

M. Shamsul Haque

National University of Singapore

Government Responses to Terrorism: Critical Views of Their Impacts on People and Public Administration

Following the tragic, massive terrorist attacks on the United States in September 2001, many antiterrorist laws, policies, and institutions have emerged to wage war on terrorism. These antiterrorist initiatives have major consequences for individuals, societies, and nations all over the world. Although controversies have proliferated with regard to the implications of counterterrorism for people's basic rights, the debate remains fragmented and often unfocused. This article examines the critical impact of new antiterrorist initiatives on the fundamental rights and responsibilities of citizens and others, with special reference to public administration.

Citizenship has been a central concern in both practical and academic public administration in most constitutionally democratic societies, emphasizing people's rights and responsibilities in relation to the state and to society in general. It is argued that citizenship represents the fundamental basis of constitutional democracy in terms of the reciprocal relationships between the state and people; thus, it provides the framework within which public administration functions as one of the basic domains of the state (Oliver and Heater 1994). During recent decades, in response to remarkable sociohistorical events—especially various movements and demands for civil liberties, economic opportunities (including union rights), gender equality, and ethnic representation—the nature of these relationships has undergone considerable change, especially in terms of expanding people's rights and entitlements, in almost all societies. In this regard, T.H. Marshall (1950) explains how the scope of citizenship began to expand to incorporate civil rights, political rights, and social rights. In line with this overall progress in the configuration of citizenship, the public service in most countries expanded to implement diverse policies and programs—ranging from basic needs and services to equal employment opportunity and affirmative action—to serve the public with fairness, equality, responsiveness, and accountability.

Recently, however, concerns have grown about newly emerging challenges to the principles of citizenship that are posed by market-driven reforms in governance, the re-

definition of citizens as utilitarian customers, and the replacement of collective public interest by individual choice (Eriksen and Weigard 1999; Denhardt and Denhardt 2000). While concerns about the diminishing value of citizenship in public management were already on the rise, the September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States have raised new questions about public governance and the democratic principles of citizenship. While policy makers attempt to justify antiterrorist laws and institutions in the name of internal and external security, critics argue that such measures may pose a considerable challenge to various domains of people's rights, especially privacy, freedom of expression, political dissent, racial equality, and social entitlement (Dempsey 2001–02). According to the United Nations High Commission for Human Rights, new antiterrorist provisions may undermine basic human rights (Robinson 2002). In short, the growing debate questions the trade-offs between liberty and security in the aftermath of September 11 (Dempsey 2001–02).

Public administration is greatly affected by the September 11 event, especially in terms of articulating and implementing varied legal provisions, strategies, and programs

M. Shamsul Haque is an associate professor in the Department of Political Science at the National University of Singapore. His most recent articles on governance and public administration have appeared in Public Administration Review, International Review of Administrative Sciences, International Journal of Public Administration, International Journal of Politics and Ethics, and other refereed journals. He is currently studying public governance in Asia. Email: polhaque@nus.edu.sg.

adopted in many countries in response to terrorism. However, the event is too recent to expect much substantive literature. One major edited volume published immediately after the event is *Governance and Public Security* (Roberts 2002). Although this volume includes several articles that are useful in terms of their analysis of the potential administrative repercussions of September 11, it hardly deals with greater concerns such as the change in the nature of relationships between people and administration that is caused by new antiterrorist measures. A short commentary published in *Administration and Society* by Zahid Shariff (2002) includes hardly anything substantive in this regard except the author's prediction that September 11 might have strengthened the credibility of public administration professionals because of a renewed recognition of their role in serving people, which had been tarnished by bureaucrat bashing during the past few decades. In its March/April 2002 issue, *Public Administration Review* published a special report titled "Organizing for Homeland Security" (Wise 2002), which examines major approaches to organizational management in coordinating and managing public institutions involved in antiterrorist policies and programs. A broader analysis can be found in an earlier article titled "Fanatical Terrorism versus Disciplines of Constitutional Democracy" (Newland 2001), which also appeared in *Public Administration Review* (November/December 2001).

Some controversies have also emerged with regard to the favorable and adverse effects of September 11 on public administration as both a practical and an academic field. Few scholars emphasize that responses to terrorism have positive implications for the field or for the restoration and expansion of public trust in the credibility and necessity of public agencies and employees (Gordon 2002; Boaz 2001). Critics point out the failure of agencies and officials (especially those related to international and external security) to anticipate and prevent such a terrorist attack (Boaz 2001). These scattered arguments hardly explain how state-citizen relations have been affected by the new antiterrorist measures. In any case, these are examples of how some piecemeal studies are gradually emerging in relation to the impact of September 11 on public administration.

Needed are in-depth, comprehensive studies to examine the implications of the war on terrorism for various dimensions of public administration, including patterns of its relationships with people in different circumstances. However, an objective assessment of the impact of new antiterrorist measures is difficult because some have been presented emotionally by their proponents and opponents, making it difficult to gather impartial information, interpretations, and viewpoints. In fact, it is a common challenge in public administration to go beyond what L.E. Lynn (2001) calls "stylized facts, stories, conjectures, and ideo-

logical glosses" and to "ascertain whatever lessons and meanings might lie beneath." This article attempts to present a balanced assessment of the impact of antiterrorist measures on public administration, especially on its role to protect people's rights and to facilitate their performance of responsibilities. Because the existing views largely offer a favorable explanation of the war on terrorism, this study focuses more on the other perspectives, analyzing some of the adverse effects of antiterrorist laws, executive orders, and other measures on the principles of people's fundamental responsibilities and rights in relation to the theory and practice of public administration. In this attempt, the next section of this article briefly describes the background of the war on terrorism and the antiterrorist measures adopted after September 11.

