Imaginative Geographies and Homeland Insecurities: An American T.V. Drama's Portrayal of Pakistan and the Discourse of U.S. Security Mechanisms in the Post 9/11 Era

David J. Roof & Sadaf Ali

Abstract

Using interpretative phenomenological analysis, this article examines the fourth season of the T.V. series *Homeland,* a show that dramatizes U.S. CIA anti-terrorism operations. The fourth season of *Homeland* set in Islamabad, Pakistan sparked controversy. We analyze this controversy and some of the key themes of the fourth season. This work reveals the show's portrayal of a 'discourse of danger'. Central to this is *Homeland*'s portrayal of Pakistan as dangerous and unstable, with Islamist terrorism being regarded as the most significant destabilizing factor. We examine how the show constructs the U.S. as a '*Homeland*' which must be understood to possess the imperatives of 'national security'. To analyze these themes we utilize conceptual frameworks developed by Michel Foucault. Foucault examined how since the eighteenth century western societies have situated apparatuses of security as its essential technical instrument. Foucault went beyond legal codes and disciplinary mechanisms to examine the function of 'mechanisms of security'. We also utilize Giorgio Agamben's work on the 'state of exception' to further the analysis of 'mechanisms of security' used to suspend legal rights.

David J. Roof (PhD) is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Studies at Ball State University in Muncie, Indiana, U.S. and Sadaf Ali is a graduate of Area Study Centre, Quaid-i-Azam University Islamabad. Requests should be sent to djroof@bsu.edu.

Introduction

No one said becoming a terrorist would be easy. — Carrie Mathison

This article examines the Emmy award winning drama series *Homeland,* a television show that dramatizes U.S. CIA anti-terrorism operations. Specifically, we focus on the fourth season of *Homeland* set in Islamabad, a season that won praise in the U.S. and sparked controversy in Pakistan. It sparked controversy by presenting Pakistan as a "hell hole" and a country that could not be trusted as an ally of the U.S.[1] One Pakistani spokesman, for example, said that *Homeland* was 'maligning' the country.[2] Nadeem Hotiana press attaché for Pakistan said, "The show projects and reinforces stereotypes about the U.S. and Pakistan that do not serve the best interests of our two peoples and countries."[3] Further, Shehzad Ghias writing for the Pakistani news outlet *Dawn* claimed that *Homeland* suggested that, "…all schools in Pakistan are obviously suicide bombing training institutes."[4] In the U.S., however, the show has remained popular and well received. President Obama of the United States, for example, once listed it among one of his favorite shows.[5] But, how has the show managed to remain celebrated in the U.S. while 'maligning' one of its key allies?

Two Homelands: One Domestic & One Foreign

Adapted by Alex Gansa and Howard Gordon from a hit Israeli show Hatufim (Prisoners of War) *Homeland* is an American television series that explores U.S. foreign policy, specifically focused on terrorism, explored primarily through the main character Carrie Mathison (played by actress Claire Danes). Carrie's suffering from manic depression adds a layer of complexity to her nervous actions, suspiciousness and erratic behavior.[6]

The fourth season of *Homeland* set in Pakistan (set primarily in Islamabad) was actually filmed in Cape Town, South Africa. This season caused a significant amount of controversy among Pakistanis. On a more basic level controversy stemmed from inaccurate depictions of Islamabad, incorrect usage of Urdu, and inconsiderate portrayals of the Pakistani people.

The national language of Pakistan "Urdu" was generally misspoken by the characters. Shehzad Ghias stated that, "The Indian and American actors deployed to play Pakistanis seamlessly delivered their lines in Urdu with the authenticity of Siri telling me it loves me on my iPhone."[7] Furthermore, the primary villain in the fourth season was named Haissam Haqqani (played by Numan Acar), almost identical to the name of Pakistan's former ambassador to the United States, Husain Haqqani. This led to anger among the Pakistani government. Pakistan Embassy spokesman Nadeem Hotiana said, "Maligning a country that has been a close partner and ally of the U.S. ...is a disservice not only to the security interests of the U.S. but also to the people of the U.S."[8]However, there were more significant aspects of the criticism coming largely from Pakistanis and Muslims more generally.

