Facing airport security: affect, biopolitics, and the preemptive securitisation of the mobile body

Peter Adey
School of Physical and Geographical Sciences, Research Institute for Law, Politics and Justice, Keele University, Keele ST5 5BG, England; e-mail: p.adey@esci.keele.ac.uk
Received 5 January 2008; in revised form 1 September 2008; published online 23 February 2009

Abstract. This paper explores how the mobile body and, specifically, the face have become a site of observation, calculation, prediction, and action in the process of moving across borders. The paper explores how in the circulatory space of the airport/border, the body's circulatory systems, biological rhythms, and affective expressions have become objects of suspicion—mobile surfaces from which inner thoughts and potentially hostile intentions are scrunitized, read, and given threatening meaning by the newest modes of airport security and surveillance. Examined according to the vectoral modes of historicity and virtual possibility, as well as the internal and external play of intention and feeling, the paper uncovers an increased attention to differential axes of mobility—of past and future, surface and interior. The paper situates these techniques within the preemptive biopolitical securitisation of mobility across borders which, it is argued, has found its referent object in the primal realm of affective capacities.

"Uniforms strut with dogs
 find a fingernail clipper
 Command, Spread your legs,
 hands up, unbuckle
 that belt, let it drop.
 Now my shoes provoke
 security designed to make me
 bow down, tolerate any invasion"   *Airport* by Renato Rosaldo (2004)

"The stranger is, by definition, an agent moved by intentions that one can at best guess but would never know for sure. ...The stranger is the unknown variable in all equations calculated when decisions about what to do and how to behave are pondered; and so even if the strangers do not become objects of overt aggression and are not openly and actively resented, the presence of strangers inside the field of action remains discomforting, as it makes a tall order of the task of predicting the effects of action and its chances of success or failure."

Zygmunt Bauman (2003, page 106)

1 Introduction
In a plenary session of the first Canadian Aviation Security Conference held in 2006 I sat on a lone table of academics listening to a security consultant describe some of the practices they had recommended to the US Department for Homeland Security. After discussing the benefits of passenger profiling, the speaker ended his talk with a quick and surprising aside: they were developing 'behavioural' profiling and it was on the way (on profiling see Canter, 1999; Elmer, 2004). As I glanced back to my table for some verbal clarification of what this meant, my attention was immediately diverted away from the speaker. The development was resonating in a series of embodiments I was able to witness in several of the conference delegates sitting next to me. It was an audible intake of breath which first caught my interest. Scanning the nearby faces

revealed a narrowing of several delegates' eyebrows and a turndown of their lips into a frown. While I did not really know what any of this meant or, rather, what had caused such a reaction, it was exciting. I felt myself get caught up in the mood and the movements of my fellow delegates. Something had clearly been said worth taking notice of. I felt my pulse become noticeably quicker and I could feel and see the scrap of paper in my hand vibrate in accordant rhythm. I had been clearly carried along a wave of feeling that had altered my mood and, from my awareness of my raised heartbeat, my body's attitude.

I will not go any further into this story, but just say that I began with it as a way to show how the kinds of microgestures and outward expressions of emotion, which appeared to be something like shock, surprise, disgust, or confusion, are now becoming the object of scrutiny in airport security.[1] My own practices of observing and attempting to make sense of these expressions are reflective of the ideas and techniques that I examine in this paper. I will show that they closely resemble wider efforts to control mobile bodies across borders and through sites such as airports.

The paper dwells on three related techniques and technologies of airport security and surveillance which are governing and securing mobilities across the airport/border. By employing conceptions of the biopolitics of security, the paper explores how certain knowledges of affect (Anderson, 2006; McCormack, 2003; 2004; Thrift, 2004), psychological discourses, and other rationalities are being deployed within techniques that attempt to make mobilities secure by determining one's intention. When Gilles Deleuze writes that you do not know "beforehand what good or bad you are capable of; you do not know beforehand what a body or a mind can do" (1988, page 627; see Probyn, 2004), this is precisely what new modes of security are attempting to do.

We can see such a focus exemplified in what I show to be a contemporary security focus upon an imagined presocial, prelinguistic, and potentially inhuman species. As Bulent Diken and Carsten Lausten (2006) have recently explored, the bodily censorship constructed by the latest x-ray screeners, which look through clothing to image an "a-sexed or 'castrated' body without sexual organs: the ultimate, naked image of homo sacer as a non-erotic 'body' that only consists of dismembered 'organs'" (page 449), the paper explores the continuation of this trend to reduce, dividualise, and, as I argue, animalise the body into its prereflective and unconscious bodily capacities to affect or be affected (Deleuze, 1988); they construct an imagination of an anxious and neurotic subject of drives, instincts, moods, and emotions (see also Anderson, 2006; Isin, 2004). These imaginations matter (Gregory, 2004).

The paper details how this development has several implications that reconcile theorisations of mobility with the biopolitical. It further shifts and must question our understanding of the mobile body and its enrolment as an object to be governed and secured as it crosses certain spatial and territorial barriers. Such practices provoke alternative conceptions of a mobile individual by addressing an axial dimensionality of bodies with interior and exterior surfaces as well as pasts and futures which may be both surveilled and acted upon in order to prevent particular futures from coming true—a continuation and complication, I argue, of the logic of preemption.

These practices further capture an ironic mood shift in surveillance and security which are now increasingly attuning to moods, focusing in on microscopic particles and traces (see McCormack, 2007), physiological indicators, and micro-expressive gesticulations. Indeed, it is through such moods that preemptive logics are being operationalised, working within what Cynthia Weber describes as a wider "moral geography

---

[1] These sorts of affective states resonate with what Sianne Ngai (2005) terms 'minor affects' (Anderson, 2007b).

of terror" to "securitize the unconscious"—a preemptive justice of sorts, "through which all acts and now thoughts and prethoughts must be first securitized and then and only then formally judged" (2007, page 116). The techniques I discuss exemplify such a concern to project forwards through the scrutiny of thoughts and prethoughts, although we will see how it is at this affective register that futures-of-sorts are brought into being along a circular or transversal logic (see, for instance, Anderson, 2007a; Massumi, 2002).

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 draws a conceptual discussion of mobilities and biopolitics by way of an exploration of three interrelated facets of airport security, from biometrics, profiling, and the experience of these techniques. I argue that these facets constitute the dimensions of the newest and vapid forms of airport security. These are then explored in section 3, which first gives a short history of these techniques before unpacking them in greater detail in section 4. In section 5 the paper then provides a discussion of the implications for the biopolitical securitisation of mobility, before concluding in section 6 with future research directions.

2 The biopolitics of airport security

"At the frontier we can't avoid the truth; the comforting layers of the quotidian, which insulate us against the world's harsher realities, are stripped way, and wide-eyed in the harsh fluorescent light of the frontier's windowless halls, we see things as they are. The frontier is the physical proof of the human race's divided self, the proof that Merlin's utopian sky-vision is a lie. Here is the truth: this line, at which we must stand until we are allowed to walk across and give our papers to be examined by an officer who is entitled to ask us more or less anything."

Salman Rushdie (2003, page 412)

In this section of the paper, and as a contextual and conceptual basis to the ideas and techniques the paper deals with later, we can identify several trends in airport security, wider surveillance practices, and interdisciplinary approaches to them. These trends, I suggest, are important to discuss given the way they are becoming conjoined as evidenced later on.

Mobility, for Tim Cresswell (2006a), is a fundamental fact of human existence. To live is to move, just as to move is to live [see Urry (2000; 2002; 2003a; 2003b) on the socially constitutive role of mobility, and Adey (forthcoming)]. Of course, the right to movement is enshrined in various constitutions and forms of law as Cresswell (2006b) has shown of the American constitution (see also Blomley, 1994), or as others illustrate in maritime law (Steinberg, 2001). The restriction of one's mobility is often likened to a restriction of one's human rights. There is, of course, an array of approaches which have detailed the differential politics of mobility, exploring how different people are placed in different ways to mobility, and thus different ways to power, as Doreen Massey (1993) would have it (see also Graham, 2005; Sheller and Urry, 2006; Wood and Graham, 2006). Other recent work within the apparent 'mobile turn' has explored how mobilities are shaped, regulated, and controlled through a host of various policies, technologies, and practices.

While this body of work is incredibly useful, there is a parallel corpus of research following the writings of Giorgio Agamben as well as the more recently published lectures of Michel Foucault. This work questions the way mobility has become a problematic of security as an object that needs securing.[2] There is much import

---

[2] Much of this research agenda has emerged from international studies and international relations.

in this work for the conceptualisation of how mobilities are controlled through biopolitical managerial techniques which take mobility as an inextricable component of what it means to live.[3]

Much of the work in this area has developed as a critique of a developing vogue within airport and wider border security which uses the body, or information about the body, in order to identify one person from the next. The anxiety over who or what may be passing through the nation's borders means that uncertainty—a key object of biopolitical governing—is addressed by identification and by making known (Daase and Kessler, 2007; Ek, 2006; O'Malley, 2004). The so-called *data-double* [for a critical examination of this concept see Bennett (2006)] refers to the notion that our physical bodies and personal identities are repeated digitally by a data-double cruising in some sort of mirror world (Pascoe, 2001). Specific data about one's body are being used to distinguish one person from the next by matching up the corporeal body presented at a border checkpoint with the digital data of that body stored on a database or a credit card [for how these data-doubles enable the augmentation of the 'real' passenger, see Fuller and Harley (2004)]. Although, to put it more precisely, it is not bodies per se which are being captured, but parts of bodies—dividuals according to Deleuze, a body "partial, fragmented and incomplete" (Walters, 2006, page 192; see also Introna and Wood, 2005). For many writers, Foucault's (2003; 2007) texts on the biopolitical help us interpret how these sorts of techniques enact a managerial, and not necessarily disciplinary, enrollment of a molar—a group of people addressed as a population and made known. Bodies, and knowledge of bodies, are abstracted into data which may be sifted, tabulated, and searched.

