGOs working in conflict areas also became objects for scrutiny by security agencies in a way that they had not been previously. Admittedly organisations such as Hamas and Hezbollah, which have been accused of
using welfare services and charitable organisations to further their aims, were being closely monitored by security agencies prior to 9/11. However, charities in general and international NGOs working in conflict areas did not merit sufficient concern to monitor their relationships with local communities, as has occurred post-9/11.

By portraying the enemy as a fundamental threat to political stability and particularly to the idea of liberal democracy, politicians, aided by the media, cultivated a climate of fear and the need for exceptional, emergency measures. Indeed, comparing the Cold War with the post-9/11 era the glorifying messages about ‘our way of life in the West’ were very similar – the virtues of liberal democracy, the importance of civil liberties and human rights, the benefits of the market. This climate of fear was in turn used to justify the restrictions on civil liberties. As Peter Meyers (2008) masterfully demonstrates, the creation of a climate of fear and a sense of emergency causes civil society to abrogate its critical powers and its freedoms. Just as President Roosevelt invoked the idea of war and emergency to institute emergency powers in the Depression, so President Bush too invoked the notion of war. As in the Cold War, citizens and civil society since 2001 have been persuaded to abdicate resisting measures or abdicate imposing constraints on the President (Meyers, 2008: 142) and so relinquish their freedoms for greater security. In this way civil society becomes complicit in state repression as it forgoes its rights and obligations to challenge injustices and hold government to account.

The complicity of civil society is not new. In Nazi Germany the Catholic church complied with the national socialist regime, whilst in the colonial era churches were part of the civilising mission of colonising powers. Similarly during the authoritarian and dictatorial regimes in Latin and Central America of much of the last century, parts of civil society complied and indeed stood behind such repressive regimes, whilst other groups resisted and advocated alternatives. This is not to deny the emancipatory role of many civil society groups in different historical and political contexts; rather, it suggests that the progressive and emancipatory potential is just that, a potential rather than an essential condition.

The more explicit, strategic engagement with civil society for security purposes since 2001 continues a thread that was already being woven in the 1990s and that had
antecedents in the Cold War period. In the Cold War era the strategic deployment of civil society organisations was more hidden through such mechanisms as covert connections with certain groups and funding of youth, labour and cultural organisations so as to counter the threat of communism. For example, *Ramparts* magazine exposed in 1967 the CIA’s clandestine connections with the National Student Association and other so-called private voluntary organisations. As Marchetti and Marks (1974: 47-48) note, the CIA directly controlled some of these organisations, especially those used as channels for funds. In other instances, the CIA financed organisations so as to direct the organisations to its preferred policies by working through key personnel in the organisation. Marchetti and Marks point to clandestine funding by the CIA of the Boston Symphony Orchestra with the goal of improving public perceptions of the USA in France. They also point to the placement of CIA agents in cultural organisations such as the magazine Encounter in England and the Congress for Cultural Freedom in Europe\(^{xiv}\). These agents were then able to put forward anti-communist programmes to the organisations’ leaders and steer them to seeking funding from CIA-sponsored foundations in the USA (Marchetti and Marks, 1974: 49). Other kinds of covert support by the CIA to civil society organisations include the funding of political parties, the establishment of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty targeted at Eastern Europe, and the creation of the Asia Foundation (Marchetti and Marks, 1974: 23). Similarly, as Agee describes (1987: 365), the CIA provided support to pirate radio stations operating from Honduras and Costa Rica to counter the Nicaraguan revolution. It also lay behind the American Institute for Free Labour Development’s unsuccessful attempts to strengthen two small independent unions opposed to the Sandinistas\(^{xv}\).