The portrayal of Pakistan should be taken seriously. The Islamic Republic of Pakistan is the sixth largest nation in the world with an estimated population of around 191 million.[9] Pakistan's population has changed dramatically in the last 50 years. For example, in 1951, the population was 34 million. In 2005, that number had risen to 158 million—with a demographic shift in population toward a higher prevalence of youth as compared to adults.[10] The dramatic rise in the population has created a strain on economic institutions. This economic strain along with social and historical factors has created instability in the region.[11] Pakistan has been controlled through direct rule of military dictatorships, as was the case with the first military dictatorship in 1958. The military has

often imposed martial law throughout the country, and often installs or controls the civilian parliamentary government. Pakistan has had a number of military rulers, and these military dictatorships often subsumed government institutions (such as public education) under the control of the Army. Pakistan entered the twenty-first century under military rule. The legacy of dictatorships has likewise hindered the democratic goals of the education sector in Pakistan. The fourth season of *Homeland* did not reveal these complexities of Pakistan and the importance of its relationship with the U.S.

At times, *Homeland* portrays terrorism as a complex manifestation of the social, cultural, economic, and political milieu in which they arise. Furthermore, there are Muslims in the show who are depicted sympathetically and in a complex manner. Yair Rosenberg argued that the show challenged the prejudices of its viewers regarding Islam rather than affirming them.[12] This has led conservative critics to condemn the show, and accuse *Homeland* of justifying terrorism.[13] The show has, for example, depicted the aftermath of U.S. drone strikes that indiscriminately killed innocent men, women, and children. The drone strikes are shown to foster violent reactions, calls for retaliation and cycles of violence. As one character remarked, "nothing has made the world more dangerous in the last 15 years than the foreign policy of the United States."[14] However, while the show might possess this complexity, it's generally not manifested in the ethos of the main characters. In season five, Carrie does seem haunted by the many people she is responsible for killing. However, she also rationalizes targeted assassinations and the killing of innocent people as 'collateral damage'. In season four, she says of the killing of the CIA agent on the streets of Islamabad, "You think we behave badly? This is how the other side behaves." [15] As with portrayals of violence in the U.S. media more generally, terror and torture always refer to the actions of others never to ourselves.[16]

Beyond the conflicting perspectives and controversy, *Homeland* provides a vantage point to explore U.S. security discourse in relation to Pakistan in the post 9/11 era. The research question in this article asks what the central themes are in season four of *Homeland*, and how these themes might be interpreted.

Mode of Inquiry

This article utilized interpretative phenomenological analysis to analyze the dialog and visual discourse of the show. The first two steps involved getting closer to the data by visually analyzing episodes, reading through the dialog and making descriptive comments. As Smith noted with phenomenological analysis these first two steps merge naturally.[17] Descriptive comments included rephrasing of the show's primary themes and labeling the conceptual themes that involve knowledge from data source (various episodes) and the secondary literature.[18] For the analysis of the discourse, we created a three-column table. Original data was listed in the middle column (observations of the visual rhetoric and key dialog). The last column was used for conceptual comments. We developed themes centrally from the conceptual comments using descriptive phrases.[19] The first column was used to identify emergent themes that helped make the data more focused and interpretive, concise and compressed, but still expressive enough to connect to the original source.[20]

We sought to retain the original data source while being guided by the research question and secondary literature. Then we searched for connections across emergent themes. We then grouped these themes by super ordinate and subordinate themes. These themes were used to create a hierarchical node tree, after which we then worked on revisions and adjustments. Consistent with the general approach to interpretative phenomenological analysis there was not a clear cut distinction

between analysis and writing up the findings.[21] This approach to data collection involved both deductive and inductive processes. For example, thematic codes were structured from main sections as super ordinate themes were re-read, given modified meanings and reclassified. At times, some data were moved from one super ordinate theme to another. Our process for analysis involved returning to the data reiteratively to alter, and deepen our understanding. This analysis revealed a few super ordinate themes.