In these studies, the body functions as one's passport (Van der Ploeg, 1999). The body must then show up, be present, ready, corporeal, to be read as various thresholds are surpassed (Agamben, 1998). From fingerprint and iris recognition technologies to the simple photograph imprinted on one's passport, identities have been proved by presenting a part of one's body at the airport/border (Salter, 2004; Torpey, 2000). The unity of the body is undone by focusing in on pieces of it. These pieces stand for the whole, for the whole of an identity. For instance, pattern recognition filters use finger prints. Palm recognition and now iris recognition technologies are deployed in many instances of facilitating airport priority passengers and frequent flyers who are pre-enrolled. In airports the Privium frequent flyer programme at Schiphol, Netherlands, as well as CANSPASS, and 'trusted traveller' are cases in point of the elite use of these systems wherein trusted and frequent flyers have opted in (Adey, 2004; Cresswell, 2006a; Muller, 2007; Salter, 2004).

Another major shift in airport and border security has been the introduction of the infamous profile. Originating from the realms of consumer marketing, and later perfected by Israeli Airline El Al, passenger profiling has taken many forms and guises (Elmer, 2004). Imaginations in the media which do not need rehearsing here have highlighted the problems faced by one who 'flies while Arab'. Essentially, profiling addresses a future. For Mike Curry, a profile constructs "a narrative within which the customer does something that she has not previously done, and by establishing the plausibility of that narrative" (2004, page 488). Profiling projects forwards into the future in order to use that future to produce an outcome such as security. As Colleen Bell puts it, the "biopolitical preoccupation with security sends it into 'hyperbolic' mode, whereby subjects are accounted for on the basis of behavioural potentialities, rather than on the basis of how they have actually acted" (2006, page 160).

---

[3] Foucault (2007), of course, positions mobility alongside uncertainty with his understanding of 'circulation'.

Highly criticized systems such as the Computer Assisted Passenger Prescreening System (CAPPS and CAPPS II) developed by the Transport Security Administration (TSA) created profiles of potential behavioural and personal indicators—a model of what someone likely to commit terrorist activity would act like and be like (Bennett, 2006; Lyon, 2007). Systems such as CAPPS were concerned with the "actions—and especially the future actions—of individual members of a group". As Curry goes on, "To fit a profile meant to be predisposed to act in a certain way in certain situations" (2004, page 489). Such systems, it has been shown, rely on quite large amounts of information, creating sorts of data trails or biographies and histories. By placing people into a specific category or a 'risk pool', one may then use this profile to predict—using known data to theorise the unknown.

Before we can examine how these techniques have mutated into the latest of measures, the last part of this section is an observation on their implications. For, whilst work in this area has increased exponentially, we should go further to note that these sorts of analysis tend to lose a sense of the simultaneous impact of such technologies, practices, and procedures upon the corporeal and qualitative experiences of these spaces (see, for exception, Salter, 2006). What happens, as David Lyon (2007) has recently put it in the context of surveillance, to 'flesh and bones'—to the bodies of airport life?

What do the processes of airport security feel like? Rosaldo, in his visceral poem (cited at the beginning of this paper), describes this. How is one quite literally touched by the procedures of airport processing, as Lisa Parks (2007) has recently asked? With a 'command', Rosaldo writes, we spread our legs. The bowing down to untie one's shoes, and to remove them, appears, for Rosaldo, to be symbolic of the submission of the body to the procedures and practices of airport control. What humiliating actions must one endure? We need to ask what quality of life issues are at stake here? Do we submit to humiliation, embarrassment, and some pain, to make us supposedly more safe? We know, for instance, that airports are remarkably emotional places of dread, boredom, fear, excitement, sadness, and terror. Airports have atmospheres of tension, a stressed feeling. They resemble the sorts of 'jittery spaces' Steven Flusty (2004) refers to. But this image of an excitable body awakened by airport imagery, signs, symbols, and the hustle and bustle may be contrasted with passivity (Bissell, 2007), such as a body, hungered, fatigued, or exhausted from standing in the immigration queue. For many people, airports and air travel constitute some sort of rite of passage, a journey we must endure if we are to get to our destinations.

It is easy to argue that these sorts of anxieties, fears, and experiences are being ignored by academics [although for a counter point see Salter (2007a)]. Though it is less the case for airline, airport, and security professionals who have long worked to previsualise and imagine the passenger's needs and wants in order that their behaviour might be predicted and therein anticipated. Such an attention has arisen in part so that the consumerist political economy of the airport terminal can be managed at a profit as passengers' 'felt experiences' are made both measurable and quantifiable (Adey, 2008; Lisle, 2003; Salter, 2008). In other new developments, airport security is becoming more and more responsive to how security is experienced. Consider how these concerns are attended to by the TSA. Their spokesperson Kip Hawley explains,

"We recognize that the checkpoint is an interruption in the way of boarding a flight and often can be a source of frustration for travelers. TSA is moving to an approach where we spread out and calm down the security process. This should decrease stress at checkpoints, improve security, and improve the passenger experience. We're working with our airport and airline partners to establish a more calm security environment" (2007a).

Here, we see an amazing shift in the intended consequences of security—in the "moving toward a calmer, more nimble process" as Hawley (2007a) describes it.

To sum up, examined according to frames of the biopolitical, the regulation of airport mobilities may be characterized as a movement from the 'pan-opticon' to the 'ban-opticon' in the sense that such controls are not necessarily disciplinary but are addressed through the other pole of Foucault's apparatus. The power based on abandonment refers, in contrast, to a model of disengagement; "it is a 'banopticon' in the sense that it seeks proactive control and risk management rather than normal-ization" (Bigo, 2002, page 82; 2006; Muller, 2004). As Louise Amoore puts it, this is "an extension of biopower such that the body, in effect, becomes the carrier of the border as it is inscribed with multiple encoded boundaries of access" (2006, pages 347 – 348). Both practices of biometrics and profiling employ a schema of technologies and procedures of recognition and calculation in order to deal with an uncertain future (Crampton and Elden, 2006). Both are based upon or have the effect of discriminat-ing one person from the next. As Mick Dillon and Luis Lobo-Guerrero put it, "The general problematic with which these biopolitical security techniques of population became preoccupied was…the problem of differentiating good circulation from bad circulation" (2008, pages 279 – 280). But the idea of biometrics and profiling is that they are also preemptive. Profiling enables the prediction of eventualities in order to prevent them, whereby biometrics sort out some identities from others in order to cancel out specific identities likely to present risks and therefore future eventualities. As Amoore writes, "What Van Munster (2004, page 142) has called a 'discourse on eventualities' has allowed the war on terror to be fought preemptively" (Amoore, 2006, page 340).

Moreover, this security context seems now to be about much more than allowing people to live by making them safe. Rather, it is how this quality may be expressed and constituted both in qualified cognitive experiences, and in intangible stresses and states of feeling. Foucault later argues that biopower is concerned with much more than just the lives and the 'living' of the population, but, rather, that its people should be "doing a bit better than just living" (2007, page 327), and that this 'doing a bit better' can be converted into the forces of the state. The concern of the police, for instance, should be the individual's 'felicity'—the ability to live in happiness. In this light, it appears that the feelings of airport passengers are being considered by airport security personnel, both as the object and as the subject of their concern.

In the following, we will see how these concerns, which could be summarised as efforts to 'identify', to 'project', and now to 'care', are merging together into a mutated form of airport security known as behaviour observation or behavioural profiling.[4] These processes are not necessarily breaks in trend or contradictory to what has gone on before, but emerge as metamorphosed techniques with similar workings and outcomes. We will see how behavioural observation takes as its focus an imagination of a passenger-subject stripped down to its species [the referent object Dillon (2007a; 2007b) argues of biopolitics] yet characterised by its ability to experience a continuum of affects.[5]

[4] It should be noted that these practices are not as simplistically divided as I have just shown. Biometrics and profiling obviously combine elements of the approach of both.
[5] In my use of the term 'affect', I am indebted to Engin Isin's (2007) continuum or schema of affects. Isin outlines five: instincts, conducts, desires and drives, qualitative emotions, and, lastly, feelings.

3 Facing airport security

"People are seldom sufficiently aware of the extent to which even the most practical aspects of our relationships depend on reciprocal knowledge—not just in the sense of all external things, or of the momentary intentions and mood of the other. Rather, what we know consciously or instinctively of a person's being, of their inner foundations, of the unchangeability of their nature, all of this inevitably colours our momentary as well as our lasting relationships to them."

