

**The Annual Review of
Interdisciplinary Justice Research**

Volume 3, Fall 2012

**Edited by
Steven Kohm
The University of Winnipeg
Centre for Interdisciplinary Justice Studies (CIJS)
ISSN 1925-2420**

Anti-Security: Q & A
Interview of George S. Rigakos

Martin V. Manolov, Department of Law and Legal
Studies, Carleton University

Security (sĭ-kjoor'-ītē, suh-kjoor'-ītē): The state of being free from danger or threat, the state of feeling safe, stable, and free from fear or anxiety – Oxford English Dictionary (2012).

Genealogically, the word “security” comes from the Latin verb “*secures*”, meaning free from care. Yet, today “security” is a concept that is far from its jovial and confidence-inspiring Latin forefather; rather, “security” has become more clearly bipolar, more aporetic. The inherent contradictions are vividly apparent when one considers current national and international security discourses and the irrefutable fear and anxiety that such discourses evoke and are also based on. Have we become more fearful, more calcified? If so, can this be altered? George S. Rigakos and Mark Neocleous suggest that an affirmative answer can only be found in challenging the contemporary paradigm of security by working towards counter-hegemonic language and action.

In their recent (2011, Red Quill Books) edited volume *Anti-security*, Neocleous and Rigakos argue for a shift in our thinking about the existing security regime. They argue that we cannot alter our perceptions and understanding within the established framework of “security”. Security has become ubiquitous and hegemonic, located at every corner and intersection of our very existence. From individual security to national security, from intellectual property to the security features of commodities, one is hard pressed to identify

avenues for discussion and critique that do not fall within the existing framework. Consequently, the only alternative would be to create a new conceptual lens, one that is characterized by the freedom to engage security issues without being repatriated into the existing discourse: what they call “Anti-Security”.

In this article, I engage professor Rigakos in a conversation regarding the ideas behind and surrounding “Anti-Security”. Structured as a series of questions and answers, this article aims to offer the reader an overview of, and an introduction to, the idea of “Anti-Security”, its’ roots, its’ *raison d’être*, its’ utility, and lastly a brief discussion of “pacification” as a theoretical framework. The goal here is not to be exhaustive, but to simply offer a sample of the potential of “Anti-Security” as an idea, to suggest that “Anti-Security” is indeed the adequate discursive apparatus through which the critical individual can express her own ideas, and where critical studies can be conducted outside of, what many of us have come to see as, the proverbial “box”.

How did Anti-Security come to exist? What does the term mean?

Mark Neocleous and I began talking about the need to set up an alternative space to help foster a critical interrogation of security in 2009 when he visited Carleton University. Not just more “critical security studies” but an attempt to bring into question the foundation and material manifestation of security culture, the security industrial complex, the rise of security and risk expertise, and the myopic way in which security was being linked to or pardoned by 9/11. We felt that there were many others, in particular graduate students, who had not yet been wrapped up by the very long tentacles of security thinking and who were very suspicious of the way in which police power—both internationally and domestically—was being critiqued through a very narrow liberal lens. Mark had already been writing about this for some time at a more philosophical and political level as a “critique of security”. At the same time I was uncovering the same mechanisms in my sociological re-

search on the commodification of public and private policing. We decided to set up a seminar and invite interested scholars and activists in October of 2010 to Carleton University.

The workshop triggered considerable discussion about what it was we were doing or could be doing. It was very energizing. As a result of the conference, we settled on “Anti-Security” as both the title for the anthology of the book that was produced and also as a moniker under which we could continue the discussion. We also produced “Anti-Security: A Declaration” which was a provocation aimed at questioning the analytic framework of doing security research and a call for more radical research, activism, and involvement in the project by others. In the summer of 2012 we also introduced an “Anti-security” stream for the European Group for the Study of Deviance and Social Control in Nicosia, Cyprus.

