



TE TUMU
SCHOOL OF MĀORI, PACIFIC & INDIGENOUS STUDIES

Manawa whenua, wē moana uriuri, hōkikitanga kawenga

From the heart of the land, to the depths of the sea;
repositories of knowledge abound

Te Papa Hou is a trusted digital repository providing for the long-term preservation and free access to leading scholarly works from staff and students at Te Tumu, School of Māori, Pacific and Indigenous Studies at the University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand.

The information contained in each item is available for normal academic purposes, provided it is correctly and sufficiently referenced. Normal copyright provisions apply.

For more information regarding Te Papa Hou please contact maori-studies@otago.ac.nz

Author:	Brendan Hokowhitu
Title:	<i>The Logic of Terror</i>
Year:	2008
Item:	Book Chapter
Editor:	Danny Keenan
Book Title:	<i>Terror In Our Midst: Searching for Terror in Aotearoa New Zealand</i>
Place of Publication:	Wellington
Publisher:	Huia Publishers

TERROR IN OUR MIDST?

SEARCHING
FOR TERROR
IN AOTEAROA
NEW ZEALAND

EDITED BY
DANNY KEENAN

The Logic of Terror

Brendan Hokowhitu

What is at issue is more than the control of a territory or a population or the disbanding of a subversive organization. The stakes have become metaphysical.¹

The logic of terror

Non-discursively or intuitively, it seems to me that the *terror* raids on 15 October 2007 were inevitable. The subjugation of Māori via New Zealand's juridical system and, specifically, under the confining discourse of 'terror suppression' feels *logical* within the context of the 'age of terror'.

From this very identifiable context, this chapter confronts the threat to the fundamental rights of Māori and all New Zealanders that the *terror* raids perpetrated by examining the spread of the *logic of terror* through global discourses. By *logic of terror*, I refer to the pervasive overarching discourse of 'terror' that has become infused within everyday life since 11 September 2001 (hereafter referred to as '9/11'). This definition is in opposition to the notion of 'terror' commonly associated with 'acts of terrorism' enacted by those framed within the *logic of terror* as 'known terrorists'. Within the *logic of terror*, it is the pre-emptive assertion of the will of the powerful over typically 'othered' groups that I envisage as *terrorism*.

Central to this chapter is the question of how have we arrived at this point? That is, this paper examines the social function that the *logic of terror* has played in determining political and social control tactics that include the *terror* raids on Ngāi Tūhoe. What conditions have enabled the regularities of *terrorism* possible? How in the New

First published in 2008 by Huia Publishers
39 Pipitea Street, PO Box 17-335
Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand
www.huia.co.nz

ISBN 978-1-86969-329-9

Copyright © the authors 2008
Cover photograph courtesy Monique Ford, Whakatane Beacon
Cover design: Tim Hansen

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, including photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior permission of the publisher.

National Library of New Zealand Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

Terror in our midst? : searching for terror in Aotearoa

New Zealand / edited by Danny Keenan.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-869693-29-9

1. Police—New Zealand. 2. Civil rights—New Zealand.

3. Terrorism—Prevention—New Zealand.

I. Keenan, Danny.

363.32—dc 22

Published with the support of the Office of the Pro-Vice Chancellor Māori,
Victoria University of Wellington



and with the assistance of

Puke Ariki
LAND TRUST

Zealand postcolonial context have we become subjects of the *logic of terror*?

Framing notions of power

To begin to answer these questions, it is first necessary to reframe how we typically analyse 'power'. Thus far, the discourse surrounding the *terrorism* of 15 October 2007 has focused, firstly, on juridical power. In this context, the focus is upon the legality of the actions of the alleged 'terrorists' and, secondly, the legality of the actions of the *terrorists* (i.e., the New Zealand Government, Howard Broad and the New Zealand Police). Secondly, the news media, especially, has manufactured power as a personalised struggle between Howard Broad and Tame Iti, both of whom have been constructed as figureheads, one representing the strong-arm of the state, the other, 'the dangerous face of Māori radicalism.'²

To their discredit, the Māori press has also tended to personalise the terror raids instead of interrogating the larger power systems at play. For instance, in coverage by *Mana* magazine it was reported that:

A cat and mouse game is being played out and will continue in the coming months. It has the capacity to tear us in separate directions. The cat is Howard Broad. He has all the guns and he demonstrated that on October 15 when he unleashed heavily armed combat ready police in black uniforms, helmets, masks and balaclavas with combat rifles and guns strapped to their knees, on the people of the tiny eastern Bay of Plenty town of Rūātoki. At gunpoint they ordered people going about their lawful business on the public highway out of their vehicles, ordered them to hold up numbers in front of them and took their photographs.³

Our first task then is to reformulate 'power' itself as there is the tendency to represent power in ways that are logical, that is, within a language we understand. In the above case, power is conceptualised hierarchically with Broad and the police as 'Goliath' and the people of Rūātoki as 'David'. The construction is conducted through language that is imminently accessible to our current logic. The present article attempts to reframe power to examine the *terror* raids within the *logic of terror*.

I don't think we can broach this reformulation of power without revisiting Foucault and his 'quest to present alternative nondiscursive conceptualisations of power, as opposed to discursive representations of power, or the representation of power as aligned to law and the juridical system'. In 1976, Foucault gave a series of lectures at the Collège de France, which focused on an alternative conceptualisation of power. In particular, Foucault probed the idea of 'war' as the 'principle of intelligibility' from which politics are determined.

In this 'age of terror', it is possible that the full significance of Foucault's strategic model may only now be being fully realised. In his model, Foucault characterises discourse 'as a battle, a struggle, a place and an instrument of confrontation, a weapon of power, of control, of subjection, of qualification and of disqualification.' For the purposes of this chapter, I would like the reader to similarly reconceptualise power, yet in terms of *terror*, where the principle of intelligibility in this 'age of terror' is *terror* itself. That is, *terror* has become the general nondiscursive discourse that determines the intersections of people politically. *Terror* provides its own reciprocal language through which people interact and understand each other politically. This language includes acts of terror by those constructed within the dominant discourse of *terror* as 'terrorists', and acts of *terror* practiced by those who have the power to construct, such as the imperialist invasions carried out by the United States government. The chapter will also demonstrate that the fear promulgated by the *logic of terror* forms a new political and moral rationality.

The present chapter, therefore, shifts the focus from the visible, logical and discursive, to the invisible non-discursive *logic of terror*. Howard Broad's heavy-handedness is of little concern here. The task is to unveil the processes of power that enabled the actions of Howard Broad, that enabled 'invasion' based on a rationale of *terror*.

Similarly, it is irrelevant to this paper at least whether or not the police actions were permissible within New Zealand's juridical system for, as we have seen with the Foreshore and Seabed debacle, the legal system is far from an objective entity. The chapter presents an alternative way of analysing power where the Terrorism Suppression Act 2002 and the inevitable *terror* raids on Ngāi Tūhoe are reconceptualized as tactics of power based on *logic of terror*.

Power, therefore, is represented as non-discursive, as an entity not intelligible to the language we typically use to describe political intersections. This is not to say that we simply deflect attention away from the perpetrators of *terror* (i.e., Broad et al), rather we unmask these acts as tactics of oppression permissible within the *logic of terror*. To understand the *terrorism* perpetrated by the New Zealand Police in October 2007 we need to return to the events of 9/11. Since this time, knowledge itself has been transforming in strategic relation to the notion of *terror* itself.

The pervasiveness of the logic of terror

Since September 11, 2001, each of our days has been marked by daily accounts of outbreaks of 'terror': cameos of little skirmishes, a bomb going off, descriptions of the ongoing slow friction of occupied territories. And since that date ... the off-shore-ness of it all has gradually seeped through the screen of 'elsewhere' and into the ways we construct our own personal lives. For daily we are reminded that we must be vigilant, we must be afraid ...⁴

In the above quote, Hoffer reminds us that it is the pervasiveness of *terror* discourses that have normalised acts of *terrorism*. Seemingly, the *logic of terror* is based on reciprocity between terrorism and *terrorism*. In the first instance, as Baudrillard points out, the global imperialism of the United States led to the conditions that brought about 9/11: 'there is a general allergy to an ultimate order, to an ultimate power, and the Twin Towers of the World Trade Centre embodied this in the fullest sense'.