Georg Simmel (1950, page 112)

Behavioural profiling techniques are emerging which surveil in quite a different way to those discussed above. If we quickly return to the conference I began the paper with, I described how I perceived the faces of the other people sitting at my table. I could read and later reflect on what appeared to be newborn states of 'surprise', 'anger', and 'shock'.[6] In a similar way, airport security personnel are systematically reading the *faces* of passengers in order to discover not identity, as we have seen, but, rather, intentions and emotions displayed in facial expressions. This technique, we will see, treats the face and other face(t)s of the body as much more than surface markers, and more like sets of movements, postures, and degrees of transition. Such a technique marks a wider turn in the epistemological question of just what it is to be secured, or, moreover, just what it is that becomes the object of security and surveillance strategies (see also Dillon, 2004). In the construction of these new epistemic objects (Rheinberger, 1997), the referent object of security becomes precisely both the subject that needs securing as well as the object that provides the threat to security (Dillon and Lobo-Guerrero, 2008). The processes that the paper focuses upon are simply efforts to read emotions, feelings, fears, and anxieties by examining the way they are formed through and display themselves in minute aspects of the body's mobility, particularly bodily – facial comportment and practice. These expressions are supposed to betray the movement of an intention, an ideology, a belief, or, indeed, what is becoming known as terrorist or 'hostile intent'.

Reading faces in order to discover emotions and the intentions that may lie behind them is an end-point of a history of investigation into the expression of emotion in the face and the body, and other similar efforts to determine 'character' in the cranium (known as phrenology). Charles Darwin's (2006 [1892]) early investigations of primates discovered what he believed were universal dispositions to express feelings through specific facial movements, which he found in both animals and humans (Chevalier-Skolnikoff, 1973). Various followers of Darwin and academics inspired by Darwin's work later found a number of specific facial movements expressed according to several different affect states. These expressions may be seen as communicative, or as the apparent end-point of a feeling. Yet, in developments in psychology and neuropsychology led by academics such as Silvan Tomkins (see Sedgwick, 2002) and his student Paul Ekman it has been argued that feelings are actually constituted through facial mobility particularly (see also Damasio, 2003). Drawing on conceptions of affect aligned with William James, facial expressions are understood to exceed merely the effect of a feeling (on unconscious and preattentive mechanisms see also Robinson, 1998). Thus, the principles of James's (1884) famous thought experiment of a man running away from a bear have been carried over to the face. James reverses the assumption that the man runs because he is afraid; he argues, rather, that the man feels afraid because he runs. In the same way, it has been shown that various facial movements constitute particular feelings.

[6] We can be aware here of a number of different theorisations of how affects are transmitted, from the ecto-pheromonal (Brennan, 2003), to the contagious (Gibbs, 2001), to the attitudinal (Ahmed, 2001).

Understood socially, these sorts of conceptualisations provide a disjuncture between commentaries on the position of faces in public space as developed by social theorists [see, for instance, Goffman (1967) and, more recently, Butler (2004) and Dauphinee (2007)] although they do follow what criminologists have noted about earlier forms of policing and border control. Egon Bittner's analysis of the life of the policemen examines the intuitive reading of eyes, posture, and movements that indicate potential tendencies as they attune themselves to a 'continuous condition of peril' (1967, page 712). And yet, according to Simmel (1950), the face does not just reveal identity; the a priori experiences and journeys are supposedly etched on the pedestrian's face. For Simmel, the face "is the geometrical site of all this knowledge; it is the symbol of everything that an individual has brought with him or her as the prerequisite of their life. In it is deposited that which has dropped from the past to the bottom of his life and has become permanent features in the individual" (1997, pages 112–113).

In contrast with Simmel, the face becomes the repository of the future or a reservoir of feelings displayed as they happen, anticipating futures which might be, or feelings someone may want to keep hidden. The security techniques I now discuss are premised upon just such understandings which have developed in consultation with a number of the experts from the fields of psychology and neuropsychology I have just mentioned.[7] Such a league positions affect as an object to be known and captured in observations of physical motions, and compared with an abstractive and tabular catalogue of different sorts of motion and their associated feelings. Affect expert Ekman (see, for instance, 2001; 2003) and his colleague psychologist Mark Frank have been providing pro bono work for the TSA programme known as Screening Passengers by Observation Techniques (SPOT) also based on a Behavioural Assessment System developed by Massachusetts police at Logan airport in Boston. By drawing on Ekman's Facial Action Coding System (FACS) developed in the late 1970s (Bourke, 2005), which catalogued hundreds of expressions of emotions, and by using something along the lines of the FACS Affect Interpretation Database, agents are trained to look for how feelings surface in minute and instantaneous gestures drawn on suspect's faces such as pursed lips, raised eyebrows, and many more, especially those emotions people try to conceal (Ekman and Friesen, 1978; Ekman et al, 1976).

These sorts of facial movements have been targeted, according to Ekman, because of the way intentions are often expressed unintentionally through feelings and then leaked away by what he terms 'micro-expressions' (DePaulo et al, 2003; Ekman et al, 1999). Micro-expressions are understood to be those body movements that occur when one tries to hide an emotion. For instance, how 'a flash of anger' can quickly strike and pass from someone's face. Flashes of fear might be seen as a split-second tightening of a muscle in the middle of the forehead (Darwin, 2006 [1892]; Ekman, 2006). These affects are named by the TSA as 'involuntary muscular responses'. According to proponents of this scheme, because the expressions are apparently involuntarily, they are incredibly difficult to defeat, leading one screener to remark, "You just don't know what I am going to see" (Lipton, 2006). Agents are effectively looking for how intent transitions into a visceral mode of anticipatory experience. This, they suggest, can happen in a number of different ways. For instance, the fear of being caught before the act, or the act itself, is anticipated by a terrorist as a sort of feeling. This anticipatory affect is then felt and subsequently experienced in a way which could

be identified and read as something like a qualitative emotion, like fear (Bourke, 2005). Unlike facial recognition, then, which captures a snapshot of the face in order to recognise the individual distinctive patterns of that face and therefore determine identity, these techniques identify the transition in order to recognise emotion. In a sense, it is the capacity for these techniques to read the transitions of the face— the changes—that is important. In so doing, they achieve something quite different to the immobile face held in a photograph, where all "vocalization of grief or agony" all "sense of the precariousness of life" are lost (Butler, 2004, page 142).

Another solution currently being tested in several airports in the United States has been developed by Israeli security firm Suspect Detection Systems (SDS). Run by a division manager of a telemarketing company, the former head of the polygraph division of the Israeli Police, and the former deputy chief of Mossad, the system was actually inspired by an anticipatory genre of its own, science fiction. The SDS founder Shabtai Shoval had seen the Steven Spielburg movie *Minority Report*, based on the short story by writer Philip K Dick. Set in the dystopic future of 2054 where murderous crimes are predicted and stopped before they are able to take place, *Minority Report* has been a common source of comparison for preemptive and premeditated policies under the 'war on terror', and increasing forms of security and surveillance (see, for instance, Grusin, 2004; Weber, 2007). On seeing the film, Shoval pondered "how great it would be to be able to prophesize a crime before it happens" (Brinn, 2005). The SDS system is motivated by the problem of terrorists who freely enter countries with the intention to cause terrorism upon their entry. Terrorists are supposed to obtain the explosives and weapons, which would have halted their progress through a port of entry, once they have passed the country's borders. Just like the facial behavioural techniques examined above, the SDS system attempts to discover intent and hostility through several measurements. In this way, the technique further 'delocalises' and detemporalises the border by extending its purview beyond the instantaneous present (Salter, 2004; Vaughn-Williams, 2007) towards future scenarios.

The machine devised by SDS is the SDS-VR-1000. Essentially, it is like an automated polygraph machine that works by attempting to discover passenger emotions through the measurement of various facial as well as physiological responses to questions. Passengers must sit immobile, temporarily incarcerated in a machine where they place their hand on a metal plate and read or listen to some instructions. The machine records various physiological indexes. The passenger responds, in their choice of language, to fifteen to twenty questions generated by factors such as the location, and personal attributes like nationality, gender, and age. The process takes as much as five minutes, after which the passenger is either cleared or interviewed further by a security officer.

The final system to investigate is the most recent effort of the TSA. The TSA has recently launched its working project 'Hostile Intent', the current zenith of behavioural monitoring and profiling, under the remit and development of the Science and Technology Directorate, whose ultimate aim is "to develop a non-invasive, remote, culturally independent, automated intent and deception detection system" (King, 2007, page 1). The TSA's calls for manufacturer, industry, and academic solutions suggests a new reach of behaviour detection observation, sometimes referred to as suspicious behaviour detection. In short, the above two approaches appear to be merging into the gathering of multiple forms and stages of intent measurements— varying by incremental stages of automation, contact, and proximity. In collaboration with Ekman and Frank, distanced and automated approaches to behaviour detection have been proposed. These include the sorts of physiological measurements associated with body temperature, such as infrared thermography, laser vibrometry, and infrared

photo-detection. Other measurements look less at physiometry and more at bodily movements. For instance, infrared eye-tracking and pupil dilation have been suggested, and, in particular, the automation of the FACS (Tsiamyrtzis et al, 2007; Zeng et al, 2007). Initial and distanced observation of various indicators by these means may warrant a closer look by detection officers before a face-to-face conversation may be embarked upon. A detection officer will scrutinise body, voice, and speech to see if the passenger requires even further police attention.[8]

4 The different faces of airport security

"[T]he face, strictly speaking, does not speak, but what the face means is never-theless conveyed by the commandment, 'Thou shalt not kill'. It conveys this commandment without precisely speaking it. ... the 'face' does not speak in the sense that the mouth does; the face is neither reducible to the mouth nor, indeed, to anything the mouth has to utter."