Interpretation and Discussion: Understanding the Major Themes

One of the primary super ordinate themes in *Homeland*'s fourth season is the portrayal of Pakistan through a 'discourse of danger', one that also exists outside the confines of the show and is used to advance political objectives.[22] This discourse involves political objectives entwined in the fear surrounding Islamic extremism and terrorism; what Foucault referred to as "the dazzling discourse that power uses to fascinate, terrorize, and immobilize."[23] Central to this is *Homeland*'s portrayal of Pakistan as dangerous and unstable, with Islamist terrorism regarded as the most significant destabilizing factor.

We can see the 'discourse of danger' represented in the show's promotional material. In the teaser poster for *Homeland's* fourth season, for example, Carrie is depicted like *Little Red Riding Hood*(a European fairy tale about a young girl and a Big

Bad Wolf) surrounded by faceless black hooded figures (women in Burkas) lurking in the dark. Mary Douglas wrote that the initial problem with Little Red Riding Hood was how to interpret a story when it was not clear whether it was

meant to be funny or tragic, and when the whole social context was missing. [24] A subordinate theme in *Homeland*'s fourth season grouped under the 'discourse of danger' is the absence of social and historical context. The show, for example, continually situates the basis of terrorism in the context of charismatic leaders. This is a problematic aspect of the show. As Masood Ashraf Raja argued, "We must interpret the rise of Islamism (and its attendant fundamentalism) within the very specifics of Pakistani history, for, after all, one person, no matter how charismatic or powerful, cannot reshape the symbolics of an entire nation."[25] He goes on to argue that the root of terrorism must be read within their spatial and temporal specificities.[26] *Homeland* situates the acts of terrorism in the fourth season as influenced almost exclusively by the character Haissam Haqqani (played by actor Numan Acar). The U.S. protagonists (the CIA) in the show operate implicitly with the notion that stopping terrorism involves killing Haqqani. The mission to kill Haqqani leads to another primary theme in the show, one that involves interdependent geographic domains.

Another super ordinate theme of *Homeland* is the portrayal of Pakistan as an 'imaginative geography'.[27] Thematically, the strongest mystification comes from the 'imaginative geographies' of *Homeland*.[28] 'Imaginative geographies' are perceptions, those based primarily on the fear of a dangerous other.[29] This portrayal of an imaginary geopolitical representation involves a secure 'inside' enclosing the places of the United States' 'homeland', and an 'outside' terrorist threat deemed necessary of pre-emptive attacks; "both ambivalent and ridden with contradictions."[30]

The show constructs the U.S. as a 'homeland' that must be understood to possess the imperatives of 'national security'. Cities such as Islamabad –as portrayed in *Homeland*- are central to this construction as they are "imaginatively constructed as little more than 'terrorist nest' targets to soak up

U.S. military firepower."[31] The 'homeland' and 'target city' are interdependent and treated together as a single, integrated 'battle space' within post 9/11 U.S. discourse.[32] In *Homeland*, Pakistan plays the role of target city. It's a 'target' city, in that it's treated as a single integrated 'battle space' and deemed a breeding ground of threats to U.S. interests.[33] In contrast, the show depicts the U.S. as a savior nation on a mission to protect their homeland against evil.

Although Pakistan is one of the most significant allies of the U.S in the war on terror since 9/11, the fourth season showed Pakistan as an imaginative geography that is largely at least complicit if not directly linked to terrorism.[34] Perhaps the most controversial scene in the fourth season came when a crowd on the street in Islamabad rips a CIA agent from a car, where he is viciously beaten to death in the street. The inhabitants of Islamabad are depicted in an almost zombie like state savagely killing the agent. The fourth season continually implies that the Pakistani government and intelligence agencies are protecting terrorists at the expense of the Pakistani citizenry. [35] Deconstructing these scenes requires a consideration of the interplay between images and ideology.