Following disclosures in 1967 of clandestine CIA support to private organisations, President Johnson established a special committee to review CIA relations with private organisations and recommended that no covert support be given to private voluntary organisations or educational institutions, unless there were very strong national security interests at stake. Subsequently the CIA drew up a secret list of exceptions, such as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and ostensibly continued to back a major international youth organisation until 1970 (Marchetti and Marks, 1974: 51).
With the end of the Cold War the strategic deployment of civil society organisations for security purposes became more overt. No longer hampered by superpower rivalries development institutions could pay closer attention to problems of poor governance in state security institutions without the risk of losing a Cold War ally. A new field of development programming, practice, discourse and institutions began to grow around security sector reforms, pushing these to open up more to public scrutiny and strengthening the capacity of civil society actors to demand transparency and accountability (Anderlini and Conaway, 2004: 31; Caparini, 2005: 72-73). Whilst the rise of the governance agenda afforded a fertile terrain upon which development agencies could court security matters, the increasing engagement of the UN in peace-building in conflict and post-conflict situations laid the ground for deeper interaction between the worlds of security and development.

As part of this process, development institutions sought to promote the role of non-state actors in conflict prevention and peace-building. In this context where left-wing, radical and alternative groups in the North and South no longer posed a serious threat to liberal capitalism and global political order, the possibility for engaging non-governmental actors in the realm of security opened up. In the post-Cold War conflicts in Sierra Leone, Zaire, Bosnia and Kosovo, civil society organisations entered the fields of security sector reforms, conflict prevention and peace-building, a terrain upon which civil society actors hitherto had troddenwearily. As militaries began to provide humanitarian relief and undertake development projects, they also expected humanitarian workers to step in once territory had been militarily secured, as in Afghanistan, thereby drawing humanitarian NGOs into military strategy. This securitisation of aid was already causing considerable concern amongst humanitarian NGOs, who saw the military’s intervention in development as undermining humanitarian principles of impartiality, neutrality and independence (Oxfam, 2011).

What however is different in the post-9/11 era is the scale and extent of this securitisation of aid and civil society. Whilst in the 1990s most of this securitisation took place in conflict-ridden areas, since 2001 it has broadened out across all of development policy. An important pre-condition for this securitisation of aid was of course the fact that foreign aid has always been closely linked to the foreign policy, economic and security interests of national governments. However it is only since the
1990s, and then particularly since 2001, that development, security and civil society have become strategically interlocked to such a degree.

A third continuity relates to the increasing strategic deployment of civil society in government and development agendas, particularly since the 1990s. Some multilateral institutions such as UNDP were already working with NGOs in the early 1980s, particularly around agendas of participation and a more people-oriented approach to development. By the end of the 1980s bilateral development agencies such as USAID and DFID had begun to channel aid money through NGOs in recognition of their contribution to humanitarianism and their innovative approaches. However, it was not until the end of the Cold War that international development institutions began to strategically engage with civil society organisations. This reflected two other related developments. The first of these was the resurrection of the language of civil society by East European dissidents in the 1980s and its gradual spread as a discourse of emancipation, and eventually absorption into political discourse. In particular the Tocquevillian conceptualisation of civil society as an arena of plural, diverse, peaceful and harmonious association in contrast to Marxist, Gramscian or Hegelian notions that recognised the divisive and conflictual dimensions of civil society came to dominate public discourse. The other was the emergence of new public management theory which cast a key role for non-profit organisations and the private sector in the delivery of social welfare, thereby bringing civil society into the planning gaze of the state. On the aid front, multilateral and bilateral development organisations and international financial institutions such as the World Bank began to set up divisions dedicated to the promotion of civil society, allocating resources and staff to this end.

Whilst much of this engagement with civil society was for the purposes of poverty reduction and/or democratisation, there were also some limited attempts to involve civil society strategically in the reform of security institutions, as already noted. There was also an increasing securitisation of aid in the humanitarian field that inevitably touched upon relief NGOs. This more purposeful, deliberate and strategic engagement with civil society on several fronts fostered closer ties and networks between state and civil society actors and built relations of trust that could be levered post-9/11. However, this closer encounter between the state and civil society has been double-
edged: on the one hand it has required the state to scrutinise more carefully in the post-9/11 climate who it is supporting; but on the other hand this proximity has made the intrusion into the arrangements of civil society organisations, such as new regulations requiring them to verify their choice of partners, much easier.