The Current War on Terrorism: Initiatives, Measures, and Significance

The terrorist attacks on September 11 were an unprecedented event that intensified antiterrorist initiatives and policies, mobilized world opinion, ushered in a newly formed worldwide coalition, and globalized the discourse on terrorism. However, terrorism is not a new phenomenon—terrorist incidents and antiterrorist measures have been present for decades. For instance, between 1981 and 2000, the total number of terrorist attacks globally was 9,179 (an average of 459 attacks a year), with the highest number (630 attacks a year) in the mid-1980s (Center for Data Analysis 2001). Regionally, during 1995–2000, the average number of terrorist attacks per year was 122 in Latin America, 101 in Western Europe, about 45 in Asia, and only 15 in North America (*ibid.*).

A series of international antiterrorist conventions emerged prior to September 11, including the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Aircraft in 1971, the Convention against the Taking of Hostages in 1979, the Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings in 1997, and the Convention for the Suppression of Financing Terrorism in 1999 (CEC 2001). At the national level, terrorism was a major American concern for over two decades, leading to various government initiatives reflected in documents such as *Managing Terrorist Incidents* (1982), *National Program for Combating Terrorism* (1986), *U.S. Policy on Counterterrorism* (1995), and *Terrorism, the Future, and U.S. Foreign Policy* (2001) (Richelson and Evans 2001).

Despite the existence of such a long list of antiterrorist conventions and legal provisions, the colossal terrorist attacks on September 11 could not be predicted or prevented. On that day, through the global media, the whole world observed the horrifying actions that destroyed New York's World Trade Center, damaged the Pentagon building, and

caused the deaths of thousands of people. Subsequently, the episode unfolded with its worldwide condemnation by political leaders and policy makers, the announcement of a “war on terrorism” by President Bush, the formation of an antiterrorist coalition among various nations, a global search for the terrorists responsible for the attack, massive military operations in Afghanistan to eliminate the al-Qaeda terrorist networks led by Osama bin Laden, and the adoption of multifaceted legal provisions against terrorists and their sympathizers worldwide (Gordon 2002).

In the history of terrorism, the September 11 attack was the most significant event because it altered the structures of interstate relations, transformed perceptions of security, redefined the identities of friends and enemies in world politics, restructured the criteria of state–citizen–resident relations, and reprioritized the mission of public governance. At the international level, the United Nations passed Security Council Resolution 1373 (September 28, 2001) immediately, calling on all states to prevent and suppress the financing of all terrorist acts, criminalize the provision or collection of funds for terrorists, freeze funds and assets of individuals involved in terrorism, and so on (UNSC 2001). This resolution also requires all states to exchange information regarding terrorist networks, false travel documents, traffic in sensitive materials, and communications technologies used by terrorist groups.

In the United States, the national government has adopted a series of antiterrorism measures since September 11, including the Financial Anti-Terrorism Act, Airport Security Federalization Act, Bioterrorism Response Act, Preparedness against Domestic Terrorism Act, Aviation Security Enhancement Act, Airline Security Act, Bioterrorism Preparedness Act, and United States Security Act. One of the most important legal provisions is the so-called USA PATRIOT (Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism) Act, signed by the president on October 26, 2001. As the next section will explicate, this act enhances the government’s authority and capacity to redefine terrorism, conduct surveillance, gather intelligence, determine crimes and penalties, detain immigrants for lengthy periods, and verify financial transactions and accounts (Chang 2001; White House 2002a). Another significant antiterrorist measure adopted in the United States after September 11 was the creation of the Office of Homeland Security, which aims to “develop and coordinate the implementation of a comprehensive national strategy to secure the United States from terrorist threats or attacks” (Wermuth 2002, 31). Other related organizations and initiatives have also emerged, including the Anti-Terrorism Task Forces, Customs Trade Partnership Against Terrorism, Citizen Corps, and so on (White House 2002a).

Other Western countries also have strengthened and expanded antiterrorist laws since September 11. For example, the European Commission adopted the Framework Decision on Combating Terrorism (2001), which prescribes the definition of terrorism, extent of penalties and sanctions, extradition procedures, and means of exchanging information to be followed by the member states of the European Union (CEC 2001). After September 11, Canada introduced the Anti-Terrorism Act (2001), which prescribes measures to define and designate terrorist groups and activities, prosecute and punish terrorists, facilitate the use of electronic surveillance, and allow the arrest and detention of suspected terrorists (Canada, Department of Justice 2001). Likewise, the British government adopted the Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Act (2001). In Australia, the government has introduced various amendments in its antiterrorist laws, including the *Security Legislation Amendment (Terrorism) Act (2002)* and *Border Security Legislation Amendment Act (2002)* (CEC 2001). Similar amendments in antiterrorist laws have been pursued in France to expand the powers of police to conduct investigation, monitoring, and surveillance.

In the case of developing countries, the United Nations’s Security Council Resolution 1373, adopted after September 11, requires these nations to comply with its provisions and strategies to eradicate terrorist groups and networks, refrain from any form of support to such groups and networks, and share and exchange information in this regard (UNSC 2001). Some developing countries have also adopted their own antiterrorist measures. In particular, following the September 11 event, India introduced the Prevention of Terrorism Ordinance (2001), which broadens the definition of terrorism and empowers law enforcement agencies to investigate and punish terrorist activities. The Indonesian government is also pushing for a controversial antiterrorism bill that would provide expansive power to its security forces to manage radical religious groups (Asmarani 2002). The Malaysian government has promised to cooperate with the United States in information sharing, military operations, intelligence, and law enforcement. In terms of global support to the American antiterrorist campaign, 23 countries have agreed to host U.S. forces to conduct military operations, 89 countries have granted overflight authority, 76 countries have approved landing rights, and 142 have issued orders to freeze the assets of suspected terrorist organizations (White House 2002b).