So, in that context, it’s quite clear that “Anti-security” has been intended as a political project from the beginning. It’s not a theory or an analytic concept. It’s a political project aimed at helping coalesce critical scholars and activists. The hope is that under the framework of Anti-security a number of critical theoretical and empirical interventions may be incubated. The point, for me, was to create a space to talk about security without creating more security intelligence and recirculating the same tired debates (liberty versus security, the right balance of security, domestic versus international security, post-9/11 security, etc.) that are barely debates at all and typically revert back to a reaffirmation of security.

Now, I should mention that there is an “Antisec” group out there that is involved in hacktivism. While our project so far comes from a different place, these hacktivists have chosen some very tantalizing targets that certainly elicit closer scrutiny. They attack online cyber-security firms that release virus codes often in the form of “security alerts” that can be easily copied by immoral hackers to raise further mayhem. And, of course, that’s precisely the point. These same cyber-security firms then offer the sale of ready-made solutions or patches. They are perfect purveyors of (in)security by prolif-

erating (sometimes inventing) the security breach and selling its solution. Antisec has knocked out these merchants by hacking and crashing their sites. By doing so they are aiming to undermine the circuit of the security commodity. I think when groups like Antisec, Anonymous and Lulz engage in these types of interventions instead of simple mischief they are doing some profound work.

Perhaps it hardly needs to be said but we're obviously not against people having a safe and fulfilling life that is as worry free and enriching as possible. To be against security is actually to be against the global economic system that undermines this sense of well-being despite claims to the opposite.

As a framework, you suggest that Anti-Security may be used as the starting point for the development of theoretical and empirical projects that re-evaluate security-related issues. However, can this framework be applied to the development of projects that are not directly related to security? Consequently, are there any particular disciplines or areas of study that would more easily lend themselves to the use of this framework?

Part of the problem with security as a construct is its ubiquity for critical scholars. I wouldn't want us to set up an alternative *conceptual* frame that serves the same purpose and achieves the same breadth of application. Such a term would try to do too much and would thus lose its connection to material conditions –including especially the control of populations, the pacification of domestic and international labour – that subtend security. We need a more focused and transparent construct.

That being said however, any *disciplinary* frame interested in a critical, materialist critique of security can contribute to such an undertaking. I think this is part of what we already call the revival of a “police science” which is to say a post-disciplinary examination of the formation of police power and security as it was imagined in the Enlightenment mind: a rediscovery of the legislative, policy, economic, and moral compulsion to fabricate a social order conducive to

wealth creation as early as the 17th century. This police science was pre-disciplinary and its objectives were clear. Now, international relations, criminology, police studies, political science, psychology, management sciences, and many others social sciences have taken up these objectives although they are mired in a division of labour that serves to obfuscate the fabrication of a social order. Anything that breaks through this obfuscation, I think, would be worthwhile.

At the lecture that you delivered at Carleton University in 2011, titled “Security as Pacification”, you argued: “to be against security is to stand against the securitization of political discourse, and to challenge the authoritarian and reactionary nature of security”. It is not hard to comprehend the authoritarian nature of security; but, could you expand on, and offer some examples of, security’s reactionary nature?

Security is reactionary in at least two ways. First, it constantly scans for threats and reinterprets all struggle and resistance as a risk. This is reactionary. Security doesn’t *seem* to care about the political nature of these risks: skin-heads, anarchists, football hooligans, terrorists... are just risk categories, risk groups. But we know security is not apolitical. Although security appears apolitical, it is anything but. Security intelligence is obsessed with understanding the nature of the threat and making determinations about preparedness. The central threat to security, to the capitalist order, is anything that threatens the basis for wealth accumulation under capitalism. So, I would say, any significant threat to property relations. The history of security is the history of enforcing this system of accumulation and, not surprisingly, infiltrating and destabilizing radical movements ranging from Luddism, to the expansion of the electoral franchise such as the National Political Union, to anarchist and communist organizations. These have always been the primary targets of security intelligence. Recent research has demonstrated this was also the case in the lead-up to the Toronto 2012 G20. In fact, the first recorded undercover operation of the “new police,” contrary to the promises of Robert Peel, was to infiltrate the National

Political Union. This infiltration and provocation continued as a standard police practice throughout the industrialization of the US in the pre and post-war and onto COINTELPRO and the new social movements. So, it is reactionary in this way.