Furthermore, these closer links between the state and parts of civil society have also contributed to the quiescence of civil society, over and above the climate of fear factor discussed above. Of particular concern here is the growing reliance of welfare- and development-focussed non-profits on government funds, particularly where they have been subcontracted to provide services. The effects of this were seen most vividly in the state of Gujarat, India after the massacre of thousands of Muslims in retaliation for the alleged involvement of Muslims in the burning of a train transporting Hindu pilgrims. The silence of much of Gujarati civil society in the aftermath of the massacre dependency was linked in part to the dependence of many local non-profits on government contracts. As Sheth and Sethi (1991) already noted in the 1990s, service-delivery focussed civil society organisations had become 'instrumental appendages' of the state, through their dependence on government or donor funding. The quiescence of civil society was also aided by the growing dominance of a Tocquevillian conceptualisation of civil society that effectively depoliticised civil society actors engaged with the state and rendered them less alert or suspicious of government intentions.

The fourth continuity relates to the 'hearts and minds' strategy used by US and allied governments in counter-insurgency operations and in preventing extremism. This approach takes place effectively on both domestic and international fronts as described in the previous section. Current application of the counter-insurgency approach as used in Afghanistan and Iraq draws on similar military tactics deployed in the British Malayan campaign in the 1950s and later, but less successfully, in Vietnam. The use of propaganda during the Cold War on both sides of the ideological divide reflects also a similar intention to win and maintain support in adversarial contexts. The basic thrust of the 'hearts and minds' strategy is that you can soften the use of military power by providing benefits such as clinics, veterinary assistance, schools, wells to populations in areas occupied by the allied military. The soft projection of military force intends to shift the perception of the military as an
aggressor to saviour in the eyes of local populations and create dividends for allying against rather than with the insurgents. The ‘hearts and minds’ strategy also functions as a tactical device to gain access to populations and areas deemed threatening and to gather intelligence. What is different since the Cold War is that hearts and minds strategy is used to address the assumed causal relation between poverty and extremism (Bradbury and Kleinman, 2010: 15-16). Furthermore, hearts and minds activities are also framed in terms of enhancing governance processes and strengthening the legitimacy of the incumbent government by demonstrating its ability to provide security and welfare, as in Kenya and Afghanistan.

These motives are also echoed on the domestic front in government approaches to preventing extremism. The increasing strategic deployment of civil society organisations after the London bombings in 2005 reflected a growing recognition amongst politicians in the UK that the War on Terror could not be won through military force alone. As former UK Prime Minister Tony Blair stressed in a speech to the World Affairs Council in Los Angeles in August 2006, ‘We will not win the battle against this global extremism unless we win it at the level of values as much as force.’ (Wintour, 2006). Similarly in the USA, there has been a growing realisation that the War on Terror has to be fought in the ideological terrain, just as in the Cold War, and that military confrontation was seriously limited in what it could achieve, and indeed could have adverse repercussions, such as increasing rather than deterring potential recruits xvii.

What is also different now, compared with the 1950s or Vietnam, is on the one hand the increasing convergence of humanitarianism with security strategy xviii and on the other hand the availability of a substantial contingent of humanitarian and development organisations that vie with military for the space of humanitarian relief and development. As a result local populations often perceive the benefits provided by the military through ‘quick-impact projects’ or by international and local NGOs to be one and the same. This then compromises the position of humanitarian organisations as neutral and impartial providers. Moreover, compared to the Vietnam and Malay counter-insurgency campaigns, the allied militaries in Iraq and Afghanistan explicitly plan for NGOs to come into the areas that they are occupying so as to hold the territory. Thus for the military, NGOs are assumed strategic ‘allies’,
assumed partakers in the war and its goals, rather like camp-followers, even though NGOs may not necessarily respond as the allied militaries hope for.

Finally, there is the continuity of resistance that subverts any totalistic use of military and governmental powers. As discussed above, in the immediate years after the 9/11 attacks resistance from many civil society groups was subdued. It was mainly human rights activists and Muslim leaders, who spearheaded resistance to the strategies and, tactics. Once non-profits and service-oriented NGOs and the general public were themselves directly affected by new regulations and legislation, the resistance widened. Mounting public discontent over the protracted duration of first the Iraq and then the Afghanistan wars, and particularly the increasing casualties and deaths amongst allied forces, led to broader questioning of the `War on Terror' agenda. Such resistance has put limits on how much politicians and militaries could do in prosecuting the War on Terror. For example, the heated debate amongst humanitarian actors about military intervention in the humanitarian field has been one factor limiting the success of militaries in hearts and minds counter-insurgency. Similarly attempts to tighten regulation over non-profits in the USA through the Guidelines met with sufficient resistance to stall their implementation.