This brief description above of new antiterrorist laws, institutions, policies, and strategies shows how September 11 has fundamentally changed national and international priorities and concerns, perceptions of internal and external security, roles of the state and bureaucracy, and the nature of relationships between the state and society.

In America, the broad scope of these antiterrorist measures has serious implications for how the nation-state relates to the international community, makes public policy, allocates federal budgets, prioritizes expenditures, delivers services, relates to its own citizens and other residents, and defines human rights and responsibilities. In other words, the antiterrorist measures not only have affected foreign policy and internal policy priorities, they have also affected the basic principles of people's constitutional rights as the essence of democratic governance. While it is too early to assess the effectiveness of these legal provisions to combat terrorism, critics are concerned that such measures may have consequences for people's rights and entitlements in each country. The next section examines how these measures are affecting the basic tenets of people's constitutional protections, with special reference to public administration.

New Measures of War on Terrorism: Impact on People's Rights and Public Administration

The impact of antiterrorist measures on the rights and responsibilities of citizens, other residents, and visitors are crucial concerns in a constitutionally democratic nation-state. In Western democracies, these fundamentals include civil rights (freedom from state intervention in the private sphere), political rights (effective political participation, expression, and influence), and social rights (access to basic goods and services through reallocation by the state) (Eriksen and Weigard 1999; Oliver and Heater 1994). In the United States, through various constitutional amendments and laws, an expanded definition of civil rights has emerged that encompasses freedom of speech and assembly, the right to vote, and the right to equality in public places irrespective of race, religion, gender, age, and national origin. This broad scope of civil rights covers political rights as well as social rights. The evolution and expansion of these basic rights took many decades and involved popular struggles and movements.

In other nations, such rights have often changed depending on major historical events affecting the nature of state formation, mode of governance, and structure of state-citizen relations. The terrorist attack on September 11 is undoubtedly such a historical event that has an impact on relationships between the state, its citizens, and other people. This section of the article examines how the antiterrorist measures adopted in response to September 11 have affected the mode of civil, political, and social rights and responsibilities of citizens and other residents. It is followed by an analysis of how these changes may affect public administration.

Critical Impacts on People's Rights and Responsibilities

First, with regard to people's *civil rights*—especially the right to privacy and other freedoms from state interference—it is observed that the antiterrorism legislation adopted after September 11, especially the USA PATRIOT Act (2001), has significant consequences. That act grants unprecedented powers to the executive branch to conduct surveillance, including gathering sensitive personal records, tracking email and internet usage, monitoring financial transactions, practicing sneak-and-peek searches, and using roving wiretaps (Chang 2001). Under Section 213 of the act, the sneak-and-peek searches of physical property can be conducted as normal criminal investigations without prior knowledge of the property owner (Levy 2001). Similarly, under Section 215, sensitive personal records can be obtained by certifying their relevance to the investigation of international terrorism. The scope of such investigation may cover American citizens and permanent residents, and provisions can apply to nonterrorist activities such as drug cases, tax fraud, and other federal crimes (Dempsey 2001–02).

Similarly, in Europe, the European Union's justice and home affairs ministers decided in a meeting on September 20, 2001, to combat terrorism by assigning new surveillance powers to law enforcement agencies, especially by retaining data from emails, phone calls, faxes, and internet usage (Statewatch 2001). In particular, the British government now requires all telecommunications providers to retain such data for 12 months. This is basically an initiative to put various modes of electronic communications under close surveillance or scrutiny by the government. The French National Assembly has also approved antiterrorism provisions that allow more intensive investigation and monitoring of private communications. In the developing world, the Prevention of Terrorism Ordinance (2001) in India has expanded the power of the police to detain people without trial and to search premises and intercept vehicles without warrant.

The adoption of a national ID card system has been discussed in the United States to enhance airport security, which could involve various biometric surveillance mechanisms such as digital fingerprinting, voice-authentication techniques, handprint scans, computer registries, software data collection, and electronic retinal scans (Thierer 2001). Although some experts consider such expanded surveillance power to be essential to counterterrorism, others think that it violates people's privacy and fails to provide for governmental accountability (Cave and Mieszkowski 2001). In Britain, the home secretary recently reinforced the possibility of introducing such ID cards, which is opposed by human rights advocates on the grounds that such

a provision would compromise people's civil liberties (Johnston and Jones 2002). In response to measures of intercepting communications and gathering information adopted after September 11, 2001, strong opposition has emerged from various privacy and civil liberties organizations, including those in Austria, Britain, Denmark, Germany, and the Netherlands, which have urged the European Council to maintain people's freedoms, privacy, and civil liberties (Evers 2001).

Second, in terms of people's *political rights*, critics argue that recent antiterrorist provisions represent a threat to any form of political protest, movement, and activism. For example, according to Levy (2001), although the USA PATRIOT Act has not replaced the principle of separation of powers in America, it has adversely affected the protection of due process under the Fifth Amendment and the safeguards against "unreasonable searches and seizures" guaranteed by the Fourth Amendment. Similarly, Chang (2001) is concerned that Section 802 of the act compromises political freedoms (especially freedom of speech and political association) because of its broad definition of domestic terrorism, which may cover political dissent, civil disobedience, and environmental activism and allow investigation and surveillance of such political activities and groups. To be more balanced, one needs to examine situations in other countries.

In Australia, under the Security Legislation Amendment (Terrorism) Act, the government can detain and question people for two days without legal representation. In Britain, although the government takes pride in the Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Act adopted after September 11, the critics are concerned that, under this law, people can be jailed if the home secretary suspects them of having terrorist connections, and one may consider political protesters or demonstrators to be terrorists (Nag 2001). Similarly, it is argued that under the new European Commission's Framework Decision on Combating Terrorism (2001), the definition of terrorism—that is, any act of altering the political, economic, or social structure and causing unlawful damages to state facilities—may cover various forms of political dissent and protests (such as anti-war or animal rights protests), thus undermining democratic freedoms (CEC 2001).