Second, and perhaps similarly, security is reactionary by coopting resistance. Winning over “hearts and minds”, conquering the “human terrain”, dividing and conquering, educating, etc. This does not only occur at the level of domestic and international pacification of subjects, as some sort of imperial initiative of domination, it is also an intellectual project. The establishment of security research centers, lucrative consulting contracts, prestigious grant competitions, government and NGO colloquiums, public and “in-camera” or private lectures to university researchers, the buying-off of professors through publication subventions and even using some professors to spy on their colleagues – these are all well documented instances of how corporate and state security apparatuses coopt the intellectual energy of scholars.

While not being against “security” you aim at deconstructing this field of study. If successful will the framework of Anti-Security ultimately replace the security discourse, and will it ultimately challenge the global economic system?

Well, I am against security... as we know it. But Anti-security cannot replace the dominant security discourse. If it were to do so that would mean that the entire global economic system had collapsed. Discursive formations are conditioned by broader political and economic conditions. What we are working towards is a coherent and penetrating way of destabilizing this type of security system, to provide an opening, to resuscitate security’s own inherent contradiction and to make this transparent. Ideas have power but they must operate in concert with movements and activists who are already opposed to this global political and economic system.

Why do we need to challenge security discourse?

The supremacy of security has resulted in an analytic blockage. The bandwidth in which critiques of security take place

are very narrow. At the same time the idea of security is more ubiquitous than ever. It colonizes all aspects of social relations and its connotation is almost roundly positive (even though that is beginning to change). It has the strange capacity both as a concept and as a political maneuver to attach itself to social problems and, by extension, to radically reorient the discussion and potential solutions. There are a litany of examples: imperialism to energy security; globalization to supply chain security; welfare to social security; personal safety to private security, etc., but my favourite example is how hunger, and in particular world hunger, has been hijacked by the liberal intellectual project of “food security.” Here we have a situation where the most basic of communal compulsions to feed the hungry gives way to a security-based discourse, an intelligentsia complete with journal and a small industry of security experts. We know that we could feed the hungry if we had the will but the framework as defined through the lens of food security makes this reality secondary to national and international security interests.

All sorts of madness and cruelty has been perpetrated in the name of security. In fact, I feel that the problem and problematics of security are so far-reaching and socially ingrained that the notion of security has become hegemony.

Why is the concept of security so powerful? What is it about this concept that lends itself so easily to manipulation techniques?

It’s quite interesting, isn’t it? I think we have some indication of how useful ‘security’ has been and how quickly military and policing experts have seized on its use in defining American Empire as “National Security” (as opposed to National Defense or Department of War, or perhaps even more transparently, Ministry of the Empire.) from Neocleous. But it would also be interesting to do a more comprehensive genealogy of how security started showing up on all sorts of official documents and even instruction manuals and other directions, as in “secure screw A to bolt C” or “ensure that your seatback trays are secure in flight” or “this car is equipped

with the following security features...” The lexicon of product differentiation, officiousness when it comes to policy considerations, the prestige of experts, and so forth, have all been coloured by security-talk. I can think of only one other concept that has similarly roundly positive connotations and has been deployed in a similar fashion: community. As in: community policing, community corrections, community treatment, community engagement, and so forth. The similarity of these terms is their strategic embrace by the state. But security is much better because it is a verb, an adjective and a noun. It is also all-encompassing: it is global, national, and local much like capital itself.