In a nutshell it is argued here that what appears to be a new political era, deploying new strategies and tactics, builds upon threads woven and adapted from past experiences. It is these historical continuities – the creation of a climate of fear through the deployment of an armoury of symbolic, political and strategic devices and the `hearts and minds' counter-insurgency strategy that were prominent tactics in the Cold War era; the increasing securitisation of aid and development and the strategic use of civil society in governmental and development agendas around welfare provision, poverty reduction and democratisation in the 1990s - that have made possible the prosecution of the `War on Terror' with such ease and quiescence. This is not to deny, however, the important thread of continuity in resistance that has placed limits on the prosecution of the War on Terror.

III DILEMMAS, CHALLENGES AND IMPLICATIONS
The increasing securitisation of civil society since 9/11 raises a number of theoretical and conceptual issues for civil society theorists as well as practical challenges and
Dilemmas for civil society actors. At the theoretical level it raises several issues around civil society as a battleground of ideas, as a site of social inclusion, and the empirical scope of civil society. Governments and development institutions’ enthusiastic embrace of the concept of civil society has been fuelled by a neo-Tocquevillian framing of civil society that emphasises the harmonious, plural and diverse nature of citizen action around shared, public interests. However, the securitisation of civil society since 9/11 has brought to the fore the notion of civil society as a battleground of ideas. This is manifested most vividly in the conflict contexts of Iraq and Afghanistan where militaries have sought to deploy civil society organisations in their ‘hearts and minds’ counter-insurgency strategies. It is reflected also on the domestic front where governments have turned to ‘soft measures’ such as community-based welfare programmes aimed at Muslim communities in an attempt to prevent radicalisation. These developments thus expose the normative underpinnings of different civil society theories and the need for grasping the political context within which particular theories of civil society become celebrated.

Second, the liberal, consensual reading of civil society presents it as a site of inclusion for all citizens. However, as illustrated in the above sections, certain communities and groups are not treated as full members of civil society. The stigmatisation of Muslim communities as somehow linked to terrorism by default of their religion and the close scrutiny of Muslim charities and organisations did not cause a major outcry amongst most civil society organisations. As noted above, it was only when charities, non-profits and voluntary sector groups were themselves directly affected that they were galvanised into action and formed alliances with human rights groups and Muslim organisations. This suggests then that civil society had become a site for the inclusion of some parts of civil society but not others. The social and political fissures that permeate societies thus undermine idealistic versions of civil society as an unfettered site of citizen organisation and recall the old dilemmas around marrying political equality with economic inequality in liberal, capitalist democracies.

Third, the experiences since 9/11 have exposed the narrowing of the concept of civil society to a particular set of organisations, namely, service-delivery and governance-focused non-profits. When development institutions discovered the concept of civil society in the early 1990s, they began to work more deliberately and strategically with
civil society organisations, setting up civil society divisions, allocating resources to civil society support programmes, and increasing funding to civil society groups. Though they used the language of civil society to encompass a wide range of organisations, including business associations, professional associations, faith groups, co-operatives, trades unions and so on, in practice the bulk of their funding went to service-delivery, humanitarian and development NGOs, and governance-focussed NGOs. In the UK local governments similarly started to sub-contract service provision to private sector agencies and non-governmental organisations. This instrumentalisation of the idea of civil society led to its gradual depoliticisation and technicisation. A crucial outcome of this was the silence and quiescence of these groups when Muslim communities, organisations and charities became stigmatised as associated with terrorism. This calls for the revitalisation of the emancipatory thread of civil society that has become lost in the process of bureaucratising civil society for governmental purposes. It requires viewing civil society organisations not just as ‘supplementers’ to the state or ‘alternative’ service-providers but also as political actors in their own right. This in turn reawakens those old debates about the relative roles of state, market and civil society in the provision of public goods and social justice (amend).