In the developing world, according to critics, some states have used the events of September 11 as a pretext to justify internal political repression in the name of controlling terrorism. For example, the proposed antiterrorist bill in Indonesia is criticized on the ground that it may undermine human rights and can be used by the elites to purge opposition voices (Asmarani 2002). In India, there are serious reservations that its Prevention of Terrorism Ordinance may criminalize legitimate political protests of vulnerable social groups, serve the ruling party against the

press and political opponents, and weaken the protection of civil liberties and human rights (POTO 2001). According to Klingner (2001), current antiterrorism efforts in many developing countries are likely to adversely affect people's participation in democratic governance and their peaceful resistance against varied forms of injustice.

In addition, it is observed that, in the process of building an antiterrorist coalition after September 11, the United States has extended military or financial assistance to some countries, including Pakistan, India, the Philippines, and Uzbekistan, which allegedly practice political repression, ethnic inequality, and/or caste discrimination (HRW 2002). Specifically, there are restrictions on political parties under the military rule in Pakistan, continued caste discrimination in India, abuses of military and police powers in the Philippines, and a repressive political system in Uzbekistan (*ibid.*). Although organizations such as Human Rights Watch may not always succeed in objective reporting, such political conditions in these countries are widely known facts, and, prior to September 11, some of them were criticized for human rights violations by the American government itself.

Third, in relation to political rights, *minority rights* are also affected in different countries in the context of the war on terrorism. In the United States, for instance, the terrorist attacks on September 11 and the images and expressions that followed, influenced some Americans to become intolerant and aggressive toward Muslim Americans, Arab Americans, Sikh Americans, and South Asian Americans (U.S. Department of Justice 2002). These minority groups experienced some violent assaults, physical attacks, death threats, and vandalism (HRW 2002). Although the government has undertaken certain joint interdepartmental initiatives to combat such discrimination based on ethnicity, religion, and national origin (U.S. Department of Justice 2002), the rise of such racial assaults may represent a new challenge to minority rights in America. Cave and Mieszkowski (2001) argue that these discriminatory attitudes toward minorities may not be isolated from the racial and religious profiling publicized in the global media and implicated in certain antiterrorism initiatives.

With regard to immigrants, according to Chang (2001), the USA PATRIOT Act tends to deprive some of due process and First Amendment rights by expanding categories of immigrants that are subject to removal on terrorism grounds and by increasing the attorney general's authority to detain immigrants suspected of terrorist activities. In Russia, although the government's human rights abuses in Chechnya were condemned by most Western countries before September 11, after the event, these countries began to downplay them because of alleged Chechnyan links with terrorist networks (HRW 2002). Similarly, in China, the government now tries to defend its crackdown on the

ethnic separatist movement of the Muslim population in the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region by portraying them as terrorists (Amnesty International 2002, 5). Similar tendencies to deny minority rights in the name of anti-terrorism may be found in India under the newly introduced Prevention of Terrorism Ordinance. These are only a few of many critical observations of how current antiterrorism campaigns may be affecting minority rights in various countries and how some governments may use them to deny such rights.

Finally, with regard to people's *social rights*, the war on terrorism may have certain indirect impacts on people's entitlement to basic services as a result of the restructuring of budgets in favor of defense and law enforcement at the expense of social programs. In terms of defense spending, compared to 2001, the proposed defense budgets for 2003 represent increases of \$4 billion in Russia, \$2.5 billion in China, \$8.5 billion in Saudi Arabia, and so on (CDI 2002). However, it is the United States where the defense budget is the world's largest and has expanded the most. According to the U.S. Department of State (2002a), in the proposed federal budget for 2003, the defense budget is about \$379 billion, which amounts to a 14 percent increase in defense spending over 2002, and it represents the largest increase in 21 years. Other gainers in the proposed budget are the Federal Aviation Administration, Coast Guard, Customs Service, Justice Department, and Federal Emergency Management Agency, which are mostly related to safety and law and order (U.S. Department of State 2002b). In addition, in this budget, the requested allocation was \$37.7 billion for homeland security (increased from \$19.5 billion in 2002), \$11 billion for border security, \$2.3 billion for the inspection of customs services, and \$6 billion for protection against bioterrorism (Bush 2002).

Although it is too early to conclude whether such increases in government spending on major sectors and organizations related to external and internal security may affect spending on social programs in America, the fact remains that, in the proposed 2003 budget, the government outlines significant cuts in highway programs, federal payments to hospitals, and job training programs (U.S. Department of State 2002b). In this regard, Twight (2002) emphasizes that, under the war on terrorism, the federal government has adopted a series of new law and order programs that might adversely affect the funds available for social programs. However, this problem is likely to be more serious in low-income countries such as India and Pakistan, where any increases in the use of resources for military, security, and law and order are likely to diminish the availability of such resources for services like education, health, housing, and other basic needs.

Impact of Terrorism Responses on Public Administration

It is clear from this discussion that under the war on terrorism, the antiterrorist laws, institutions, and budgets have expanded in an unprecedented manner. Although these measures have been presented as necessary to combat terrorism, they have serious implications for people's basic rights, including their rights to individual privacy, to free press and speech, to political participation and association, to equal representation, and to basic goods and services. The erosion of these basic rights implies a form of citizenship that Hadenius (2001) calls "weak citizenship." This section of the article explores how nations' responses to terrorism have affected civism and public administration. It must be noted here that, in line with the impact on macro-level democratic rights discussed previously, the impact in public administration may be on micro-level administrative provisions and processes such as accountability, participation, trust, attitude, and so on.