Thus, the power of concepts and their adoption often lies in the structures they support. As Marx put it in the *German Ideology*: “the ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas.” When coupled with his pronouncement in the *Jewish Question* that “security is the supreme concept of bourgeois society”, then the utility of the term is obvious.

Why do you equate security to hegemony?

We can understand hegemony under capitalism to be the aggregate effect of alienation, which in turn is the ideological and cultural manifestation of commodity fetishism that, in turn, stems from workers being divorced from the fruits of their own labor and from how other commodities are produced: the mystification of production and consumption. At the same time most of us understand that we are living in an era that is defined by consumption and that this consumption helps make up our identities.

The ubiquity of security and risk management means that the entire production and consumption process is saturated with security considerations. These security considerations are as macroeconomic as securing supply routes, securing oil fields, securing trade markets, etc. and as microeconomic as building in product security at the design level to offset the potential for litigation, selling the aesthetic of security and safety as part of the enticement to buy the product in marketing campaigns, creating product guarantees and establishing

industry security ratings like five-star safety ratings and so forth. These security considerations extend to consumption as well. It envelops the entire circuit of capital. Areas of consumption such as malls and Business Improvement Districts, for example, are quite obsessed with security. But this security is also aesthetic. It is ideological. Places of consumption must seem like safe places to shop: places where “our type of people” venture. So, you have here societies based around consumption that are consuming goods organized by security logics. Ideologically, whether at the national, international or local level, security is hegemony.

Security becomes “the supreme concept of bourgeois society” because it not only rationalizes the entire system of pacification legislatively and juridically but because security is embedded in the circulation of goods that define us as individuals. For this reason I say security is hegemony. And it’s a strange thing: you simply can’t say “I’m opposed to security” in casual conversation. It is a bewildering if not a dangerous statement. It is nonsensical because it is like saying you are opposed to being. And, in a sense, this is correct. You would be saying you are opposed to being in this all-encompassing system.

So, you seem to suggest that hegemony is a spontaneous/natural by-product of alienation. However, according to Gramsci, hegemony is actively constructed by the union of social forces, that is, the historic bloc. Is your understanding of the concept of hegemony different from Gramsci’s notion? So, When you say, “hegemony is security” do you mean that security is the crux by which consent in the current society is created by the historical bloc, and more importantly, from which a counter-hegemony can be, or more strongly, should be, created?

This is part of a bigger question in Marxism about the relative importance people assign to base vs. superstructure. It’s an old debate and no longer very helpful. It’s one that Engels overstated in favour of economics and then later backed away from. It also prompted a “humanist” retort to which Gram-

sci contributed. But, I do sound far more economic in my description of hegemony than Gramsci does so I should be clear about this.

First, I have agreed elsewhere that the capitalist order had to be, as Neocleous puts it, “fabricated”, and that a genealogy of formative police thinking is the first step to understand how this unfolded. Capitalist economics were not spontaneous. They were enforced, often brutally. But once in motion, however imperfectly, capitalism acts as self-perpetuating engine to which policy-makers and latter-day police scientists must react, re-tune and even obey.

As Uno demonstrates, capitalism exists nowhere in its ideal form. To extend the mechanical analogy further, this engine is always prone to sputtering, running rough and even seizing. I believe that the ideological and economic spheres are mutually reinforcing. Inequality is linked to more policing, both public and private. This is a very concrete and material manifestation of security as hegemony. It has a clear economic basis. The notion of the changing organic composition of capital also applies to security labour. It has increasingly become machinery. We have layered onto state-salaried policing increasingly more “productive” forms of policing moving from in-house security to contract security for hire to CCTV to security software and other automated systems. Every step has resulted in very important human consequences and has facilitated the ideological ubiquity of security. But every step has also importantly followed the undeniable tendency of capital to always more effectively exploit labour, to transmute ephemeral and unproductive work into a vendible commodity that can realize surplus-value. There is no doubt that elites market and promote these processes as good *for all* but they do so alongside a very predictable (but by no means inevitable) economic process.