Butler (2004, pages 132 – 133)

Let us now explore several avenues of discussion that relate to the practices and technologies I have just described. Enrolled into a form of anticipatory governance (Anderson, 2007a; 2007b; forthcoming; see also Lackoff, 2007; Massumi, 2005), according to several logics of preemption, precaution, and preparedness, the body, I suggest is both imagined and rendered simplistic but not necessarily calculable; it is almost animalistic and organic—engaged by an even purer form of biopower which depends less and less on individual bodies. If biopolitical control is premised upon the securing of a specific referent object—what Foucault (2003) refers to as the generalisation of the human as a species—I suggest that such techniques, by attuning themselves to affects, imagine and render a specific kind of body-subject capable of being affected (Dillon, 2007a; 2007b).

The airport and the process of air travel have almost always been associated with a regressive dehumanisation, although these have normally been reserved for petty class differences, resentments, and minor discomforts (Sparke, 2006). Such a comparison is perhaps nowhere better made than in the observations made by David Mutimer (2007; see also Feldman, 2007), who explores Syrian-born Canadian citizen Maher Arer's extraordinary rendition from JFK airport in the United States to Syria for detainment and torture 'by proxy'. As Mutimer writes, "It was at this point that his passage through the airport hub departed from the standard through which we all have passed, and in ways that render the dehumanization of that standard passage little more than the mildest affront to our personal dignity—Arer was 'rendered extraordinarily'" (2007, page 160). Deprived of his rights for a fair trial and access to legal representation, Arer was quite literally stripped of all of the things that made him human—'extraordinarily rendered' as a bare life. I think we can compare Arer's treatment to a process of what Agamben describes as 'animalising the human' (cited in Bull, 2007), whereby, as Agamben (1998) quotes from Foucault, "the animal life of man" is taken as the subject of action—bestialised "through the most sophisticated political techniques". To be stripped of all the rights and civilities which made Arer human made his treatment as an animal validated.

[8] It is important to note that these procedures, technologies, and practices have not been implemented immediately, although instant judgments are something they attempt to instil within the airport screener. Rather, they are requiring security screeners to be trained so that they might be able to address these expressions as quickly as they happen. Whilst such an aim is fulfilled through automotive forms of surveillance which capture these transitions, it is also being developed through the increasing capacity of an agent to spot them through so-called 'thin-slicing' (Gladwell, 2005; see also Budd and Adey, forthcoming).

Whilst I make no claims that the sorts of practices discussed should be equally compared to anything like that experienced by Arer, their deployment embodies a similar underpinning logic of preemption, and an imagination of a subject that oscillates between a prehuman animality and back. For as well as producing a dehumanised subject, such practices are premised upon an in-built imagination of a simplistic yet threatening animalised subject. This is a " 'zoopolis' " of sorts, "in which 'citizens' are reduced to naked bodies" (Diken and Lausten, 2006, page 450) and stripped back to what may be thought of as an even simpler 'biopolitical domain', a space which Thrift once described as the "blink between action and performance … pre-set by biological and cultural instincts which bear both extraordinary genealogical freight—*and*", as I show in particular, "a potential for potentiality" (2000, page 39; Tinbergen, 1969).

4.1 Massifying
Ekman's and Frank's construction of these procedures works to repeat assumptions of the apparent autonomy of affect (Massumi, 2002) as excessive of the control of the individual subjected to its intensities. Described as emotion 'leakages', "guilt, fear of being caught, and disgust" are emotions which the body cannot contain (Ekman and Friesen, 1969). The body is viewed as a kind of vessel over which the owner occasionally relinquishes control of the contents, disclosed through nonverbal behaviours such as facial expression (Frank and Ekman, 1997). Such a rendering is reflected in Hawley's description of the system, where he states, "It doesn't make sense to dig in security resources looking in lunch pails when the real vulnerability is what happens inside" (2007b). The body is imagined with hidden depths that are only now opening up, different layers which feelings may puncture or remain within only to be scrutinised by several different measurements. The first issue we can pick up on is the notion that the behavioural profiling procedures cannot work by individualising, although they attempt to separate the high from the low risk, and, of course, highlight particular bodies. Nor could we argue that they are an attempt to discipline; they do not attempt to shape or constrain. Rather, they are based on a process which Foucault (2003) describes as 'massifying'—a reversal of the address of the individual. He writes, "we have a second seizure of power that is not individualising, but, if you like, massifying, that is directed not at man-as-body but at man-as-species" (2003, page 243). This meant an embrace of a general population, a mass "affected by overall processes characteristic of birth, death, production, illness, and so on" (2003, page 243).

Behaviour detection relies upon a complicated blending of a biological *body*, and a social one. The practices are intent on discovering *intent* and all its socialised correlatives. And, yet, their method of doing this is to drop below the social body. Behaviour detection techniques look not for socialised displays of emotion, but, rather, for the biological indicators of fear, anxiety, and conflict which are instinctive and uncontrollable—affects which are 'culturally independent'. In this way, behaviour detection officers do not hope to identify suspects because of their own individual, personal, and cultural sensibilities that may cause a multitude of affective states, reactions, and experiences during one's journey through an airport. Although, many critiques of behaviour detection warn of the difficulty in separating out hostile intent from personal and socialised dispositions.

Furthermore, one of the major criticisms of racial profiling is that it is seen to be inherently racist and discriminatory. Racial profiling is essentially premised upon treating someone differently according to their racial identification—a racialised phenotypology (Pugliese, 2006). However, the behavioural techniques discussed are intended to work in quite a different way. SPOT is actually marketed because it is meant to supercede the racial and the cultural: that is, the sorts of responses officers

are looking out for are generic to all humans—they are presocial reflexes and not habituated or socialised responses. Consequently, behaviour detection appears less like a personalised attention to specific bodies, and more to generic embodiments. Behaviour detection techniques do not measure and compare an individual's characteristics, but are more concerned with the characteristics of drives, and instincts common to the species; it is an attention, as Dillon describes, "to what it is to be a living thing" (2007b, page 12).

Within this thread, 'circulation', or, rather, internal circulations, is a second object of massification, where bodies are read as almost less than animalistic but simply organic (Agamben, 1998). Any sense of controlling agency and individual bodily differences are underwritten by a concern with universal bodily rhythms. Various behaviour detection practices attempt to look into the 'naked body' (Diken and Lausten, 2006) by measuring physiological transmissions and circulations. The visceral perceptions, as Massumi (2002) would have it, of autonomic responses which exceed conscious control are grasped. Security agencies direct their attention to a "physiological index of intent" (Weinreb and Lifshitz, 2005) by capturing the electrical impulses in the skin and blood pressure. These processes work not on the body's physical circulation through the terminal, or expressive movements of the face, but on the internal circulations and rhythms of the body's interior. In the SDS machine, the process takes a few minutes, and the passenger receives either a transfer printout authorising him or her to advance to the next stage of entry to the country, or an announcement that he or she is required for further questioning.

Through these techniques, the unintelligible interiority of the body-subject is pulled outwards and compared with modelled norms. Once measured, a calculation may be made in order to gauge the physiological "deviations from baseline behaviour" (Frank, 2006). The language of standard deviation is further supplanted with medico discourses which refer to intensities as 'elevated behaviours' (Frank, 2007).[9]

4.2 Body-been/Body-becoming

Another facet of this rendering is the way a body-subject is presumed not as it is, but as what it will be—a potentially precarious life. As Dillon writes, "The operational logic of the emergent life of contemporary biopolitics lived as an immanent life of continuous contingent emergence thus institutes a life of becoming whose hypersecurity politics is fundamentally a politics of dangerous becoming" (2007b, page 24; see 2007a). In other words, for Dillon, such practices render a body-subject that is not static, but in-formation. Similar to Parks's (2007) recent commentary on the imminent and threatening materialities of the objects that circulate airports, the indeterminacy of a body constitutes a sort of threat. What a body might be thus needs to be secured via a preemptive logic of predicting what it could become and then acting in light of that prediction. In this way, behavioural detection imagines passenger-subjects who are at that moment relatively benign, yet always likely to turn into something threatening. Passengers apparently lack the agency to control their fears as they are imagined as simple body-organisms simply overcome by instinctive drives in anticipation of what they are about to do.

According to proponents of this scheme, it appears that it is through affect that these dangerous becomings are anticipated by the dangerous body inwardly imploding into a form of animalistic mimicry, and therefore captured by vigilant security personnel. Agents look out for what Tomkins (1991; Sedgwick, 2002) described as analogic affective amplifications—how an affective response imitates the initiator, or as Luciana Parisi and Goodman (2005) put it "The future yet to be formed is actively populating the sensations of the present anticipating what is to come, the feeling of what happens

---

[9] Of course, and as mentioned, other physiological scanners have been deployed in airports as a way to discover an apparent interior that may carry disease such as SARS (Keil and Ali, 2007).

before its actualization" (cited in Clough et al, 2007, page 70). Thus, a startle to a gun firing mimics the gun's short, loud blast. The weight of a terrorist's actions and the possibilities of being caught are witnessed in a consequential and analogic impact upon their affective responses, or "how the individual already resembles his crime before he has committed it" (Foucault cited in Amoore, 2007, page 221). Thus, detection officers claim that they can distinguish between the normal fears and anxieties associated with the ritualistic passage of air travel and the far more concentrated intensities of a terror plot.