Constitutional Claims to Public Accountability. In the field of public administration, one major manifestation of popular sovereignty in constitutional governance is political and administrative accountability, realized through legal and political means (including the legislative and judicial processes), administrative means, and informal devices such as the media. Since September 11, critics charge that the adoption of antiterrorist provisions in the United States has seriously affected this authority of people to enforce public accountability, especially because of the rise of executive power challenging the powers of other branches of the national government.

According to Chang (2001), the far-reaching USA PATRIOT Act was introduced and adopted without sufficient public hearings, debate, and committee reporting, although the act has serious outcomes in terms of expanding the powers of the executive and insulating the exercise of such powers from effective judicial and legislative oversight. Critics say that it represents a challenge to the capacity of the legislative and judicial branches to counterbalance the executive power and hold it accountable to the public. In the aftermath of September 11, similar trends of expanding executive power in relation to other branches of the government can be observed in countries such as Australia and Britain, which also have adopted varied antiterrorist measures. Once again, the point is that such an increase in executive power poses a challenge to public accountability.

Public Participation versus Bureaucratic Power. The realization of people's political rights, which basically implies their empowerment, is often enhanced through their participation in public policies and decisions. Nigro and Richardson (1990) observe that the issue of legitimacy of-

ten depends on how public officials promote broadly based public participation. Today, the opportunity for such participation and access may be challenged by the aforementioned antiterrorist laws and institutions, which stress bureaucratic secrecy rather than transparency. In the current antiterrorism context, in fact, state agencies, especially those related to law enforcement, have more access to sensitive information about people, while people's access to information regarding these agencies has become limited. In this atmosphere, overwhelmed by concerns for security, surveillance, investigation, suspicion, and distrust, it is unrealistic to expect greater public participation in public administration.

Public participation may also be affected because, since September 2001, power relations between people and the bureaucrats enforcing law and order have changed. Although one may not agree with critical views that some governments have used the event of September 11 as a pretext to expand national police powers (Levy 2001), the fact remains that, under the USA PATRIOT Act (2001), the power of law and order bureaucracy has increased considerably. As discussed earlier, while the authority of law enforcement agencies has expanded to conduct surveillance and investigation, the scope of people's rights to privacy has weakened correspondingly. For Gormley (2002, 5), although people are being encouraged to participate in administration to fight terrorism by informing law enforcement agencies of suspicious activities, the situation may become complicated "where citizens report on fellow citizens." Although the traditional mode of public participation based on volunteer services still continues, the atmosphere of information gathering through expanded surveillance and monitoring may create doubts or distrust in this participatory process.

Popular Confidence in Public Service. An important dimension of public administration is the level of public trust in civil and military services. During recent decades, although one of the main objectives of market-led reforms under initiatives such as reinventing government and "reengineering bureaucracy" was to restore public confidence in governance, the outcomes have not been that remarkable. In the United States, between 1987 and 1992, the number of people with a fair degree of confidence in the federal government declined 26 percent, and in state-level governments that number declined 22 percent (Thompson 1993, 11–14). Similar declines in public trust occurred in Canada, Britain, and Norway (Haque 2001). However, some observers believe that, in the context of the war on terrorism, a growing sense of patriotism and increasing trust in public agencies has occurred. For instance, the percentage of people reporting they "always" trust the government increased from 18 percent in 1994 to 51 percent in 2001 after September 11 (Moynihan and

Roberts 2002, 133). Following the event, a growing sense in the United States and some other countries appears to be that the role of government is seen, once again, as a solution rather than a problem (Hamilton 2001).

However, according to critics, this increased confidence in government is not clear because, after all, the September 11 attacks represented "a massive failure of the government" to anticipate or prevent them (Boaz 2001). After the event, it is being realized that serious deficiencies are present in various public agencies related to intelligence, law enforcement, immigration and border control, and emergency situations (Moynihan and Roberts 2002). In this regard, Carter finds the recent approaches to antiterrorism adopted by the U.S. federal administration (including those after September 2001) inadequate, and he concludes that certain fundamental weaknesses are present in dealing with terrorism (Carter 2001–02, 9–12). In any case, in an atmosphere of severe external threats, most people tend to rally behind the government, but the long-term sustainability of this public support is uncertain. The terrorist attacks of September 11 represent one such episode, which was so horrifying, disastrous, and emotional that only the government could address it and take the necessary national and international measures to limit future threats. An opinion poll conducted by ABC News after September 11 shows that, although 68 percent of respondents expressed trust in government to handle national security and terrorism, only 38 percent showed such trust in the government handling of issues such as health care, economy, social security, and education (Palmer and Samples 2002, 12). In other words, the war on terrorism has not necessarily improved people's overall trust in government.

Global Orientation of Public Service. According to Mameli (2002), after September 2001, the parochial, inward-looking view of public service has proven inadequate, and there is a need for exposing the profession to the global atmosphere to deal with transnational issues such as the environment, health, and terrorism. In the United States, although some public administrators have embraced cross-cultural collaboration through international bodies and professional associations, gaps remain in understanding the views of American counterparts in other countries (Mameli 2002). A similar point is emphasized by Gordon (2002), who thinks that the terrorist attacks on September 11, which led to worldwide cooperation among heads of state and public officials, provided an impetus for pursuing national policy agendas based on cross-national collaboration, especially for preventing and addressing such attacks in the future.

Beyond a doubt, the September 2001 assault has brought together varieties of political leaders, policy makers, and public administrators to take preventive and remedial measures against terrorism. But as far as the public service is

concerned, one needs to think carefully to strike a balance between the need for reorienting public employees to the global atmosphere and cross-national linkages on the one hand, and the importance of their responsiveness and accountability to domestic public interests and demands on the other. It certainly has become essential for public employees to think globally in this relatively borderless world, where many countries are simultaneously affected by common international issues ranging from environmental catastrophes to terrorist attacks.

