

Readers interested in questions of effectiveness will find *Fearmonger* a useful resource, as will those looking for an accessible explanation of the Conservative crime bills. Readers who are well versed in criminal justice matters, however, will already know that the Conservative crime bills will not reach their stated goal of producing communities safe from crime, but can make use of the data being set out.

References

Moore, Dawn. 2007. *Criminal Artefacts: Governing Drugs and Users*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Moore, Dawn; Lisa Freeman and Marian Krawczyk. 2011. "Spatio-Therapeutics: Drug Treatment Courts and Urban Space." *Social & Legal Studies*, 20(2), 157-172.

Bell, Colleen. 2011. *The Freedom of Security: Governing Canada in the Age of Counter-Terrorism*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia. ISBN 978-0-7748-1826-1. Paperback: 32.95 CAD. Pages: 195.

Svendsen, Adam D.M. 2010. *Intelligence Cooperation and the War on Terror: Anglo-American Security Relations after 9/11*. London: Routledge. ISBN 978-0-415-62222-6. Paperback: 44.95 USD. Pages: 236.

Reviewed by Kevin Walby and Alex Luscombe
University of Victoria

Security and intelligence agencies have expanded rapidly since September 11, 2001. Given the consequences for social justice in Canada and the rest of the world, studying this expanding security and intelligence community has never been so important. Two significant contributions in this area are *The Freedom of Security* and *Intelligence Cooperation and the War on Terror*.

The Freedom of Security explores how security and freedom have become entwined in Canada since September 11, 2001. Specifically, Bell investigates the practices of Canadian government agencies like the Canada Border Services Agency and Department of National Defence, with the rationale of drawing attention to Canadian federal government agencies as key actors in the War on Terror (2). The purpose of the book is not to demonstrate that there has been a reduction in rights since the events of

September 11, 2001, but rather to show how security and freedom have become interwoven. As Bell puts it, the “main problem explored is how logics and practices of security are embedded within and harness politics of freedom” (7). Freedom is not simply the antidote to security but a means through which security is mobilized, legitimated and reconstituted.

For conceptual guidance, Bell draws from governmentality studies. The governmentality literature provides a useful orientation for tracing how discourses of security and freedom are invoked and tethered to governance practices. Bell is thus critical of the idea of security. *The Freedom of Security* in no way can be construed as calling for more security (see pg. 14) as in the human security literature. Nor is Bell arguing for a reconfiguration of Canada’s security apparatus. Instead, Bell traces how certain claims about threat, terrorism and risk result in the creation of security problems. To trace these claims, Bell examines publicly available government documents, speeches, and the results of interviews with policy specialists.

In the first chapter, Bell notes that a precautionary logic has moved to the centre of national security policy in Canada during the last decade. Increasing the demand for “risk management,” this precautionary logic manifests itself in several ways. First, there is more funding for longstanding security agencies. Second, there has been the creation of new security and intelligence agencies. Third, there has been the emergence of a broader security network at the federal level, characterized by increased surveillance and information sharing. Sticking with her main argument, Bell’s claim here is not simply that this padding of the security apparatus has resulted in decreased liberal rights. Instead, she draws our attention to initiatives that now try to enlist citizens in security projects and to keep watch for risk under the rubric of responsibility. In this sense, these initiatives are about fostering a participatory security apparatus, or at least one that tries to stimulate “groups within the population to enlist in the management of security risks” (53). This focus on participatory security is one way that Bell attempts to demonstrate the interconnectedness of security and freedom in contemporary government discourse, though more empirical details here would have been useful.

Next, Bell argues that liberal freedom and national security are mutually reinforcing in the context of government practices and court rulings. Here Bell focuses on the issue of national security certificates in Canada. Canada’s security certificate program allows for people to be detained on secret evidence, without recourse to regular criminal trial proceedings. Security certificates have existed in Canada for decades but were only used after September 11, 2001, when five men of Arab and South Asian descent were indefinitely detained at the Kingston Immigration Holding Centre. The Supreme Court of Canada ruled security certificates to be in violation of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms in February 2007, but the federal government was given a year to reform the program. The legal modification of the security certificate program, Bell argues, shows how fluid the idea of freedom can be, insofar as national security practices and

laws such as the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act* that are declared unconstitutional can be revived under the aegis of the liberal notion of rights. When such exceptional practices are normalized, freedom is construed as state protection (85) and resistance to national security is likened to terrorism.

Next, Bell examines how the relationship between security and development in Afghanistan is framed in terms of security and freedom. Canada is a participant in the armed occupation, simultaneously employing other agencies on the ground to develop and therefore westernize local infrastructure and trade. This is what Bell calls the liberal way of war, which tethers the idea of humanitarianism and human rights to security, state violence and occupation. An instance of what Bell calls “humanitarian securitization,” the liberal way of war is about withholding freedom from the subject population until they until they have been “developed” in accordance with the desires of the West. The final chapter explores what Bell calls the “simultaneous denial and defence of freedom” (146). Canada has been implicated in torture during the last decade while at the same time proclaiming to spread freedom. Citizenship is the modality of this simultaneous denial and defence. For instance, Canadian security officials facilitated the torture of Abdullah Almalki in Syria, not through rendition but through sharing intelligence that enabled Syrian officials to detain Almalki when he travelled there to visit family. The argument here is that citizenship is a technology that enables this tethering of security and freedom, the sharing of intelligence, and also the coordination of security practices between states. Again, some readers may be searching for more empirical details to support the argument.