The securitisation of aid raises not only theoretical and conceptual issues, but also practical challenges and dilemmas that civil society organisations and development institutions need to address. These revolve around the defence of civil society spaces, the protection of vulnerable groups and minority interests, the engagement of development agencies with civil society, and the prioritisation of poverty reduction goals over security. A key issue in the defence of civil society spaces for civil society actors is about how to develop counter-hegemonic strategies that challenge the politics underpinning ‘climate of fear’ discourses and accompanying ideas that more freedoms need to be forfeited to ensure public security. This is not to say that there should be no limits on freedom for the sake of security but rather that civil society actors need to maintain a debate around the these limits. Or, in other words, a key role of civil society actors is to ensure that the contested nature of such limits remains. Part of such climate of fear discourses that are essential to warring processes are the caricaturing of the enemy in demonic and simplistic ways that can end up stigmatising whole ethnicities, nations, religions and societies. Such has been the case post-9/11
for Muslim communities, Muslim organisations and Islam. Under such circumstances civil society actors beyond the stigmatised groups need to develop strategies to counter such images, to promote inter-ethnic, inter-community, inter-faith debate and exchange, and to expose the simplicity of political caricaturing. This becomes particularly important in contexts where judicial and policing practices are weak and corrupt, rendering the poor, vulnerable and stigmatised vulnerable to abuse.

In the case of humanitarian agencies the dilemma of how to maintain principles of independence, impartiality and neutrality in conflict and warring contexts remains. As governments and militaries harness humanitarian actors into their political and military strategies in times of warfare, maintaining these principles becomes particularly difficult. Local populations under such circumstances can perceive such humanitarian agencies as part of the enemy’s strategic alliance. The dilemma for humanitarian agencies in Afghanistan and Iraq is that they are indeed part of the allied strategic effort to counter terrorism and insurgency and that they are therefore part of the political game. Recognising these complex politics and their role within it is thus the first step in developing a conscious, practical strategy for addressing the humanitarian dilemma.

For development institutions engaging with civil society actors there are practical dilemmas around how to develop relations of trust with local partner organisations whilst also fulfilling due diligence obligations. The introduction by the US government of anti-terrorist certificates and of pilot partner vetting systems add not only to the administrative burdens of bilateral and non-governmental development agencies but also to their efforts to cooperate with local organisations. Partnership relations and cooperation agreements usually arise out of considerable time-intensive efforts amongst individuals to build social relations of trust. Regulatory requirements that start from a premise of distrust and suspicion can undermine processes of trust-building. Civil society actors in the field of development then need to discuss openly such dilemmas, challenge the necessity of any such regulatory procedures, and if deemed mutually necessary, consider ways of limiting the impact of such vetting on co-operation with local civil society groups.
Related to the issue of vetting and relations of trust is the broader purpose of development activity, whether carried out by governmental or civil society agencies. Since 9/11 bilateral development institutions have to varying degrees come under pressure from their governments to take account of national security interests. In some agencies this has involved designing programmes aimed at de-radicalisation and forging relations with ‘newly discovered’ Muslim parts of civil society. Given the fact that development and aid policy have historically been closely linked to security, political and economic national interests, the risk pertains that national security concerns gain undue emphasis at the expense of poverty reduction goals when development institutions come under pressure to prioritise national security goals. The dilemma then is how to ensure that developmental goals of poverty reduction do not become subordinated to security interests. Addressing such a dilemma will require not only probing assumed relations between security and development but also ensuring some degree of institutional autonomy that allows for contesting institutional priorities and objectives.

CONCLUSION

This paper set out to examine the increasing securitisation of civil society since the launch of the ‘War on Terror’ in 2001. The veil of suspicion cast over civil society in general contrasted with donors’ and governments’ euphoric embrace of civil society in the first decade after the fall of the Soviet Union. The strategic compartmentalisation of civil society into ‘bad’ parts that needed to be contained, surveilled and repressed and into ‘good’ parts that could be engaged with, nurtured and promoted marked a distinctive shift in government-civil society relations post-9/11. The increasing convergence of new humanitarianism and security from the late 1980s intensified in the wake of the ‘War on Terror’. As a result this new encounter between development institutions and humanitarian actors around security concerns deepened and extended into development policy and practice more generally. This was matched on the domestic front by the increasingly strategic engagement of local governments with parts of civil society for security purposes.