Moreover, the expressions are thought to be more than simple leakages of emotions but what Tomkins also calls 'affect-about-affect'. By this, Tomkins means the emotions generated by the generation of their initial affective state. Thus, people may be "afraid of their anger; others may be disgusted with themselves for being angry; others may be disappointed in themselves for being angry" (Ekman, 1992, page 390). This is the apparent circular tranversality of affect (Massumi, 2005). Given the expressive movements made in anticipation of being caught, or of detonating a bomb, Pierre Bourdieu's discussion of the 'presenting' of emotion is surely apt. As discussed recently by Elspeth Probyn, "emotion ' "presents" an impending future'; it causes the body to adjust to the inevitability of the future as past" (2005, page 32).

Of course, in the examples discussed, this is operationalised in a slightly different way to the function of other sorts of biometric security technologies. One characteristic of biometrics is that it has not assumed a body-in-becoming but, rather, it employs a rather static and obdurate imaging that has been very problematic for those wishing to shift this fixed categorisation, those who become beyond it, or those who have been wrongly applied with the wrong one (see Bennett, 2008). These codes can remain, rather, quite immobile. Agamben's (2005) construal of the biopolitical tattooing of the body in international air travel makes a similar point.

In contrast, behavioural profiling enables a vision of the body-becoming, and, in this context, a body-becoming-threatening. They are imminently threatening subjects rather than threatening subjects now, for that is what other forms of security and screening detect—the immediate threat—scrutinised presently and proximately through x-ray screening, metal detectors, and the body pat down. Behavioural monitoring examines a trace of an emotion registered in anticipation of a hostile act or intention to act with hostility. Thus, it acts as a clue to what that body-subject might turn into.

4.3 Incitement and the silent confession

Mark Salter has played upon Foucault's notion of the confessionary complex in order to understand the interrogatory procedures of border control which entail the passenger confessing who they are and other aspects of themselves. Salter (2007c, page 9) writes, "The pressure to produce a truth for a representative of the sovereign—a truth which only that representative may authorize—has been essential to the construction of borders". For Salter, anxieties and feelings are intertwined in the confessionary process of airport security itself. He writes of how the tone and tenor of airport mood continuously shifts: "The power of the state to expel or exclude any traveler, even citizens with no cause or appeal, is internalized into an anxiety of the confession. We do not worry 'will the state exclude me because it can?' But rather we think: 'have I told the whole truth? Is my story believable?' With 'Please step over here' we panic. At the utterance of 'Welcome' or 'Welcome home' we sigh in relief to have passed the sovereign test" (2007a, page 59). Even as airports are compared to laboratories from which new technologies and procedures are tested (Fuller and Harley, 2004), we can see how through verbal conversation and other forms of incitement the passenger is poked, prodded, and disturbed in order to reveal a sort of truth. This is a kind of physical confession—a confession as we will see not of the flesh, but *by* the flesh of its insinuations.

Not quite the auto-confession Salter (2006) warns us of, such as the 'political technologies' of 'passports, visas, and frontier controls', which 'educate' subjects with such dispositions, the discussed techniques attempt to solicit affects by inciting the auto-affective (Clough, 2000). They do not draw out just an intentional or verbal confessional but a visceral one portrayed in waveform patterns or nervous pitches and tones. Through further interaction with trained detection officers and airport screeners, these forms of scrutiny play upon the officer's intersection within 'participatory thought' arising out of the expressive–responsive bodily activities, which Thrift discusses (2006). In this sense, and as Thrift explores in the wider context of the technological addressing of people, "language (and associated sensibilities such as hearing that is acute precisely in the wavelengths that speech is broadcast in), face recognition, and general adaptivity to others" (2005, page 466) may be examined closely or at a distance, while they may be provoked and disturbed through interaction.

The SDS-VR-1000 uses other kinds of monitoring by, most notably, asking for verbal responses to its questions. The questions posed usually encompass particular words that are intended to agitate the guilty respondents and activate certain bodily responses. SDS has developed a word library which it believes only terrorists will respond to. These include words that name specialised materials relevant to terrorist activities such as the making of a bomb. Hence, 'semtex' could set off a particularly nervous reaction. Or the kinds of terminology that refer to the mental and spiritual preparation suicide bombers may undergo prior to their attack may be referred to. The machine observes changes in vocal pitch and other indicators of stress or disorientation. Similarly, officers of Project Hostile Intent will step in and engage the suspect in conversation if they think the passenger is behaving suspiciously enough. Mobility is a dimension interrogated. Mobility is examined by the performance of the mobile-body–corporeal—from facial movements to full-scale body gait and gesture. In conversation, officers will question "narratives of travel and belonging" (Salter, 2007a, page 58). However, as Foucault argued in the context of the confession, we will see how the behavioural confession is "capable of having effects on the subject himself" (1980a, page 216, cited in Salter, 2006).

In the case of suspect detection, the process is complicated. Foucault discusses how the verbalisation of sexuality into language worked to discipline sex. Here, the verbalisation encouraged by the auto-confession of the interview is not to be trusted. Agamben (2004) reminds us of Heymann Steinthall, who ranked the formation of language as a major distinguishing characteristic between humans and animals. If we examine this facet of the system, language becomes used as a way to both incite expressive feeling and capture them. Language is not important, neither is the meaning of what is said. Rather, it is the way in which it is said—the "voice"—which "is the sign of pain and pleasure" (Agamben, 1998, page 7). The purpose of such an engagement is to reconnect with bare life, to ascertain the prelinguistic undertow of language constituted in pitches, rhythms, and amplitudes which may be coded into waveform patterns, or formed in further facial expressions and other kinds of body language.

The discourse of truth is, therefore, solicited by the incitement of a confession. It is not that the truth is found in the confession, but, rather, the confession is in the effects on the subject himself or herself. Through confession by the flesh, body movements, gestures, and responses, and more than "thoughts, desires, voluptuous imaginings, delectations, combined movements of the body and soul" (Foucault, 1980b, page 19), instincts, fears, and drives tell the reader much more than what they say. The subject reveals a hidden truth. The interview is then a kind of 'regime of truth' (1980a, page 133) which incites, and, alongside other 'techniques of listening', reveals (Foucault, 1980b).

5 Discussion: the biopolitical securitisation of airport security

"It is the edge of the virtual, where it leaks into the actual, that counts."

Brian Massumi (2002, page 202)

This paper has sought to describe and understand an assemblage of technologies, knowledges, and practices which attempt to regulate mobilities across and through borders such as airports. In an extended discussion, the paper now sets out three specific yet related implications before gesturing towards some further research conclusions and directions.

Firstly, it may be simply said that specific knowledges and expertise—directly from academics like Ekman—are becoming used and deployed in methods of surveillance and control, leading to what Agamben (1998, page 122) describes as an 'intimate symbiosis' with the 'scientist' and the 'expert'. The frame of the biopolitical may seem initially distant from such an approach, and particularly from conceptions such as affect. Characterised as a technique to manage and govern the 'population', biopolitical security takes as its referent object, as Foucault would have it, the species-being—a life to be secured. I have suggested that the "imperative of sovereign power to *make known*" (Dauphinee and Masters, 2007, page xi, emphasis in original) has *made known* the species-being as a category with facets of "the mechanics of life" and other "biological processes" (Foucault, 1980b, page 139). Into this referent object 'intrudes' not just the biologic-scientific, but neuro-psychological and physiological principles (Agamben, 1998).

In their assemblage of psychological and security expertise, the procedures outlined have *made* apparent traits of compulsion, drives, instincts, and responses known, identifiable, and measurable (Dingfelder, 2004). It is in this sense that such procedures render the passenger-subject as more or less than human. Treated, read, and scrutinised according to basic indicators of fears and passions that agency cannot disguise but only make worse (Tomkins, 1991), the passenger-subject is continuously partitioned into different sorts of life. What Agamben (2004) refers to as a mobile border helps to capture the continual transgression of passenger-subjects moved in and out of boundaries—boundaries of the nonhuman, vegetal, or organic, of the animal or inhuman, of inside and outside the flesh, just as the subject crosses the threshold of the airport/border (Feldman, 2007).

Secondly, perhaps the capacity for security to address, identify, and capture affects is nothing unique. As suggested, Foucault's (2007) analysis of security asserts that the 'felicity'—the well-being and happiness—of the population is its aim. The techniques examined are a continuation of a touchy-feely form of security concerned with identifying and thereby securing the well-being—the feelings—of its population. But in the examples discussed it is the feelings of the population that are used as the very means of security. Thus, while life 'constantly escapes' (Foucault, 1980b, page 143) techniques of governance and administration, the practices I have described appear to be determined to envelop this register.