The symbolic acts of 9/11 enabled an environment where a cynical Bush administration was able to cash in on the fear of an American public unaccustomed to attacks within its own borders. Enmeshed with public fear were assertions of US imperialism: said George Bush, 'our war will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated.' As with Howard Broad, it is easy to vilify the Bush administration (and they are worth vilifying) for the proliferation of terror. International relations specialist Robert Patman suggests that 'the Bush administration has tended to focus on the symptoms – disrupting and defeating the al-Qaeda network – rather than eliminating the political causes

of terrorism with a broader range of policies'⁵. Here, Patman is obliquely implying that the US's tactics in the contrived 'war on terror' has resulted in an intensification of terroristic activities.

In early 2003, following the rapid 'end' to the war in Iraq and Bush's self-congratulatory boast that 'al-Qaeda is on the run,' a series of 'terrorist' attacks in one week undercut the sense of returning comfort many Westerners were feeling. The activities included four synchronised attacks by al-Qaeda in Saudi Arabia upon western compounds that killed 34, two suicide bombings in the Russian Republic of Chechnya that killed 70, and five attacks in the Moroccan city, Casablanca, which left 41 dead. Eric Pooley of *TIME* magazine suggested 'the idea that the swift, successful end of the war in Iraq had somehow made the world safer from terrorism – shimmered and vanished. In its place were familiar fears.'⁶

The renewed terrorist activities, in turn, legitimised the US's continued imperial endeavours: 'this incident in Saudi Arabia shows that we still have a war to fight.'⁷ To Baudrillard, the global imperialism of the Bush administration, for instance, was based on madness and, thus, will effect madness. The resultant madness is merely symptomatic of the system: 'with its totalizing claim, the system created the conditions for this horrible retaliation. The immanent mania of globalization generates madness, just as an unstable society produces delinquents and psychopaths. In truth, these are only symptoms of the sickness. Terrorism is everywhere, like a virus.'⁸

Here, I would like to reiterate that 'terrorism' and *terrorism* are reciprocal and symbiotically reproductive; the language of world domination demands a counter-language. Very much like Foucault, Baudrillard draws our attention away from 'acts of terror' and towards the conceiving of the system itself as the producer of *terror*. For instance, the pervasiveness of the *logic of terror* and the manufacturing of world events legitimised the seemingly non-correlative actions of the Bush administration who 'declared war on global terrorism after 9/11 without clearly defining who or what was the enemy'⁹; the enemy, or ally, being *terror* itself.

In coordination with the continued *terroristic* activities of the United States abroad, the results of the *logic of terror* were being normalised. 'Invasion' in the name of 'homeland security' was being conformed. Within the *logic of terror*, invasion takes many

forms, including invasion of a country, invasion of a town, invasion of a community, and invasion of individual human rights. As Foucault points out, 'a power whose task is to take charge of life needs continuous regulatory and corrective mechanisms ... such a power has to qualify, measure, appraise and hierarchize, rather than display itself in its murderous splendour ... [the] juridical institution is increasingly incorporated into a continuum of apparatuses whose functions are for the most part regulatory.'¹⁰

That is to say, rather than the savage disregard of human rights that the *logic of terror* has enabled, such as with the treatment of the prisoners of Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, it is the everyday 'regulatory and corrective' mechanisms of the *logic of terror* that normalises its resultants. It is the surveillance within our everyday lives; it is the changes in how we govern ourselves that propagate the *logic of terror*. For instance, the invasion of personal space when going through 'security' in airports normalises *terror*. To be examined, x-rayed, stripped, and sprayed. Our complicity and acceptance of this pre-emptive invasion, of this dehumanising process, as 'part and parcel of how it is these days', in turn normalises 'invasion'. Similarly, our acquiescence to pre-emptive invasion in our everyday lives normalises larger pre-emptive invasions based on fear and paranoia.

In his introduction to the *Der Spiegel* interview with Jean Baudrillard in 2004, Gary Genosko draws our attention to the imbrication of war with the West's mediated and commercial experience:

maximally amplified and multiplied across the networked screens of a globalised world, another war against Iraq, conducted by another Bush, invades our TV rooms and entertainment centres ... Turn on your war processor at almost any time of day, or stumble upon any of the numerous ambient units in your everyday world of laundry mats, malls, bars, airports, gyms, and there it is, like a free sample or, better, a gift that programming appears to be. All war, all the time, if you want it.¹¹

Genosko's analysis alludes to the controversial analyses of the recently deceased Jean Baudrillard. Baudrillard's testing thesis suggests that, like other versions of reality, the 'realities' of war and terror that we

watch played out on our TV screens are produced. Central to his claim is the notion that reality and fiction are so heavily intertwined that there is no longer a division between the two.