The Minotaur in the Labyrinth: Understanding *Homeland* as a Puzzle

The opening sequence of season four of *Homeland*, which runs prior to every episode, is a montage of grainy footage superimposed with images of George W. Bush and Ronald Reagan addressing the nation after terrorist attacks, along with segments of the show. In the opening sequence to *Homeland*, Carrie is shown as a child with an animal mask,

inside the maze. This sequence foreshadows the coming show, in which she is virtually always manically trying to demystify and solve puzzles created by her earlier actions. Her imagination is fueled by images. The opening sequence also shows Carrie as a young woman growing up in a world dominated by images of terrorism. The show's producers have said that the "frenetic and crazy and off-setting "images are intended to evoke Carrie's disorder and were inspired by the pilot.[36] In this schizophrenic opening sequence of images Carrie appears as a young girl as she puts on the Minotaur's mask and goes into the labyrinth.[37]Later she is portrayed again in the maze as an adult in a dream like sequence.

In mythology, the image of the Minotaur was a creature with a human body and the head of a bull who dwelt at the center of labyrinth, an elaborate maze. The Minotaur was cursed as a child, given the body of a man and the head of a bull. The child grew to be an out-of-control adult. The beast was trapped and

kept in a labyrinth that it could not find its way out of. The labyrinth in *Homeland* is ideology, the belief system in which the characters find themselves entwined, a system of belief, drawn from the state of exception in the post-9/11 era. Ideology relies on representations of the imaginary and the 'relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence.'[38] Analysis of shows like *Homeland* can reveal the connection between imaginary representation and real conditions. However, ideology is inescapable because even its demystification depends on representations.[39]

The labyrinth of ideology is explored through the show's main character. As Sergio Dias Branco noted, "what moves Carrie? Not really the search for truth, but the quest for a confirmation of what she imagines to be true. Her imagination is fueled by images. Without them, she loses the capacity to imagine and make suppositions."[40] Carries' delirious extremes of paranoia are represented through her manic depressive episodes. Likewise, for the vast majority of U.S. Americans the fear of terrorism is-in a sense- imaginary.

Citizens of the U.S., *Homeland*'s target audience, have an exaggerated fear of terrorists.[41] According to one study, for example, 47-percent of U.S. citizens are worried that they or someone in their family will become victims of terrorism.[42] However, according to the Centers for Disease Control, U.S. citizens are much more likely to die from falling off a ladder (where the odds are 1 in 10,010) as opposed to being killed in a terrorist attack (where the odds are about 1 in 88,000).[43] Even in 2001, in the year of the 9/11 attacks, 15 times more U.S. citizens were killed in automobile crashes than terrorism. As Benjamin H. Friedman noted, "heart disease, cancer, and strokes are the leading causes of death in the United States-not terrorism."[44] He also insightfully stated that, "fear of terrorism is a bigger problem than terrorism."[45] This is the primary goal of terrorism, to evoke fear. That 'fear of terror' is more problematic than terrorism itself could certainly not be found as the central message of any one *Homeland* episode, but could be an underlying theme to the fourth season.

In addition to the imaginative realm of international terrorism, we should note that research from the Police Executive Research Forum indicates that terrorism in the U.S. from domestic right-wing groups is a greater threat than that from foreign advisories.[46] Right-wing extremists in the U.S. have caused a total of 254 fatalities averaging 337 attacks per year in the decade after 9/11.[47] Furthermore, in the past few years,

only a few actual foreign "terrorists "were arrested in the U.S.[48] Nonetheless, what has happened over the past decade, and is depicted more accurately in *Homeland* is the idea of terrorism and security as part of a radical reconfiguration of society and a rationale for the reconfiguration of human rights. Protection of the 'homeland' in the U.S. is part of a "radical ratcheting-up of surveillance and(attempted) social control along with endless 'terror talk', highly problematic clampdowns …potentially indefinite incarcerations, sometimes within extra-legal or extra-territorial camps, for those people deemed to display the signifiers of real or 'dormant' terrorists."[49] *Homeland* also exposes the complicated shift in the function of politics and war in the post 9/11 era. The show portrays a complexity in international relations, for example, where the U.S. is waging a war inside Pakistan, one of its allies. Understanding this complexity requires consideration of shifts in politics and power.