But let us be clear that behavioural profiling is far from a simple example of biopolitical security, for it, rather, achieves a blurred distinction between simply making known and other disciplinary forms of normalisation, coercion, and incitement. Most recently, Charlotte Epstein makes a similar assertion using biometrics. She writes that "A biometric system controls the movement of disciplined bodies in and out of a space, to protect both the space and the bodies within it. Hence, while in its design the system evokes both forms of surveillance, it ultimately subsumes the punishing aspect of surveillance under the security objective, all the while relying centrally on the successful operation of discipline" (2007, page 154). In this way, behavioural profiling actively regulates and disciplines; it abstracts and manages, while it also normalises and incites.

Thirdly, these techniques speak to the issue of the contingent and the aleatory. The semi-calculative practices of suspect detection are deployed, in effect, *before* a crime takes place. This is just one way, of course, to deal with the contingent or the uncertain. But we have seen how the simple equation of passenger-mobility = contingency is being radically blurred by airport security which is aimed and experienced at an affective register. Airport security, for instance, is often criticised for acting in direct opposition to uncertainty. Airport security is perhaps a reassurance to passengers, staff, and potential terrorists. As Hawley (2007b) states, "Although it may be comforting for us to see employees in line for screening, a checkpoint provides an unchanging, predictable barrier that is always there, every day. And the terrorist can spend all the time he needs to find ways around, over, or through it." In essence, the techniques discussed appear to be employed as a way to turn this trend on its head—by fighting contingency with contingency. New layers of security are meant to be "each nimble, unpredictable, and dynamic" (Hawley, 2007b) in an effort to act as an irritant or a discomfort to potential terrorists; passengers cannot know, according to the screener mentioned earlier, "what [they are] going to see" (Lipton, 2006). As we have seen, it is then the fear of the unknown, and how that unknown is given visceral shape, that supposedly presents what is the worst for a possible terrorist. Moreover, the very act of behaviour detection enacts its own blurring of calculative cognition which is ruled by the quantitative calculation of risk management (Salter, 2007b). The act of seeing becomes an act of foreseeing, preempting, or anticipating (Amoore, 2007), where instinctive, intuitive, and quickly calculated judgments made at 'lightning-fast speed' can be required of airport screening and security staff (Parks, 2007; Massumi, 2006).

Set in the context of the airport's general reliance upon risk management, threat assessment (Salter, 2007b), and even operational and consumer planning (Adey, 2008; Budd and Adey, forthcoming), there is the sense that these behavioural techniques have been produced in the context of crystal-ball-like predictive systems already. What Timothy Luke and Gearóid Ó Tuathail (2000) might describe as 'dromoscopic experiments' of 'partially anticipated futures', the procedures discussed do something quite unlike consumer and passenger profiling, which is increasingly premised upon collating vast quantities of data prior to one's flight, or one's arrival, where what one has done shapes the predictions of what one will then go on to do [Advanced Passenger Information data transfer has been detailed by Dodge and Kitchin's recent work (2004)].[10] Initially, this logic appears something like preemption; however, looking closer, behavioural profiling complicates this relation with multiples of preemptive strikes informed by and targeted at an unconscious domain (Massumi, 2006).

Firstly, it appears that, by reading and identifying feelings, behaviour detection enacts a kind of preemptive governance whereby the future is predicted and prevented in some way, without recourse to prior knowledge, histories, background trails, or genealogical baggage (Thrift, 2000). Weber's (2007, page 115) exploration of the intervention into Padillia's terrorist intentions uses the words of Deputy Defence Secretary Paul Wolfowitz's explanation,

> "'There was not an actual plan. We stopped this man in the initial planning stages', meaning that a conviction in criminal court would have been virtually impossible to attain. Padilla, then, is being held for what the Bush administration thinks he thought, not for what the Bush Administration can prove he was about to do, much less did. The criminal act here has moved not just from the deed to the thought; it has moved from the conscious thought to the unconscious one. For, as Wolfowitz puts it, 'There was not an actual plan'" (Weber, 2007, page 115).

[10] Dillon and Lobo-Guerrero (2008) explore the importance of genetic information in new forms of insurance risk profiling and wider securities.

In this light, the techniques discussed are intervening in an event before it has occurred and according not to a thought, but, rather, to a suspected intention displayed unconsciously.

Secondly, the very logic of behavioural detection security techniques is also premised upon an understanding of affect that embodies its own kind of preemptive reversal—a transversality (Anderson, 2007a; Massumi, 2005). The sorts of self-control the TSA witnesses require the passenger – terrorist to enact his or her own preemptive strikes upon his or her own feelings (Massumi, 2006). In an effort to control himself or herself, the anticipation is leaked which makes the very future he or she was intending to avoid, come true. As Parisi and Goodman (2005) put it in a rather different context: "Control no longer attempts merely to stop an unwanted future from happening, but switches towards the rule of the pre-emptive strike." So, the very effort to control those bodily signals feeds back upon the emotions the passenger attempts to suppress, and thus, "in a strange paradoxical feedback, activates the future at every turn". Behavioural profiling, therefore, relies not upon a suspect's biographical past, but upon his or her own anticipation of a future which the profilers work to induce or ignite. From this perspective, behavioural profiling works less by acting in advance, and more by soliciting and, in a manner, 'letting go' (Foucault, 2007) in order to allow the 'hostile passenger' to reveal himself or herself.

6 Conclusion

In this conclusion, I now end with some further possibilities for consideration. Firstly, we must question what these techniques actually imply for privacy and personal freedoms. The sense that behaviour detection enables one to look within has been described as a process of considerable intrusion. Kathryn Hughes, a journalist writing for *The Guardian*, states that, "This prospect is so chilling precisely because, in a world where we have all but ceded our bodies to the public domain, our interior lives are the one piece of ourselves over which we retain sovereignty" (2005). For others, it is not really an issue of looking within uninvited, but almost an issue of being stolen from— forced to give away information without consent. As Matsumoto writes, there is no fifth amendment, "We're talking about feelings we don't want others to know in the first place" (cited in Frank, 2007). Therefore, we must question, as Bell puts it, how the alignment of security with the life of a population itself has created an, "arsenal of surveillance strategies", how the ever-increasing creep of this 'life information' can prove markedly "inconsistent with substantive democratic principles of equality and freedom" (2006, page 163).

Secondly, we might consider how the techniques described begin to alter the acceptance of faces and bodies in public spaces and everyday life. What, for instance, would it mean to be always conscious about how your face is being read, which emotions are let go, how one can try to contain one's feelings? Moreover, this poses a problem of truth, or the "swindle" for Emmanuel Lévinas (1969, page 202). How can one believe the facial gestures and body languages one sees and interprets, what sort of 'vigilant visualities' (Amoore, 2007) are we starting to witness?

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, scholarship should go further to examine the other spheres where behaviour detection methods are being placed and, in all these contexts, their intended and unintended consequences for the embodied 'quality of life' issues of those they are composed. In some instances, behavioural detection is deployed with capacities for progressively even more potent discrimination. Whilst behaviour detection supposedly overcomes racial profiling, Joseph Pugliese details the discriminatory assumptions evident within the racialised kinesiology that led to the shooting of Jean Charles de Menezes on the London underground. As Pugliese

(2006) describes, de Menezes's 'kinetic repertoire' was interpreted according to a 'racialised regime of visuality', where:

> "his ambulatory movements and his gestures—are scripted in terms of the suspicious movements of the figure of the Orientalist terrorist: the kinesiology of breaking into flight in order to catch a train preparing to depart only serves to confirm his latent criminal intentions."

In this light, how such techniques go wrong, and are misapplied and disabused, should remain a most important consideration. Just because we are told that behavioural detection apparently overcomes racial profiling does not mean that it does. The harassment and threat of arrest to King Downing, the National Coordinator of the American Civil Liberties Union's Campaign Against Racial Profiling, by law enforcement officers at Boston's Logan airport in 2003 after talking on his mobile phone may have resulted from the enaction of Pugilese's 'racialised regime'. Questions surrounding whether the methods of the detection of 'hostile intent' actually work should also be considered further, a fact admitted by the TSA, who have claimed that behavioural detection has proved particularly useful for discovering passengers wanted with outstanding convictions or warrants for arrest, or carrying drugs, weapons, and other contraband. People who are not actually terrorists have been caught far more frequently. Finally, changes to the futures and 'life chances' of those marked as suspicious or potentially dangerous should receive further scrutiny given the steadily increasing bureaucratic and managerial systems that may dog their potential movements—witnessed in the experience of earlier passenger profiling and 'no-fly' watch lists.