Civism and Administrative Theory. Beyond the practical concerns of public administration reviewed here, how does the war on terrorism affect the citizenship principle in academic public administration, especially with regard to administrative theory building? First, as in other fields and disciplines of study, in public administration, practical realities and experiences interact with academic concepts and theory building. Developments since September 2001 in the domains of practical citizen-administration relations—including the aforementioned constraints to accountability, participation, and entitlement—now affect academic discourse. Public administration scholars may encounter pressure or influence to reorient public administration to global responses to terrorism.

Second, in line with the above emphasis on the need for a global orientation of the public service to face events such as September 11, recognition is growing that such a global perspective needs to be incorporated into academic articulation of administrative theories and concepts. In this regard, Mameli (2002) suggests that public administration scholars should understand and utilize international relations theories and perspectives. It is pointed out that such an approach, combining public administration and international relations, would better explain rapidly changing global events such as international terrorism. However, it may be necessary to go beyond the mechanical integration of public administration as a field focusing on domestic policy issues and international relations as a field dominated by statecentric foreign relations. To meet today's needs, it may not be necessary to "reinvent the wheel." The heritage of comparative public administration that was strong in the 1950s through the 1970s persists, and it can be revived more vigorously. In the past, comparative public administration made considerable progress in training public managers in cross-national administrative systems, generating literature in comparative administration and constructing useful analytical frameworks. This valuable tradition can be utilized to perform much-needed cross-national comparative studies.

Third, evidence is that, since September 2001, the notion of public governance has changed in terms of a more active and expansive public sector, greater popular acceptance of the public service, more positive images of public

agencies, and stronger public trust in American government (Moynihan and Roberts 2002, 132). One must be cautious in drawing such conclusions because, as explained earlier, increased public acceptance or trust may not encompass the whole of public administration, and it may be a transitional phenomenon. After all, it was not that long ago that public service was blamed nearly worldwide for its alleged inefficiency, indifference, rigidity, and elitism, and it was considered inferior to the business sector. Although such allegations were hardly credible, one should not be too excited about the new surge or revival of active public governance, because, as discussed in this article, overwhelming concerns for security under changed modes of governance could weaken practices of popular participation in governance based on basic democratic rights and responsibilities.

Finally, thinking is emerging that the current shift toward a greater role and positive image of public administration may promise a new paradigm—evident in the growing appreciation and conviction of public servants, diminishing belief in private-sector superiority, and enhanced coordination and cooperation among public agencies (Gormley 2002, 2–5). In addition, the market-led paradigm of New Public Management, also known as the reinvention paradigm, is now in doubt (Moynihan and Roberts 2002). However, in the end, it is concluded that emergence of a changed and enduring post-September 11 paradigm is not yet certain, and the validity and credibility of such a new paradigm may lie, ironically, in more costly terrorist attacks to prove its worth (Gormley 2002; Moynihan and Roberts 2002).

Even if such a changed paradigm of public administration emerges, according to Gormley (2002, 7–8), it may not be compatible with varied forms of postbureaucratic accountability and with the notions of decentralization and service orientation. What warrants major attention is the principle of popular sovereignty and limited government in forming a reliable paradigm of "public" administration under constitutional democracy. This is critical because major foundations in the field have always been associated with citizenship-related issues of civic duty and public service, including principles of responsiveness, accountability, fairness, participation, representation, human dignity, and justice. These basic tenets of constitutional government service, which have come under scrutiny since September 2001, must remain central to sustain a practical paradigm of public administration.

Conclusions

First, because contemporary challenges to citizenship principles in politics and administration are related to the war on terrorism, it is essential to understand the causes

and remedies of terrorism itself. Existing antiterrorist strategies in the United States are largely based on the assumption that superior American values such as freedom, openness, and affluence make it vulnerable to terrorism; that there are clashes between civilizations and their cultures, between good and evil, which lead to terrorism; and that such terrorism can be eradicated mainly by force and military means (Bush 2002; Eland 1998). But there are alternative views that terrorism often thrives in countries where people are oppressed and impoverished (Hamilton 2001, 14; Newland 2001, 648). In addition, based on a study of all major terrorist attacks on the United States between 1915 and 1998, Eland (1998, 21) concludes that such actions were mostly the result of American military involvement and intervention in other countries, and that the frequency of such attacks could be substantively reduced by lowering its military profile overseas. According to Ford (2001), one major factor leading to terrorism is the anti-American hatred in many Arab and Muslim countries, which is caused by people's perceptions that American foreign policies and military strategies are often responsible for adverse human conditions in these countries, especially the suffering of the Palestinians under Israeli policies. The point here is that alternative perceptions of the causes of terrorism warrant serious consideration, because the causes and motivations behind terrorism must be addressed to combat it effectively. As Carter (2001–02, 7) emphasizes in references to September 11, 2001, “the motivations and root causes of catastrophic terrorism—inscrutable as they may now seem—must eventually yield at least part of careful study.”

Second, visible strategies against terrorism are predominantly based on military force, including preemptive strikes, commando actions, rescue operations, special reaction forces, and so on (UNODCCP 2001). There are also international conventions, laws of nation-states, rules of engagement, surveillance and investigation, intelligence gathering, police cooperation, strict law enforcement, suspension of civil rights, and so on. Although these strategies and tactics may be essential, they should be complemented by nonconfrontational options such as understanding the political and socioeconomic grievances of terrorist groups, reducing poverty and unemployment in countries prone to terrorist activities, creating international pressures on repressive regimes to practice constitutional democracy and respect human rights, reducing self-serving foreign interventions, addressing the paradox of localization and globalization, and adopting public awareness programs regarding the costs and dangers of terrorism (Newland 2001; UNODCCP 2001). This multidimensional approach to control terrorism is necessary because past experiences show that primary reliance on force is not often effective.