Hidden Points of Intersection: Power, Governance, & Terrorism

It's clear that *Homeland* is a contextual play on the post 9/11 era and the war on terror. We can say that society, politics, and culture in the early twenty first century need to be understood in relation to the war on terror and the emergence of security as the *raison d'état*.[50] Likewise, terror and security need to be understood in the context of sovereignty and power. This includes a shift in the justification of war from the conquest of land and resources to the protection and preservation of society.[51]

Perhaps no modern philosopher has been more prolific on the topics of sovereignty and power than Michel Foucault. Foucault's mid-career moved into the genealogy of *disciplinary power* to examine the *power of sovereignty*.[52] He examined disciplinary power as a normalizing agency and

constitution of the individual. This is explored throughout his corpus of work.[53]Initially the exploration of these themes led him to the institutional models used to situate and correct what is identified as abnormal or deviant. Foucault then moved his analysis from the genealogy of disciplinary power to the power of sovereignty.

Foucault examined how since the eighteenth century western societies have situated apparatuses of security as its essential technical instrument. He noted, that contemporary modes of governance are "set out between the political refusal of terrorism." [54] Foucault went beyond legal codes and disciplinary mechanisms to examine the function of 'mechanisms of security'.[55]

He claimed that,

> in a society where political authority, that is, the political party, responsible for defining both the country's characteristic form of economy and structures of sovereignty, is at the same time responsible for conducting individuals in their daily life through a game of generalized obedience that takes the form of terror, since terror is not when some command and strike fear into others. There is terror when those who command tremble with fear themselves, since they know that the general system of obedience envelops them just as much as those over whom they exercise their power.[56]

Claire Danes once alluded to this function of terror and obedience while describing her work as the main character in *Homeland.* "Carrie is perceptive," Danes stated, "but her fixation on keeping the world safe is so intense that it overrides that. She also has to be so vigilant in maintaining her own well-

being. She has a bomb ticking inside of her that she is always monitoring."[57]

In his analysis of security and terror, Foucault inverted Clausewitz's famous aphorism "war is no more than a continuation of politics, "to claim that, "politics is war continued by other means."[58] He made this inversion to note that politics are actually the mode through which the aims of war are pursued. He claimed that beneath the law, war continues to rage in all the mechanisms of power. [59] This analysis of power can be seen as an examination of the ethical and political dimensions of governmentality, or the internalization of power. [60] For Foucault, disciplinary technologies are strategies through which the normal order contains and confines 'the outside'.[61] In his analysis, it became clear that disciplinary technologies were insufficient for understanding the modes of power employed by modern nations. For Foucault "terror is not the culmination of discipline but its failure."[62] He reported,

> Wars are no longer waged in the name of a sovereign who must be defended; they are waged on behalf of the existence of everyone; entire populations are mobilized for the purpose of wholesale slaughter in the name of life necessity: massacres have become vital. It is as managers of life and survival, of bodies and the race, that so many regimes have been able to wage so many wars, causing so many men to be killed.[63]

Throughout much of the twentieth century, the discourse of war is articulated as racial antagonism and class struggle.[64] We can see this, for example, in World War II (WWII) and the Holocaust. The executive power infused in the Holocaust was predominately biopolitical in the sense that its justification was built on constructing one group as a biological threat to the populous, what we might call state racism.[65] Today, we see a

different mode of political power, and security as an all-encompassing rationale.[66]A CIA black ops agent in *Homeland*, Peter Quinn, during a briefing on the situation in Syria, stated about ISIS:

> They're gathering right now in Raqqa by the tens of thousands, hiding in the civilian population, cleaning their weapons, and they know exactly why they're there…. They call it the end times. What do you think the beheadings are about? The crucifixions… the revival of slavery? Do you think they make this shit up? It's all in the book. Their fucking book. The only book they ever read—they read it all the time. They never stop. They're there for one reason and one reason only: to die for the caliphate and usher in a world without infidels. That's their strategy, and it's been that way since the seventh century.[67]

Terrorists threaten the entire space of "civilization" where conflict between nations has become "banalized" (reduced to an object of routine police repression) and absolutized (as the enemy, an absolute threat to the ethical order).[68] This is seen throughout *Homeland*.