Second, I think the amplification, the ‘ramping up’ of capitalism also ramps up insecurity everywhere and security-talk becomes far more prevalent. People begin to chase security. It acquires a fetish. This is largely conditioned by the mar-

ket but it also reflects the real ideological insecurities of our system. So, everywhere we look, security is sold and marketed and this happens as the state engages in a whole raft of security initiatives and valorizes security by growing the security-industrial complex. The media pick up on this and so do security experts. There is now a multi-layered security intelligentsia that wants to market the idea of widespread insecurity, to sell its solution. Both the state and the market it supports benefit from this.

So, yes, I do differ somewhat from Gramsci in that I see the economic and ideological as far more mutually reinforcing and I would argue, as Marx does, that we should start with the commodity form: in this case the *security* commodity.

Surely not all of us use commodities (items that hold exchange value) alone to define ourselves. I mean, in the core idea of what we are. Is it not a fact of our very existence that one's own identity can only be meaningfully defined in relation to what the "other" is and is not, where this proverbial "other" is not limited to commodities and human beings around us but includes all objects (nature – plants, animals, air, etc.; commodities – cars, houses, etc.; national treasures – monuments, historical artifacts, etc.; ideas – philosophy, literature, music, etc.). If so, isn't then the concept of security simply a manifestation of our fears – mainly related to an inherent difficulty in defining ourselves – thus implying a purity of idea (meaning that regardless of whether or not an ideology of any kind exists, the idea of security would still exist) – one that goes beyond the ability of the current economic system to appropriate and incorporate? In this sense, isn't Anti-Security a negation of a quasi-natural order?

I would disagree. Let's first start by acknowledging that all of the things you list as non-commodities have indeed, in one way or another, become commodified. By saying this, however, I am not suggesting that everything is thus a commodity. I am saying that capitalism would like nothing more than the commodification of everything and, moreover, that this is capitalism's unrelenting core tendency. But there are always

countervailing tendencies and capitalism exists in its ideal form nowhere.

Second, you wonder if security has always *naturally* been with us because death, struggle, identity and survival have always been with us. This means that security is alpha and omega and certainly precedes capitalism. By extension, this would undermine any attempt to link security to the commodity form.

To make this argument we would have committed a double-pronged historical error. First, by reading back into human history a contemporary notion of security when such a notion did not exist and second by broadening the notion of security to encompass identity, indeed existence, itself. I don't doubt that we can see many historical antecedents of security in pre-capitalism but security emerges as an organizing, foundational, notion of society with liberalism.

By the way, by reaching back and finding security everywhere and calling it 'natural' we would end up further elevating and universalizing the very project Anti-security seeks to critique: the ubiquitous and depoliticizing reach of security. By effectively expanding the notion of security to include all potential pitfalls of life, not just today but since the beginning of recorded time, we would be complicit in the very problematic that Anti-security seeks to smash. And it's so easy to end up doing this, isn't it? This is why a counter-hegemonic language around security is so desperately needed.

In your book, "Nightclub-Bouncers, Risk and the Spectacle of Consumption" you discussed the fusion of aestheticization of consumption, surveillance and policing in the night-time economy. In addition, it seems to me that in "Nightclub" and also in "The New Parapolice", private security employees become the embodiment of the aestheticization of security (e.g., uniforms, physical appearance, behaviors, etc.). And here, you seem to distinguish between the factual manifestation and the aesthetic form of security, more specifically, the fetish of security. Could you elaborate further on the significance of the aestheticization of secur-

ity, in relation to the need to stand against security? Are you suggesting that security fetishism and its factual manifestation facilitates and builds homogeneity within the fabric of society?

I do not believe security produces homogeneity. I say security becomes hegemonic, which is not the same thing. Security, like other commodities, is ubiquitous and multi-faceted in its appearance, in the way that it is marketed, even in its overall look and aesthetic. We can buy all sorts of security solutions or debate the best types of security responses but security remains the language of policy, the mobilizing concept around how society must be defended.