References
Adey P, 2004, "Surveillance at the airport: surveilling mobility/mobilising surveillance" *Environment and Planning A* **36** 1365 – 1380
Adey P, 2008, "Airports, mobility and the calculative architecture of affective control" *Geoforum* **39** 438 – 451
Adey P, forthcoming *Mobility* (Routledge, London)
Agamben G, 1998 *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life* (Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA)
Agamben G, 2004 *The Open: Man and Animal* (Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA)
Agamben G, 2005, "No to biometrics", translated from *Le Figaro* 5 December,
http://www.notbored.org/agamben-on-biometrics.html
Ahmed S, 2004 *The Cultural Politics of Emotion* (Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh)
Amoore L, 2006, "Biometric borders: governing mobilities in the war on terror" *Political Geography* **25** 336 – 351
Amoore L, 2007, "Vigilant visualities: the watchful politics of the war on terror" *Security Dialogue* **38** 215 – 232
Anderson B, 2006, "Becoming and being hopeful: towards a theory of affect" *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **24** 733 – 752
Anderson B, 2007a, "Hope for nanotechnology: anticipatory knowledge and the governance of affect" *Area* **39** 156 – 165
Anderson B, 2007b, "Affect and the war on terror", paper presented at the Association of American Geographers Annual Meeting, San Francisco, CA; copy available from the author, Department of Geography, Durham University
Anderson B, forthcoming, "Threat and affectivity: preparedness and the war on terror", mimeo available from the author, Department of Geography, Durham University
Bauman Z, 2003 *Liquid Love: On the Frailty of Human Bonds* (Polity, Cambridge)
Bell C, 2006, "Surveillance strategies and populations at risk: biopolitical governance in Canada's national security policy" *Security Dialogue* **37** 147 – 165

Bennett C, 2008, "What happens when you book an airline ticket (revisited): the Computer Assisted Passenger Profiling System and the globalization of personal data", in *Global Surveillance and Policing: Borders, Security, Identity* Eds E Zureik, M B Salter (Willan, Cullompton, Devon) pp 113 – 138

Bigo D, 2002, "Security and immigration: toward a critique of the governmentality of unease" *Alternatives* **27** 63 – 92

Bigo D, 2006, "Security, exception, ban and surveillance", in *Theorizing Surveillance: The Panopticon and Beyond* Ed. D Lyon (Wilan, Cullompton, Devon) pp 46 – 68

Bissell D, 2007, "Animating suspension: waiting for mobilities" *Mobilities* **2** 277 – 298

Bittner E, 1967, "The police on skid-row: a study of peace keeping" *American Sociological Review* **32** 699 – 715

Blomley N, 1994 *Law, Space, and the Geographies of Power* (Guilford, New York)

Bourke J, 2005 *Fear: A Cultural History* (Virago, London)

Brennan T, 2003 *The Transmission of Affect* (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY)

Brinn D, 2005, "Israeli airport technology detects intent of terrorists" *Israel21c: A Focus Beyond* 8 May, http://www.israel21c.com

Budd L, Adey P, forthcoming, "The software simulated airworld: anticipatory code and affective aeromobilities" *Environment and Planning A*

Bull M, 2007, "Vectors of the biopolitical" *New Left Review* number 45, 7 – 25

Butler J, 2004 *Precarious Life : The Powers of Mourning and Violence* (Verso, London)

Canter D, Alison L J, 1999 *Profiling in Policy and Practice* (Ashgate, Aldershot, Hants)

Chevalier-Skolnikoff S, 1973, "Facial expression of emotion in nonhuman primates", in *Darwin and Facial Expression: A Century of Thought* Ed. P Ekman (Academic Press, London) pp 11 – 89

Clough P T, 2000 *Autoaffection: Unconscious Thought in the Age of Teletechnology* (University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN)

Clough P T, Goldberg G, Schiff R, Weeks A, Wise G, 2007, "Notes towards a theory of affect-itself" *Ephemera: Theory and Politics in Organisation* **7** 60 – 77

Crampton J W, Elden S, 2006, "Space, politics, calculation: an introduction" *Social and Cultural Geography* **7 681 – 685**

Cresswell T, 2006a *On the Move: The Politics of Mobility in the Modern West* (Routledge, London)

Cresswell T, 2006b, "The right to mobility: the production of mobility in the courtroom" *Antipode* **38** 735 – 754

Curry M, 2004, "The profiler's question and the treacherous traveller: narratives of belonging in commercial aviation" *Surveillance and Society* **1 475 – 499**

Daase C, Kessler O, 2007, "Knowns and unknowns in the 'war on terror': uncertainty and the political construction of danger" *Security Dialogue* **38** 411 – 434

Damasio A R, 2003 *Looking for Spinoza: Joy, Sorrow and the Feeling Brain* (Heinemann, London)

Darwin C, 2006 [1892] *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals* (John Murray, London)

Dauphinee E, 2007, "The politics of the body in pain: reading the ethics of imagery" *Security Dialogue* **38** 139 – 156

Dauphinee E, Masters C, 2007, "Introduction", in *The Logics of Biopower and the War on Terror: Living, Dying, Surviving* Eds E Dauphinee, C Masters (Palgrave Macmillan, New York) pp vii – xix

Deleuze G, 1988, "Ethology: Spinoza and us", in *Incorporations* Eds J Crary, S Kwinter (Zone Books, New York) pp 625 – 633

DePaulo B M, Lindsay J J, Malone B E, Muhlenbruck L, Charlton K, Cooper H, 2003, "Cues to deception" *Psychological Bulletin* **129**(1) 74 – 112

Diken B, Lausten C B, 2006, "The camp" *Geografiska Annaler, Series B* **88** 443 – 452

Dillon M, 2004, "Virtual security: a new science of (dis)order" *Millennium Journal of International Studies* **32** 531 – 558

Dillon M, 2007a, "Governing through contingency: the security of biopolitical governance" *Political Geography* **26** 41 – 47

Dillon M, 2007b, "Governing terror: the state of emergency of biopolitical governance" *International Political Sociology* **1** 7 – 28

Dillon M, Lobo-Guerrero L, 2008, "Biopolitics of security in the 21st century" *The Review of International Studies* **34** 265 – 292

Dingfelder S F, 2004, "To tell the truth" *Monitor on Psychology: APA Online* **35** March, http://www.apa.org/monitor/mar04/homepage.html

Dodge M, Kitchin R, 2004, "Flying through code/space: the real virtuality of air travel" *Environment and Planning A* **36** 195 – 211

Ek R, 2006, "Giorgio Agamben and the spatialities of the camp" *Geografiska Annaler, Series B: Human Geography* **88** 363 – 386

Ekman P, 1992, "Facial expression and emotion" *American Psychologist* **48** 384 – 392

Ekman P, 2001 *Telling Lies: Clues to Deceit in the Marketplace, Politics, and Marriage* (W W Norton, New York)

Ekman P, 2003 *Emotions Revealed: Understanding Faces and Feelings* (Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London)

Ekman P, 2006 *Darwin and Facial Expression : A Century of Research in Review* (Malor Books, Cambridge, MA)

Ekman P, Friesen W V, 1969, "Nonverbal leakage and clues to deception" *Psychiatry* **32** 88 – 105

Ekman P, Friesen W V, 1978 *Facial Action Coding System: A Technique for the Measurement of Facial Movement* (Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA)

Ekman P, Friesen W V, Scherer K, 1976, "Body movement and voice pitch in deceptive interaction" *Semiotica* **16**(1) 23 – 27

Ekman P, O'Sullivan M, Frank M G, 1999, "A few can catch a liar" *Psychological Science* **10** 263 – 266

Elmer G, 2004 *Profiling Machines: Mapping the Personal Information Economy* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA)

Epstein C, 2007, "Guilty bodies, productive bodies, destructive bodies: crossing the biometric borders" *International Political Sociology* **1** 149 – 164

Feldman L C, 2007, "Terminal exceptions: law and sovereignty at the airport threshold" *Law, Culture and the Humanities* **3** 320 – 344

Flusty S, 2004 *De-Coca-colonization: Making the Globe from the Inside Out* (Routledge, New York)

Foucault M, 1980a *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972 – 1977* (Harvester Wheatsheaf, New York)

Foucault M, 1980b *The History of Sexuality* (Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Middx)

Foucault M, 2003 *Society Must Be Defended* (Picador, New York)

Foucault M, 2007 *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977 – 78* (Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, Hants)

Frank M G, Ekman P, 1997, "The ability to detect deceit generalizes across different types of high-stake lies" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **72** 1429 – 1439

Frank T, 2007, "Airport security arsenal adds behavior detection" *USA Today* 25 September, http://www.usatoday.com/travel/flights/2007-09-25-behavior-detection_N.htm

Fuller G, Harley R, 2004 *Aviopolis: A Book About Airports* (Black Dog, London)

Gibbs A, 2001, "Contagious feelings: Pauline Hanson and the epidemiology of affect" *Australian Humanities Review* December, http://www.australianhumanitiesreview.org/archive/Issue-December-2001/gibbs.html

Gladwell M, 2005 *Blink: The Power of Thinking without Thinking* (Allen Lane, London)

Goffman E, 1967 *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-face Behavior* (Anchor Books, New York)

Graham S, 2005, "Software-sorted geographies" *Progress in Human Geography* **29** 562 – 580

Gregory D, 2004 *The Colonial Present: Afghanistan, Palestine, Iraq* (Blackwell, Oxford)

Grosscup B, 2006 *Strategic Terror: The Politics and Ethics of Aerial Bombardment* (Zed Books, London)

Grusin R, 2004, "Premediation" *Criticism* **46** 17 – 40

Hawley K, 2007a, "Beyond the checkpoint" *Leadership Journal* 11 October, http://www.dhs.gov/journal/leadership/2007/10/beyond-checkpoint.html

Hawley K, 2007b, "Prepared statement of Administrator Kip Hawley", US House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Transportation Security and Infrastructure Protection, 19 April

Hughes K, 2006, "Open your mind, please" *The Guardian* 22 August, page 26

Introna L, Wood D, 2005, "Picturing algorithmic surveillance" *Surveillance and Society* **2** http://www.surveillance-and-society.org