Intelligence Cooperation and the War on Terror is also about the coordination of security practices between states, but adopts a very different political and normative posture. Svendsen explores the connections between UK and US security intelligence agencies. He argues that intelligence sharing between the UK and the US is the norm rather than the exception, although there are different styles of producing and acting on security intelligence in the respective countries. The relationship between UK and US security intelligence agencies stems back to strategic alliances forged during World War II, although Svendsen focuses primarily on September 11, 2001 to the present. An idea that Svendsen raises is that some US security intelligence agencies have better relationships with UK agencies than some of their own domestic counterparts, indicative of what Svendsen calls the “globalization of intelligence.” However, one of the main findings in this book is that “the relationship does not always flow smoothly” (7) insofar as the different styles of producing and acting on security intelligence in the different countries are at odds. For example, while the UK has traditionally preferred a “softer” approach to intelligence work, characterized by passive monitoring and reactive intervention, the US has increasingly adopted an aggressive approach characterized by pre-emption and disruption. This is what Svendsen refers to as a “wait and see” versus a “see and strike” method of counter-terrorism.

Svendsen's book is based on analysis of newspaper reports, government documents, and interviews with intelligence officers in the UK and USA. First, Svendsen reviews existing materials on UK-US signals intelligence, human intelligence, and open source intelligence. And as Svendsen points out, "the vast majority of UK-US intelligence information comes from open source intelligence" (19), which might be an interesting finding for those who do not know much about how security intelligence works. Svendsen raises further questions about how a kind of "groupthink" can emerge in intelligence circles that become incestuous with information sharing. This phenomenon may have been accelerated by the creation of the US Department of Homeland Security in 2002 and UK Serious Organized Crime Agency in 2004, having further enhanced information sharing between the two countries. There are also domestic factors that influence intelligence work. For instance, Svendsen notes that in the USA there has been a drift away from civilian agencies such as the Central Intelligence Agency toward the Pentagon and military agencies (32).

Svendsen offers two major case studies. The first regards counter-terrorism efforts in the UK and the USA. As noted in the book, "bilateral UK-US intelligence liaison" for counter-terrorism efforts has a long history that predates September 11 2001. Svendsen argues that the British had a great deal of experience applying counter-terrorism security intelligence to the Irish Republican Army, but US intelligence agencies failed to take advice from the UK about tactics. Interestingly, in a "series of high-level meetings" between US and UK intelligence officials in 2002, the US considered remodelling the FBI based on its UK counterpart, MI5. This reform was never made, however, with US officials allegedly concluding that no such changes would be made until "another 'spectacular' attack on US soil, akin to 9/11" (56). The more aggressive US style of using torture, extraordinary renditions, and secret prisons continued to take precedent, despite being "far from helpful" (96).

The second case study focuses on UK-US intelligence relations regarding weapons of mass destruction and nuclear proliferation. Svendsen details the UK and US intelligence liaison and joint operations that formed as it regards weapons of mass destruction, which facilitated the invasion of Iraq based on false intelligence. "Intelligence resources in both the United Kingdom and United States were becoming overburdened" (126) and subsequent intelligence failures became politically hijacked to legitimize the attack on Iraq in lieu of credible information. Once again, the US style of "see and strike" led to crises of legitimacy, and Svendsen hints that the "wait and see" approach of UK security intelligence might have provided more credible intelligence.

This focus on "credible intelligence" evinces a significant difference between Bell and Svendsen. Bell critiques the ideas of risk and security, while Svendsen simply describes issues related to security and intelligence in the last decade. Without a critical standpoint or conceptual stance, Svendsen's text glosses over the social justice elements of security and intelligence, leaving readers to draw their own connections and conclusions.

Svendsen is careful to hide his normative position that security intelligence regarding weapons of mass destruction and counter-terrorism efforts in the UK and USA should be enhanced. This pro-intelligence position puts Svendsen again at odds with Bell, who is explicitly anti-security in her normative and political posture. At the same time, neither Bell nor Svendsen chronicle the massive demonstrations against issues related to security and intelligence in the last decade, an addition that would have greatly enhanced their accounts.

We also note some conceptual as well as methodological issues in both texts. First, both books are vague when it comes to the notion of risk management. Neither really defines this term or practice, which leaves readers guessing at the meaning. Second, both are a bit murky on what counter-terrorism actually entails. Svendsen does differentiate between counter-terrorism and anti-terrorism and ties this to different styles of security intelligence in the UK and the USA, but more conceptual framing would have been useful. Third, both authors ignore key works in their areas. For instance, Bell ignores the article on security certificates by Mike Larsen and Justin Piché (2009), which covers many of the same arguments and substantiates them with data. Meanwhile, Svendsen ignores the conceptual framework provided in the writings of Peter Gill, which would have enhanced what is a predominantly descriptive account. Fifth, both authors base their accounts on newspaper material, publicly accessible reports, and interviews. These books would have benefited from incorporating data based on access to information requests. Access to information requests allow researchers to get at data that is not otherwise publically accessible, such as the internal policies and threat assessments of security intelligence agencies. When scholars simply draw from newspaper material and publically accessible reports, they run the risk of merely reproducing the details provided in officially sanctioned government discourse rather than getting at what is actually written down within these agencies as it regards organizing governance practices. Empirical details from this register of insiders' texts would have enhanced the credibility of both authors' claims.

References

- Larsen, Mike and Justin Piché. 2009. "Exceptional State, Pragmatic Bureaucracy, and Indefinite Detention: The Case of the Kingston Immigration Holding Centre." *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*. 24(2), 203-229.