More concretely, it is interesting to consider for a moment how this becomes embodied in doing security labour. We go from tribal rotation, to feudal obligation to public duty and then security enterprise. Security labour has successively become more and more alienated. In the end, we have the core embodiment of the security aesthetic of our day: a contract security guard working for a multinational organization at the behest of a corporate client unrelated to her own home and family, working strange hours, conducting patrols that are under constant surveillance so that her immaterial labour may be representationally transformed into a concrete form. She is the product. She is emblazoned with a corporate logo. A shoulder patch sets her apart. A patch to which she has almost no meaningful allegiance or connection. It has to be one of the most alienating forms of labour yet developed and yet it represents the most 'productive' manifestation of security next to vendible commodities that are already replacing her, making her labour even more insecure.

As far as what identifying this aesthetic, along with nightclub bouncers, etc. might mean for a resistance there are all sorts of possibilities. Anyone can wear a security uniform or t-shirt and turn it into an *Insecurity* t-shirt and so forth. Creative people in the world of representational subterfuge can think this through better than I can.

What do you see as some of the major issues with the hegemony of the security discourse?

As I have mentioned, security discourse stunts debate. It doesn't halt debate. It brackets it. In fact, to a great extent security discourse invites and extends debate given its ubiquity. So long as everyone is speaking the language of security; so long as the end product is "better security" or "more effective security" or in some way or another improving security. Even criticisms of security are mostly critiques of security initiatives or technology. In this sense security discourse is clearly the discourse of dominance. It is a "practical man's" discourse aimed at "balance", being reasonable and dealing with "real world" issues. So even radical ideas about security can be summarized as security intelligence. They may very well appear as security briefs.

This becomes a major challenge. It's not a new challenge since other radical discourses in other areas of scholarship have had to deal with similar concerns about co-option. But I would suggest they are nowhere stronger than in security research and I would go further to suggest that many of these other areas including: feminist advocacy for women's safety in the home, queer alliance efforts to stop gay bashing, Canadian aboriginal communities' demands for more safety and effective policing and the inclusion of indigenous alternative sanctions in the criminal justice system, etc. These movements, among a myriad of others, become co-opted at the moment their concerns are understood as security concerns; at the moment the population is defined as "at risk" or "risky." This does not require self-definition. It simply means that the state comes to see it as a worthy security concern.

Can we say that in the above examples the state's security responses are, in sequence: paternalism as the benevolent face of patriarchy, a heterosexed protection racket, the continued enforcement of white man's justice? Sure we can, and we have. But we have not problematized the very logics that condition this hegemonic response in the first place. How all

of these instances are tied to, what I would consider to be, an historic liberal mission to govern by pacifying.

The goal of anti-security, therefore, is to produce a space in which heterodox and counterhegemonic discussions about security can take place. Where security is not taken for granted or allowed to be seen as a positive end in itself.

You talk about the ability of the security discourse to hijack social movements, even radical ones. What about ideas and principles (human rights comes to mind as a particularly important example)? And what does that mean in relation to our understanding of such ideas and principles?

As you are no doubt aware there is no consensus among critical thinkers about human rights. Marxists are also divided about rights. Marx, himself, did not help by being dismissive of rights. To be sure, the human rights we have today have been vetted through a liberal and capitalist juridical mindset. They have been erected on the teetering edifice of private property which is based on a forced seizure of land, an expropriation and pacification. But we nonetheless need human rights now and we will need them after capitalism. These rights will, of course, look very different when they become untethered to liberal political philosophy and the valorization of private property. They will not be laced with the rhetoric of security of property, security of the person and so forth. They will not seek to guarantee our liberty from the tyranny of the state because the state will wither with the rise of cooperative associations and the realization of a true, free market. But this is beyond the project of Anti-security which only seeks to destabilize as part of a wider effort of mobilization. These aspects, these principles of association tend to materialize on the back of, and simultaneous dissolution of, a previous order.