Third, in the case of the terrorist attacks of September 11, the event was so immense and tragic that the adoption of extreme antiterrorist laws and initiatives (discussed earlier) was to be expected. However, in adopting such provisions, it is necessary to have a strict and clear definition of terrorism; in many instances, the definitions are so vague and broad that they may lead to the criminalization of peaceful movements and unreasonable restrictions on basic human rights (Amnesty International 2002, 6). While terrorism usually means “any act of violence or threat” with the motive of terrorizing people to harm them or impair their freedom, security, property, and honor, activities such as legitimate political protests and liberation movements should not be considered terrorist acts (OIC 1999). In short, careful interpretation is necessary to ensure that innocent people are not being harassed and that their basic civil and political rights are not compromised. In other words, a balance must be reached between people's need for security against terrorism and their constitutional rights and responsibilities.

Finally, people's rights and involvement in overall governance, including participation in transparent public administration, should not be sacrificed under any threats, including terrorist attacks. Although debate continues about security versus liberty in the aftermath of September 11, these should not be seen as a zero-sum equation: The absence of liberties often becomes the breeding ground for terrorism, and the expansion of people's basic rights may be conducive rather than constraining to the eventual defeat of terrorism (Hamilton 2001). In fact, in public administration, concerns have grown in recent years regarding how to recognize the public interest, reinforce people's empowerment, strengthen democratic citizenship, and ensure public accountability, in order to create a “new public service” (Denhardt and Denhardt 2000, 553–56). Given new challenges to these fundamental values posed by security measures under the war on terrorism, today it is even more essential for public administration scholars to safeguard the spirit of constitutional democracy, including respect for people's rights and responsibilities.

References

- Amnesty International. 2002. *Rights at Risk: Amnesty International's Concerns Regarding Security Legislation and Law Enforcement Measures*. London: Amnesty International.
- Asmarani, Devi. 2002. Muslims Oppose Jakarta Anti-Terror Bill. *Straits Times* (Singapore), May 11.
- Boaz, David. 2001. Turning to Government. *Cato Daily Commentary*, November 2. Available at <http://www.cato.org/current/terrorism/political.html>. Accessed April 3, 2002.
- Bush, George W. 2002. *Securing the Homeland, Strengthening the Nation*. Washington, DC: White House. Available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/homeland_security_book.html. Accessed May 31, 2002.
- Canada, Department of Justice. 2001. Government of Canada Introduces "Anti-Terrorism Act." Ottawa: Department of Justice. October 15. Available at http://canada.justice.gc.ca/en/news/nr/2001/doc_27785.html. Accessed May 31, 2002.
- Carter, Ashton B. 2001–02. The Architecture of Government in the Face of Terrorism. *International Security* 26(3): 5–23.
- Cave, Damien, and Katharine Mieszkowski. 2001. The End of Liberty. *Salon.com*, September 22. Available at http://www.salon.com/tech/feature/2001/09/22/end_of_liberty/index.html. Accessed May 31, 2002.
- Center for Defense Information (CDI). 2002. *World Military Expenditures*. Washington DC: Center for Defense Information. Available at <http://www.cdi.org/issues/wmel>. Accessed May 20, 2002.
- Commission of the European Communities (CEC). 2001. *Council Framework Decision on Combating Terrorism*. September 19. Available at <http://www.statewatch.org/news/2001/sep/terrorism.pdf>. Accessed May 31, 2002.
- Center for Data Analysis. 2001. *Facts and Figures about Terrorism*. Washington, DC: Center for Data Analysis, Heritage Foundation. Available at <http://www.heritage.org/shorts/20010914terror.htm>. Accessed May 31, 2002.
- Chang, Nancy. 2001. *The USA PATRIOT Act: What's So Patriotic about Trampling on the Bill of Rights?* New York: Center for Constitutional Rights.
- Dempsey, James X. 2001–02. Civil Liberties in a Time of Crisis. *Journal of the National Council of Jewish Women*, Winter 2001/2002. Available at <http://www.ncjw.org/news/winter2002/dempsey.htm>. Accessed April 3, 2002.
- Denhardt, Robert, and Janet V. Denhardt. 2000. The New Public Service: Serving Rather than Steering. *Public Administration Review* 60(6): 549–59.
- Eland, Ivan. 1998. *Does U.S. Intervention Overseas Breed Terrorism? The Historical Record*. Foreign Policy Briefing, no. 50. Washington, DC: Cato Institute.
- Eriksen, Erik Oddvar, and Jarle Weigard. 1999. *The End of Citizenship? New Roles Challenging the Political Order*. Working paper, no.99/26. Oslo, Norway: ARENA. Available at http://www.arena.uio.no/publications/wp99_26.htm. Accessed May 31, 2002.
- Evers, Joris. 2001. Euro Civil Liberty Campaigners Urge Restraint. *IDG News Service*, Amsterdam Bureau, September 21. Available at http://www.idg.net/lic_697701_1794_9-10000.html. Accessed May 31, 2002.
- Ford, Peter. 2001. Why Do They Hate Us? *Christian Science Monitor*, September 27, 1.
- Gordon, Paula D. 2002. International Relations and National Agendas After September 11, 2001. *PA Times* 25(2): 6.
- Gormley, William T. 2002. Reflections on Terrorism and Public Management. In *Governance and Public Security*, edited by Alasdair Roberts, 1–16. New York: Campbell Public Affairs Institute, Maxwell School, Syracuse University.
- Hadenius, Axel. 2001. *Institutions and Democratic Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hamilton, Mary R. 2001. Government Matters More than Ever. Paper presented at the First International Congress of Political Science and Public Administration, November 28, Universidad Autonoma del Estado de Hidalgo, Mexico.
- Haque, M. Shamsul. 2001. The Diminishing Publicness of Public Service under the Current Mode of Governance. *Public Administration Review* 61(1): 65–82.
- Human Rights Watch (HRW). 2002. *World Report 2002: Events of 2001*. New York: Human Rights Watch.
- Johnston, Philip, and George Jones. 2002. Blunkett Plans ID Card. *Daily Telegraph*, February 6, 1.
- Klingner, Donald. 2001. International Relations in the Aftermath of Terror. *PA Times* 24(10): 7–8.
- Levy, Robert A. 2001. The USA PATRIOT Act: We Deserve Better. *Cato Daily Commentary*, November 27. Available at <http://www.cato.org/current/terrorism/justice4terrorists.html>. Accessed April 3, 2002.
- Lynn, L.E. 2001. Globalization and Administrative Reform: What is Happening in Theory? *Public Management Review* 3(2): 191–208.
- Mameli, Peter A. 2002. American Public Administration in a Globalizing World. *PA Times* 25(2): 3.
- Marshall, T.H. 1950. *Citizenship and Social Class, and Other Essays*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Moynihan, Donald P., and Alasdair Roberts. 2002. Public Service Reform and the New Security Agenda. In *Governance and Public Security*, edited by Alasdair Roberts, 128–46. New York: Campbell Public Affairs Institute, Maxwell School, Syracuse University.
- Nag, D. 2001. Arrest without Any Reason under Blair's Regime. *People's Democracy* (India), 25(49): 12.
- Newland, Chester A. 2001. Fanatical Terrorism versus Disciplines of Constitutional Democracy. *Public Administration Review* 61(6): 643–50.
- Nigro, Lloyd G., and William D. Richardson. 1990. Between Citizen and Administrator: Administrative Ethics and PAR. *Public Administration Review* 50(6): 623–35.
- Oliver, Dawn, and Derek Heater. 1994. *The Foundations of Citizenship*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

- Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC). 1999. Convention on the Organization of the Islamic Conference on Combating International Terrorism. Geneva, Switzerland: OIC. Available at <http://www.oic-un.org/26icfm/c.html>. Accessed April 4, 2002.
- Palmer, Tom G., and John Samples. 2002. Limited Government After 9-11. *Cato Policy Report* 14(2): 1–14.
- POTO. 2001. Amnesty Urges India Not to Adopt Controversial Law. *Dawn* (Pakistan), December 1.
- Richelson, Jeffrey, and Michael L. Evans, eds. 2001. *Volume I: Terrorism and U.S. Policy*. National Security Archive Electronic Briefing Book, no. 55, September 21. Available at <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB55/index1.html>. Accessed March 31, 2002.
- Roberts, Alasdair, ed. 2002. *Governance and Public Security*. New York: Campbell Public Affairs Institute, Maxwell School, Syracuse University.
- Robinson, Mary. 2002. Introductory Statement, United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. March 20. Available at <http://www.statewatch.org/news/2002/mar/12unhchr.htm>. Accessed May 31, 2002.
- Shariff, Zahid. 2002. Reflections on Public Administration in a Time of Crisis. *Administration and Society* 34(1): 4–7.
- Statewatch. 2001. EU: Data Protection or Data Retention in the EU? London: Statewatch. Available at <http://www.statewatch.org/news/2001/sep/01data.htm>. Accessed May 31, 2002.
- Thierer, Adam. 2001. National ID Cards: New Technologies, Same Bad Idea. *Techknowledge*, no. 21, September 28. Available at <http://www.cato.org/tech/tk/010928-tk.html>. Accessed April 3, 2002.
- Thompson, Frank J. 1993. Critical Challenges to State and Local Public Service. In *Revitalizing State and Local Public Service*, edited by Frank J. Thompson, 1–40. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Twight, Charlotte. 2002. It's Not Just about Terrorists. *Cato Daily Commentary*, March 8. Available at <http://www.cato.org/current/civil-liberties/index.html>. Accessed April 3, 2002.
- United Nations Office of Drug Control and Crime Prevention (UNODCCP). 2001. *A Classification of Counter-Terrorism Measures*. Vienna, Austria: UNODCCP. Available at http://www.undcp.org/terrorism_measures.html. Accessed May 31, 2002.
- United Nations Security Council (UNSC). 2001. *Security Council Resolution 1373 (2001)*. Adopted by the Security Council at its 4385th meeting on September 28. Available at <http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/committees/1373/>. Accessed April 4, 2002.
- U.S. Department of Justice. 2002. Joint Statement against Employment Discrimination in the Aftermath of the September 11 Terrorist Attacks. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Available at <http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/legalinfo/jointstatement.htm>. Accessed May 31, 2002.
- U.S. Department of State. 2002a. Bush Sends \$379,300 Million Defense Budget Request to Congress. February 4. Available at <http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/poll/terror/02020402.htm>. Accessed May 19, 2002.
- . 2002b. *Fact Sheet on Fiscal 2003 Budget Proposals*. February 4. Available at <http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/poll/terror/02020414.htm>. Accessed May 19, 2002.
- Wermuth, Michael A. 2002. Mission Impossible? The White House Office of Homeland Security. In *Governance and Public Security*, edited by Alasdair Roberts, 29–36. New York: Campbell Public Affairs Institute, Maxwell School, Syracuse University.
- White House. 2002a. Strengthening Homeland Security Since 9/11. Available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/homeland/six_month_update.html. Accessed May 31, 2002.
- . 2002b. Campaign Against Terrorism: A Coalition Update. March 11. Available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/march11/coalition/>. Accessed May 31, 2002.
- Wise, Charles R. 2002. Organizing for Homeland Security. *Public Administration Review* 62(2): 31–44.