Isin E, 2004, "The neurotic citizen" *Citizenship Studies* **8** 217 – 235

Isin E, 2007, "Governing affects", paper presented at the Biopolitics of Security workshop, Keele University, Keele, November; copy available from the author, Faculty of Scoial Sciences, The Open University, Milton Keynes

James W, 1884, "What is an emotion?" *Mind* **9** 188 – 205

Keil R, Ali H, 2007, "Governing the sick city: urban governance in the age of emerging infectious disease" *Antipode* **39** 846 – 873

King J L, 2007, "Deception detection: creating realistic facial expressions using the FACS methodology in training simulations", research paper, Simulation Interoperability Standards Organization, http://www.sisostds.org

Klein N, 2007 *Shock-doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism* (Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Middx)

Lakoff A, 2007, "Preparing for the next emergency" *Public Culture* **19** 247 – 271

Lévinas E, 1969 *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority* (Duquesne University Press, Pittsburgh, PA)

Lipton E, 2006, "Faces, too, are searched at US airports" *New York Times* 17 August, http://www.nytimes.com/2006/08/17/washington/17screeners.html

Lisle D, 2003, "Site specific: medi(t)ations at the airport", in *Rituals of Mediation: International Politics and Social Meaning* Eds F Debris, C Weber (University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN) pp 3 – 29

Luke T W, Ó Tuathail G, 2000, "Thinking geopolitical space: the spatiality of war, speed and vision in the work of Paul Virilio", in *Thinking Space* Eds M Crang, N Thrift (Routledge, London) pp 360 – 379

Lyon D, 2007 *Surveillance Studies: An Overview* (Polity Press, Cambridge)

McCormack D P, 2003, "An event of geographical ethics in spaces of affect" *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, New Series* **28** 488 – 507

McCormack D P, 2004, "Drawing out the lines of the event" *Cultural Geographies* **11** 211 – 220

McCormack D P, 2007, "Molecular affects in human geographies" *Environment and Planning A* **39** 359 – 377

Massey D, 1993, "Power-geometry and progressive sense of place", in *Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change* Ed. J Bird (Routledge, London) pp 59 – 69

Massumi B, 2002 *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation* (Duke University Press, Durham, NC)

Massumi B, 2005, "Fear (the spectrum said)" *Positions* **31** 31 – 48

Massumi B, 2006, "The future birth of the affective fact", in *Genealogies of Biopolitics* conference proceedings; http://www.radicalempiricism.org

Muller B J, 2004, "(Dis)Qualified bodies: securitization, citizenship and 'identity management'" *Citizenship Studies* **8 279 – 294**

Muller B, 2007, "Travelers, borders, dangers: locating the political at the biometric border", in *The Politics of/at the Airport* Ed. M B Salter (University of Minnessotta Press, Minneapolis, MN) pp 127 – 143

Mutimer D, 2007, "Sovereign contradictions: Maher Arar and the indefinite future", in *The Logics of Biopower and the War on Terror: Living, Dying, Surviving* Eds E Dauphinee, C Masters (Palgrave Macmillan, New York) pp 159 – 180

Ngai S, 2005 *Minor Affects* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA)

O'Malley P, 2004 *Risk, Uncertainty and Freedom: Risk, Uncertainty and Government* (Glasshouse Press, London)

Parisi L, Goodman S, 2005, "The affect of nanoterror" *Culture Machine* **7** http://culturemachine.tees.ac.uk/Cmach/Backissues/j007/art_res.htm

Parks L, 2007, "Points of departure: the culture of US airport screening" *Journal of Visual Culture* **6 183 – 200**

Pascoe D, 2001 *Airspaces* (Reaktion, London)

Probyn E, 2004, "Teaching bodies: affects in the classroom" *Body and Society* **10** 21 – 43

Probyn E, 2005, "Shame in the habitus", in *Feminism After Bourdieu* Eds L Adkin, B Skeggs (Blackwell, Oxford) pp 21 – 44

Pugliese J, 2006, "Asymmetries of terror: visual regimes of racial profiling and the shooting of Jean Charles de Menezes in the context of the war in Iraq" *borderlands e-journal* **5** http://www.borderlandsejournal.adelaide.edu.au

Rheinberger H-J, 1997 *Toward a History of Epistemic Things: Synthesizing Proteins in the Test Tube* (Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA)

Roberts R, 2007 *Just War: Psychology and Terrorism* (PCCS books, Ross-on-Wye, Hereford)

Robinson M D, 1998, "Running from William James' Bear: a review of preattentive mechanisms and their contributions to emotional experience" *Cognition and Emotion* **12** 667 – 696

Rosaldo R, 2004, "Airport", in *Shock and Awe: War on Words* Eds B van Eekelen, J Gonzalez, B Stozer, A Tsing (New Pacific Books, Santa Cruz, CA) page 4

Rushdie S, 2003 *Step Across this Line: Collected Non-fiction 1992 – 2003* (Vintage, London)

Salter M B, 2004, "Passports, mobility, and security: how smart can the border be?" *International Studies Perspectives* **5 71 – 91**

Salter M B, 2006, "The global visa regime and the political technologies of the international self: borders, bodies, biopolitics" *Alternatives* **31** 167 – 189

Salter M B, 2007a, "Governmentalities of an airport: heterotopia and confession" *International Political Sociology* **1 49 – 61**

Salter M B, 2007b, "SeMS and sensibility: security management systems and the management of risk in the Canadian Air Transport Security Authority" *Journal of Air Transport Management* **13** 389 – 398

Salter M B, 2007c, "We are all exiles: implications of the border as state of exception", Contemporary Insecurities and the Politics of Exception, Standing Group on International Relations Conference, Turin, http://archive.sgir.eu/uploads/Salter-sgir_salter_we_are_all_exiles.pdf

Salter M B (Ed.), 2008 *Politics at the Airport* (University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN)

Sedgwick E K, 2002 *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity* (Duke University Press, Durham, NC)

Sheller M, Urry J, 2006, "The new mobilities paradigm" *Environment and Planning A* **38** 207 – 226

Simmel G, 1950, "The metropolis and mental life", in *The Sociology of Georg Simmel* Eds D Weinstein, K Wolf (Free Press, New York) pp 409 – 424

Simmel G, 1997, "Sociology of the senses", in *Simmel on Culture* Eds D Frisby, M Featherstone (Sage, London) pp 109 – 120

Sparke M, 2006, "A neoliberal nexus: economy, security and the biopolitics of citizenship on the border" *Political Geography* **25** 151 – 180

Steinberg P E, 2001 *The Social Construction of the Ocean* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)

Thrift N, 2000, "Still life in nearly present time: the object of nature" *Body and Society* **6 34 – 57**

Thrift N, 2004, "Intensities of feeling: towards a spatial politics of affect" *Geografiska Annaler, Series B* **86** 57 – 78

Thrift N, 2005, "From born to made: technology, biology and space" *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, New Series* **30** 463 – 476

Thrift N, 2006, "Re-inventing invention: new tendencies in capitalist commodification" *Economy and Society* **35** 279 – 306

Tinbergen N, 1969 *The Study of Instinct* (Oxford University Press, Oxford)

Tomkins S S, 1991 *Affect Imagery Consciousness. Volume 3: The Negative Effects: Anger and Fear* (Springer, New York)

Torpey J C, 2000 *The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship, and the State* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)

Tsiamyrtzus P, Dowdall J, Shastri D, Pavlidis I T, Frank M G, Ekman P, 2007, "Imaging facial physiology for the detection of deceit" *International Journal of Computer Vision* **71** 197 – 214

Urry J, 2000 *Sociology Beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty-first Century* (Routledge, London)

Urry J, 2002, "Mobility and proximity" *Sociology — the Journal of the British Sociological Association* **36** 255 – 274

Urry J, 2003a *Global Complexity* (Polity Press, Cambridge)

Urry J, 2003b, "Social networks, travel and talk" *British Journal of Sociology* **54** 155 – 175

Van der Ploeg I, 1999, "The illegal body: 'Eurodac' and the politics of biometric identification" *Ethics and Information Technology* **1** 295 – 302

Van Munster R, 2004, "The war on terrorism: when the exception becomes the rule" *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law* **17** 141 – 153

Vaughn-Williams N, 2007, "The shooting of Jean Charles de Menezes: new border politics?" *Alternatives* **32** 177 – 195

Walters W, 2006, "Border/Control" *European Journal of Social Theory* **9 187 – 203**

Weber C, 2007, "Securitizing the unconscious: the Bush doctrine of preemption and minority report", in *The Logics of Biopower and the War on Terror: Living, Dying, Surviving* Eds E Dauphinee, C Masters (Palgrave Macmillan, New York) pp 109 – 128

Weinreb G, Lifshitz H, 2005, "A word for fear" *Globes: Israeli Business News* 20 April, http://www.globes.co.il/

Wood D, Graham S, 2006, "Permeable boundaries in the software sorted society: surveillance and differentiations of mobility", in *Mobile Technologies of the City* Eds M Sheller, J Urry (Routledge, London) pp 177 – 191

Zeng Z, Pantic M, Roisman G, Huang T, 2007, "A survey of affect recognition methods: audio, visual and spontaneous expressions", in *ICMI 2007 Conference Proceedings, Nagoya, Aichi, Japan, 12 – 15 November* (EPrints Service, University of Twente) pp 126 – 133