It is not surprising then that immediately following the 15 October *terror* raids Tame Iti suggested: 'they came in here like in a B-grade film'. Iti's analogy alerts us to the influence the media plays in propagating the *logic of terror* within New Zealand also. In the self-gratifying stories New Zealanders like to tell, we seldom want to think of ourselves as influenced by discourses that emanate from the United States. Yet, since the events of 9/11, the diffuse nature of discourses focused on terror that have pervaded our mediated experiences has meant that, as one of the global Westernised mediated nations, New Zealand has been firmly ensconced within the *logic of terror*. And, in turn, New Zealand's mediated landscape has enabled tactics based on the *logic of terror* to enter our midst in the form of *terror* raids perpetrated against othered people.

Human rights, the 'other' and the logic of terror

It is told to us as if it is a new thing. We are told that this global war on terror involves us all, and that those things that we hold most dear to us are the things that define us from that other thing that perpetually threatens to take it away. That other thing – that otherness – cannot be clearly defined. It has come to be associated with a wraithlike phantasm of the Islamic world, and it inevitably seems associated with a vague concept of the 'middle east'. But overall it seems to be most able to be associated with a concept of 'out there' – that place, any place, beyond a 'homeland' and 'security'.¹²

The preceding discussion draws our attention to the fact that we cannot analyse the 15 October *terror* raids without illustrating them as resultants of a global *logic of terror*.

Prior to 9/11, it would have been inconceivable to pre-emptively violate the rights of New Zealanders based on the threat of terror. Today, however, the construction of morality within the *logic of terror* means the *terror* raids were hardly surprising. It seems that in this time of 'fear', blind faith deception and savage acts of invasion are being insidiously normalised.

Crucial to this particular discussion is the transformation of morality in the *logic of terror*. This can be analysed via the degradation of the fundamental Enlightenment-based human rights, which the *logic of terror* is affecting. Patman argues that 'the Bush administration's efforts to strengthen national security after September 11 have been widely seen as weakening Washington's adherence to human rights and the rule of law. These principles lie at the heart of the liberal democratic system and play a key role in legitimising and distinguishing democratic rule from the activities of terrorist groups.'¹³

Again, obliquely, Patman is suggesting that the actions of the Bush administration are akin to terrorism. Patman, however, overlooks the fact that the liberal democratic juridical system is itself transforming within the *logic of terror*; the juridical system being a tactical resultant of its times as opposed to a monolith of power. In this reformation of morality and power, we can better appreciate the warnings Foucault provided us with regard to normalising technologies. Foucault suggested that a vast 'documentary apparatus' would be the key to power and the transforming landscape of morality: 'the power of the state to produce an increasingly totalising web of control is intertwined with and dependent on its ability to produce an increasing specification of individuality.'¹⁴

Hence, 'the Patriot Act ... defined terrorism to include direct action by protesters (and) widened the use of wire-tapping on telephone calls and emails.'¹⁵ Similarly, in New Zealand the Terrorism Suppression Act 'allowed police unrestricted and unprecedented access to our private communications.'¹⁶ Closely linked to the reformation of morality affected by the *logic of terror* is the relationship of the 'Other' to the self, which is extremely pertinent to the *terror* perpetrated against Ngāi Tūhoe. Essentially, the discourse promoted by the Bush administration, in cahoots with other Western governments such as Britain, was fostered on the grounds that 'Others' had fewer rights than the normal population. Interestingly, the transforming morality is regressing in part due to the pre-enlightened discourses espoused by the Bush administration especially. Discourses based on 'the will of God' and 'good and evil', have quickly positioned the Other as 'evil' and the self as 'good'. The moral retrogression has served those in power the sovereign-like mandate to enact absolute sovereign-like justice.

For instance, the Patriot Act 'authorised the Attorney-General to detain foreign nationals, on mere suspicion, without any of the legal protections of the United States Constitution.'¹⁷ Under such conditions, that is, within the *logic of terror*, distinctions between the self and Other have been firmly drawn, as outlined by the Bush administration's zero-sum formula where, 'either you are with us or you are with the terrorists'.¹⁸ Baudrillard was quick to point out the retrogression away from an Enlightened morality based on autonomy and freedom, following 9/11:

is it not a paradox that the West uses as a weapon against dissenters the following motto: Either you share our values or...? A democracy asserted with threats and blackmail only sabotages itself. It no longer represents the autonomous decision for freedom, but rather becomes a global imperative. This is, in effect, a perversion of Kant's categorical imperative, which implies freely chosen consent to its command.¹⁹

In relation to the above quote, it is important to return to Baudrillard's opening quote to remind the reader of what is at stake when the human rights of fellow citizens are breached within the *logic of terror*. The stakes are, indeed, metaphysical.