You have mentioned pacification a few times. Why is Pacification the most appropriate theoretical framework?

Well, it's the most appropriate for me. We can appropriate pacification as a critical and counterhegemonic analytic

framework for discussing security as Neocleous has already begun to do. It's a new way for radical philosophies, sociologies and other social sciences to confront genealogies of security by problematizing the objectives of security, uncovering connections that were previously buried or masked, counteracting the ubiquitous reach of security in the scholarly literature and recognize that pacification connotes a state of war and anticipates resistance. For all these reasons pacification has tremendous promise.

What is also useful about pacification is that it is a concept that has been excavated from the security literature itself. It is security's big secret. That is, when security was beginning to be understood as a liberal, governmental ideal –as an organizing principle of power as we have inherited it today— it was bound up with the control of colonial subjects, the creation of productive labour, the accumulation of wealth and the ideological fabrication of a social order in line with capitalist interests. Pacification was the operational arm of primitive accumulation and, of course, it still is.

After the Vietnam War pacification has all but dropped from official discourse because it connoted bombing people into submission and waging an ideological war against opponents of capitalism and imperialism. Those who used to talk about pacification right up to the 1960s were based out of imperial centres and they were quite transparent about their interests: whether it was bringing civilization to the Indians, making the Irish more productive, or winning over the Vietnamese. There exists a litany of examples and they are easy to excavate. The motivation behind military adventures and conquests, international police actions, and attempts to win the “hearts and minds” of dominated populations were quite clear. Today, this is still the shameful organizing principle of security that imperial powers, domestic police agencies, security studies experts, and politicians would soon want us to forget. These processes have continued unabated under the more rosy and ubiquitous notion of security. But whether it's in Times Square or whether it's in central Baghdad the or-

ganizing principles of pacification seem interchangeable with domestic and international colonization: the conquering of space so that is made conducive to capital accumulation, the circulation of goods, and making people more productive. In a sense, pacification identifies and uses the language of security against itself. This is why I find it particularly useful.

One last question to conclude on: Why would Anti - Security not simply be co-opted by the current security discourse?

At a purely theoretical level, it would be like swallowing a cancer. Anti-security points to everything that dominant security tries to obfuscate, play down, apologize for and even hide. It relentlessly explores all that security would soon bury. It is, after all, *Anti*-security. I don't think Anti-security would ever be invited to dinner. It's just too embarrassing, too self-destructive.

As I said previously, if Anti-security is pointing to the crux of what ideologically subtends the global economic and political system then its acceptance would coincide with the end of the that system. And that's fine by me.

Conclusion:

In this article professor Rigakos presents a glimpse into the inner workings of the current security discourse, explores its inherent contradictions, identifies its ubiquity and hegemonic nature as challenges to, and inhibitors for, critical studies and analyses, and consequently offers "Anti-Security" as an alternative. What is then "Anti-Security"? Well, at its base, "Anti-Security" is a discursive space where radical challenges to security can be conducted outside of the hegemonic reach of the current security discourse. It is a place where counter-hegemonic language and practice may be incubated.

Anti-Security therefore, offers three major areas for critical thought, that is: the philosophical, the analytical, and the political. Each of these provides a wide breadth for future research possibilities, where scholars, students, and activists can identify alternative theoretical frameworks, develop and

test hypotheses, and engage in effective political participation. As such, scholarship and practice alike may rely on Anti-Security as a vehicle for the outreach to, the engagement of, and the mobilization of, like-minded individuals.

In suggesting Anti-Security as an alternative, the idea is to challenge critical scholarship to achieve better, more independent outcomes, ones that are not co-opted into the fabric of security, and that become hegemonic. It is then up to students, scholars, and activists to further develop analytic and strategic tools of resistance, and to challenge the legitimacy and utility of the sociopolitical and economic system that buttresses security.