Whilst development agencies and academics have drawn attention to the securitisation of aid over the past two decades, far less attention has been given to the ways in
which civil society actors and organisations have become strategic elements in global and national security agendas. The repressive dimensions of the post-9/11 global security regime continue to shape the context within which civil society organisations operate. Whilst the election of a new administration under President Obama promised to undo some of the excessive aspects of the counter-terrorism regime, such as the declared intention to close the Guantanamo detention facility, much of the regulatory and institutional architecture spawned by the post-9/11 security regime remains firmly in place. The securitisation of civil society poses numerous dilemmas for civil society actors and development institutions that remain unresolved. Moreover, the explosion of the euphoric and mythical conceptualisation of civil society as a sphere of liberal harmony in the immediate post-Cold War years calls for a more critical analysis of the politics of civil society and the application of theoretical perspectives that take as fundamental the contentious nature of civil society and recognise the strategic utility of civil society to governments.
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i For a useful discussion of different disciplinary approaches to the idea of civil society see White 2004
iii This research emerges out of a larger research project on the “Global War on Terror, Non-Governmental Public Action and Aid” funded by the UK Economic Social Research Council. The project in turn formed part of a broader ESRC-funded research programme on Non-Governmental Public Action (2003-2009).
iv The Charity Commission Operational Guidance, for example, states that ‘the incidence of charitable involvement with terrorist organisations is very rare’.
vi Interview, USAID, April 2008.
vi The FATF is the world’s main anti-money-laundering body and has 31 member countries. In 2002 it agreed to try to make its rules binding on all countries. These rules included freezing terrorists’ assets and the Special Recommendation VIII extended the rules to money-service businesses, including the hawala finance transfer system, charities, and universities. Governments came under international pressure to introduce more robust anti-money-laundering legislation in line with FATF.
ix Again there are differences in relation to individuals in the USA and UK. For example, the university scholar, Tariq Ramadan, a prominent Swiss theologian, academic and activist, was barred under the Patriot Act from entering the USA until 2010, when the decision was revoked by Hillary Clinton following a legal judgment. However, Ramadan was not barred from entering the UK.
xi The Dutch Committee on Afghanistan was cited in an interview as one of the few INGOs that had coordinated with the local PRT on the distribution of aid (author’s interview, Oxfam, Kabul, 23rd August 2006.
xii For example, in India, the incumbent political leaders of the states of Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh invoked the Prevention of Terrorism Act to detain political opponents and critics. (Interview, senior human rights activist, New Delhi, December 2005). Also see PUDR, 2005b, p. 7.
xiii Lawyers in the US have fought an ongoing legal battle against the ‘material support’ clause in the Patriot Act. In November 2008 a federal court ruled that the definition of ‘material support’ was unconstitutionally vague. However, the decision was overruled in 2010 by the Supreme Court.
xiv Encounter was a magazine that supported the idea that cultural achievements and political freedom were closely linked.

xv The American Institute for Free Labour Development was also working with co-operatives in the north of Nicaragua, where Somoza’s National Guard apparently tended to recruit supporters (Agee, 1987: 366). Agee also describes (1987: 153-155) how the CIA tried to destabilise the People’s National Party and the Prime Minister, Michael Manley, elected in 1972 in Jamaica, by trying to disrupt the elections, using inter alia methods such as forming civic groups for political action.
xvi As Pearce (2006:7) notes, the realpolitik of national security was used to justify closing off security institutions to public scrutiny, human rights monitoring and citizen participation in security-related policy-making.
xvii See Philip Gordon’s (2007) article on what victory in the War on Terror would like for an exposition of the importance of ideological struggle.
xviii For a useful overview of the increasing convergence of new humanitarianism and military strategy see Gordon (2010).