A warning for New Zealand

All New Zealanders should take heed of Baudrillard's warning because it is the autonomy and freedom of all of our citizens that the October 2007 *terror* raids violated. The permeation of *terror* as a 'principle of intelligibility' in New Zealand's political scene points to *terror* based resultants in New Zealand's future:

Discourse – the mere fact of speaking, of employing words, of using the words of others (even if it means returning them), words that the others understand and accept (and, possibly, return from their side) – this fact is in itself a force. Discourse is, with respect to relations of forces, not merely a surface of inscription, but something that brings about effects.²⁰

While New Zealanders have been subject to the encroachment of the *logic of terror* through global discourses and, locally, through the adoption of the Terrorism Suppression Act, the visible alignment of Māori subjects with the notion of 'terror' does not bode well

for New Zealand's future ethnic relations, which are already under severe strain following the divisive politics of the Don Brash-led National Party, and the Foreshore and Seabed farce.

New Zealand will rue the day when *terror* is normalised, that is, when Māori are confined, stigmatised and visualised as *terror subjects*. The spectre of terrorism has been raised in New Zealand, and will allow the permeation of the terroristic discourse into this 'nation's' story, as the following foreign correspondent sombrely notes:

New Zealand armed police stormed into this quiet village at dawn, threw up roadblocks, shot out truck tires and forced families out of their homes at gunpoint. The rare show of force, with its dark subscript of terrorism and assassination plans, stunned this placid nation where beat cops don't even carry guns.²¹

While this reporter constructs power in a hierarchical manner and overly romanticises New Zealand as a 'placid nation', what he importantly points out is that the 'subscript of terrorism' has entered our ethnic intersections. And so, we must ask ourselves, what will be the role of the *logic of terror* in the New Zealand postcolonial context? What role will it play in defining subjectivity and 'Otherness' in New Zealand?

Resultant tactics of the logic of terror

The instruments of government, instead of being laws, now come to be a range of multiform tactics.²²

Hopefully thus far this chapter has provided a macro-lens for understanding how this most recent form of invasion in New Zealand has eventuated. The following discussion employs Foucault's notion of 'governmentality' to scrutinise the interface of the *logic of terror* and New Zealand's ethnic politics, where the October 2007 *terror* raids are viewed in terms of 'tactical productivity' and 'strategic integration'.

Firstly, it should be noted that Acts such as the United States' Patriot Act and New Zealand's Terrorism Suppression Act are themselves tactics. Their incorporation within the juridical system achieves an end in itself by the potential to confine suspected Otherness. The illegality of Otherness, thus, becomes naturally

feared and aligned with terror. In the present context, the positioning of 'Māori radicalism' alongside 'terrorism' reconfigures New Zealand's ethnic power relations:

With government it is a question not of imposing law on men [sic], but of disposing things: that is to say, of employing tactics rather than laws, and even of using laws themselves as tactics – to arrange things in such a way that, through a certain number of means, such and such ends may be achieved.²³

In recent years, the prominence of Māori politically has brought about an angst in right-wing and 'middle' New Zealanders that, in turn, has reconstituted the New Zealand political landscape and polarised Māori and Pākehā. The political milieu is too lengthy to delve into here but suffice to say that government policies towards Māori have become crucial to any New Zealand government's tenure. Case in point was the refusal by the New Zealand government to sign the United Nations Draft Declaration of Indigenous Rights. The increasingly right-wing approach to Māori and indigenous policies by New Zealand's traditionally leftist Labour Party smacks of a governing party afraid to lose power for fear of appearing over-lenient towards its indigenous population. Seemingly, in this age of 'fear' based political assertions of Otherness, that is, Other world views and epistemologies, are highly threatening to a middle white New Zealand who are attempting to reassert their dominance.

Symbolising 15 October 2007

Of most significance to this chapter is the symbolism of the 15 October 2007 *terrorism* and its determination to breed fear of Otherness. Native American activist, Andrea Smith, argues that while 'many Indian tribes came out in support of the U.S. 'war against terror' ... it is important to understand that this war against 'terror' is really an attack against Native sovereignty, and that consolidating the U.S. empire abroad is predicated on consolidating the U.S. empire *within* U.S. borders.'²⁴

Although the New Zealand and United States contexts cannot be compared, what is important in Smith's analysis is that the *logic of terror* is predicated on 'homeland' security. For New Zealand, 'homeland' security can be translated into the 'war' to secure the normalisation of the social body. It is crucial for many Pākehā New

Zealanders to believe that life as they know it within their own borders is secure; that 'Māori radicalism' can be confined. One tactic of confinement is to align Māori alterity with 'terror': 'the objective of the exercise of power is to reinforce, strengthen and protect the principality (this is, the art of governing).'²⁵

As a technology of normalisation, the association of Māori radicalism with terror via the *logic of terror* has played and will play a key role in the control and, in particular, the isolation of such 'anomalies' in the social body. The aim of such a disciplinary technology is to forge a 'docile body', symbolically or otherwise.

It is therefore the central thesis of this chapter, that New Zealand's current ethnic politics is being shaped by a 'principal intelligibility' based on a *logic of terror*. The normalisation of *terror* discourses in relation to Māori is an attempt to confine and control Māori political assertiveness as a social 'anomaly' that is deserving of punishment via New Zealand's juridical system. It is crucial that Māori realise this process and refuse its language.

It is important to note that the subjugation of Otherness via global discourses is not new. Indeed, the globalising discourses of savagery and humanitarianism underpinned colonial ideology. The alignment of Otherness with savagery has confined and continues to confine indigenous epistemologies throughout the world. In relation to the *logic of terror* and, to paraphrase Foucault, 'we are yet to cut off the coloniser's head'. Yet, perhaps it is not the coloniser's head we should be worried about. The subjugation of alterity via the *logic of terror* is epistemologically violent and should remind us of past acts of spiritual, mental and physical violence perpetrated against our people in the name of humanitarianism. We should be extremely weary about the current intertextuality between theories of 'globalisation' and the *logic of terror*. As Baudrillard points out, globalisation:

is based, as colonialism was earlier, on immense violence. It creates more victims than beneficiaries, even when the majority of the Western world profits from it ... This process is extremely violent, for it cashes out in the idea of unity as the ideal state, in which everything that is unique, every singularity, including other cultures and finally every non-monetary value would be incorporated.

At this point, it is noteworthy to point out that the construction of Others as 'terrorists' has not repelled terrorism. As explained earlier, part of governance via a language of *terror* is the counter use of that language by those cultures affected through the Othering process. Plainly put, if constructed as 'terrorists' those Others may just speak back in the language of 'terror'.

Governing ourselves through the logic of terror

It was an attack on the community. It was an attack on me as a freedom fighter, and as a sovereign person of this country.²⁶

Recently I travelled to the United States, Hawai'i to be precise, and was not surprised (given the populace and influence of the armed forces in Hawai'i) to note an increase in the patriotic fervour since the last time I had visited. Of surprise, however, was the pervasiveness of the *logic of terror*. In flicking through the local newspapers, I realised the extent to which the *logic of terror* was determining how United States citizens were governing themselves.

For instance, in an inauspicious issue of the *Hawaii Tribune Herald* under the heading 'Citizens Arrested and Charged' there was a report of police attending a domestic argument involving a weapon. I was surprised to read that the offender was later charged with 'abuse of a family/household member and *first-degree terroristic threatening*'. Within the same court news, three other men were charged with 'terroristic threatening.'

While perhaps stark examples, the newspaper excerpts here highlight how the *logic of terror* has influenced not only how the United States is attempting to pre-emptively govern those Others now constructed as 'evil', but more importantly to this chapter, how they are using terroristic reasoning in turn to govern themselves. These criminals, these anomalies of the social body, are being defined via the *logic of terror*.

In relation to the 15 October 2007 *terror* raids, what is most frightening is not the raids themselves but the idea that such 'power' is possible; that power based on the *logic of terror* so fervently entered New Zealand's political context; that the way in which we politically govern ourselves, especially in relation to Otherness, now has a political intelligibility based on the *logic of terror*.

Conclusion: resisting the language of terror

It is important that Māori resist the *language of terror*; it is important we do not speak its guises; it is important that we realise how to combat it; it is important that we refuse its veil. Thus far, the *logic of terror* has attempted to confine 'Māori radicalism' by isolating it through positioning it as 'terroristic'. The words of Tame Iti in the quote above are important with regard to de-confining the political voice of Māori and, consequently, should be spoken loud and often. Such language unmasks the process as an 'attack' against our sovereignty, community, country and freedom. In our counter discourse, it is also important for Pākehā to realise that under this *logic of terror* it is not only Māori freedom and rights that are under siege. The *logic of terror* is a dehumanising and morally regressive super-structure for all. It is thus important for all that a Māori voice, radical or otherwise does not become normalised. The challenge this chapter presents is the refusal to separate off knowledge from power:

it seems to me ... that the real political task in a society such as ours is to criticize the working of institutions which appear to be both neutral and independent; to criticize them in such a manner that the political violence which was always exercised itself obscurely through them will be unmasked, so that one can fight them.²⁷

Notes

- 1 Baudrillard, J, 'This is the Fourth World War: The *Der Spiegel* Interview with Jean Baudrillard', in *International Journal of Baudrillard Studies*. 2004, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1-8, S. Gandesha (trans). www.ubishops.ca/baudrillardstudies/spiegel.htm, p.4.
- 2 Fox, *Mana Magazine*, November 2007, Issue 79, p. 21.
- 3 Fox, *Mana*, p. 19.
- 4 HOFFIE, P., 'The Limits of Tolerance/The Mutability of Tolerance: Thinking About Reality and Representation in an "Age of Terror"', in *Junctures: The Journal for Thematic Dialogue*, 2007, vol. 9, p. 61.
- 5 R. Patman, '9/11 plus 5 - Know Your Enemy: Fighting Cancer with a Blowtorch' in *New Zealand Listener*, vol. 205, no. 3461, 2006, p.22.
- 6 E. Pooley, 'War on Terror' in *TIME*, 26 May 2003, no.20, p.16.
- 7 George W. Bush, 13 May 2003, cited M Elliot, 'Why the War on Terror will Never End', in *TIME*, 26 May 2003, pp. 18-23.
- 8 Baudrillard, 'This is the Fourth World War', p.4.
- 9 Patman, '9/11 plus 5 - Know Your Enemy', p.22.
- 10 M. Foucault, cited in 'Introduction', in P. Rainbow (ed) *The Foucault Reader*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984, p.20.
- 11 Genosko, G. 2004. 'Introduction - This is the Fourth World War: The *Der Spiegel* Interview with Jean Baudrillard', in *International Journal of Baudrillard Studies*. vol. 1, no. 1, p.1. S. Gandesha (trans). www.ubishops.ca/baudrillardstudies/spiegel.htm
- 12 HOFFIE, 'The Limits of Tolerance', p. 61.
- 13 Patman '9/11 plus 5 - Know Your Enemy', pp.22-23.

- 14 Foucault in Rainbow, *The Foucault Reader*, p.22.
- 15 Patman, '9/11 plus 5 - Know Your Enemy', p.23.
- 16 Fox, *Mana*, p. 17.
- 17 Patman, '9/11 plus 5 - Know Your Enemy', p.23.
- 18 George Bush cited in Patman, '9/11 plus 5 - Know Your Enemy', p.22.
- 19 Baudrillard, 'This is the Fourth World War', p.6.
- 20 M. Foucault, cited in A Davidson, 'Society Must Be Defended': *Lectures at the Collège de France 1975-1976*, New York 2003, p. xx.
- 21 R. Lilley, R. 2007. 'Raid on Maori Village Opens Old Wound' in *Guardian Unlimited*. December 16, 2007. www.guardian.co.uk/worldlatest/story/0,-7157678,00.html
- 22 Foucault, cited in 'Society', p. 95.
- 23 Foucault, cited in 'Society', p. 95.
- 24 A. Smith, *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2005, p.179.
- 25 Foucault, cited in 'Society', p.90.
- 26 Tame Iti, cited Lilley, R., 'Raid on Maori Village Opens Old Wound' in *Guardian Unlimited*, 16 December 2007. www.guardian.co.uk/worldlatest/story/0,-7157678,00.html.
- 27 M Foucault, 'Governmentality', in W Larner and W Walters (eds) *Global Governmentality: Governing International Spaces*, Routledge, London 2004, p. 6.