Whereas Foucault focuses on strategies through which the 'outside' was excluded, other theorists have looked at when the 'the outside' is included 'by the suspension of the juridical order's validity – by letting the juridical order withdraw from the exception and abandon it.'[69]A contemporary of Foucault, Giorgio Agamben took the analysis sovereignty beyond that of Foucault. Agamben sought to explore the 'vanishing point' to which 'perspective lines' converge a hidden point of intersection between the juridical-institutional and the bio-political models of power.[70]His work is a rethinking of the political, a consideration of how 9/11 reshaped legal rights over human life and the right to kill.[71]

Exception as the Rule: Exceptional Measures as Techniques of Governance

Homeland is a visual expression of a *state of exception,* an ideology providing justification for a legal apparatus, built around the ancient maxim of *necessities legend non habit* [necessity has no law].[72] The state of exception takes the legal form of what cannot have legal form or the suspension of law in times of crisis.[73] The war on terrorism, directly after September 11, 2001 can be seen as a 'state of exception'. For one, it's an approach to war that erases any legal status of the being. In October 2001, the U.S. Patriot Act for example, gave the attorney general the power to "take into custody" any alien suspected of activities that endangered "the national security of the United States."[74] However, the act still required that individuals be charged with violation of immigration laws or some other criminal offense. What was different was the legal status and identity of those captured under the act. The Taliban captured in Afghanistan and Pakistan, for example, do not enjoy the status of Prisoners of War (POW) as defined by the Geneva Convention nor the laws granted someone convicted of a crime in the U.S.[75] The war on terror abandons the living being to law, as it "binds and abandons" the individual to law[76] Agamben noted,

> What is new about President Bush's order is that it radically erases any legal status of the individual, thus producing a legally unnamable and unclassifiable being… Neither prisoners nor persons accused, but simply "detainees," they are the object of a pure de facto rule, of a detention that is indefinite not only in the temporal sense but in its very nature as well, since it is entirely removed from the law and from judicial oversight. The only thing to which it could possibly be compared is the legal situation of the Jews in the Nazi Lager [camps], who, along with their citizenship, had

lost every legal identity, but at least retained their identity as Jews. As Judith Butler has effectively shown, in the detainee at Guantanamo, bare life reaches its maximum indeterminacy.[77]

The show *Homeland* reveals that in U.S. Pakistani relations 'provisional and exceptional measures' have become transformed into 'a technique of government'.[78] The war on terror is a new kind of war with new legal formularies mobilized around it.[79] In *Homeland* Carrie personifies this power. She is not the only one to personify this power, but does so more intensely.[80] She demonstrates the recently justified power of U.S. government operatives to function with sovereign power. As Masood Ashraf Raja stated in the case of Pakistan, in the biopolitical sphere of a national state, it's "the threshold of life that distinguishes and separates what is inside and what is outside."[81]

Sovereignty is traditionally attached to life in two forms, known in Greek as Bios and Zoë. These two forms can be seen in relation to biological life.[82] 'Bare life' refers to basic physical life, bare because it is not adorned with forms of meaning derived from political recognition and representation.[83]Politically-recognized life is not 'bare', as it's adorned with forms of meaning derived from political recognition and representation.[84] The function of law and human rights is transitioning bare life to politically recognized life, subsequently turning bare and valueless life into valued life. This is the difference between a human bodily organism in its most basic form and being recognized as a citizen or 'human' in a moral sense. In the German concentration camps of WWII, a person killed under a forced 'euthanasia' regime, or the detainees at Guantanamo Bay, are all examples of people who have the first kind of life but not the second. They have 'bare life', but they are not recognized as having ethically significant life. They are people who can be tortured and killed

without the implications of legal recourse – without their deaths being viewed on the same level as a murder. Bare life is the 'animality' of humans, the point at which human and animal life becomes indistinguishable.[85] Masood Ashraf Raja argued that Pakistan since the 1970s, through an Islamic perception of the nation connected religion with Bios (the Muslims), "and thus had the capacity to exclude the minorities as Zoē by default."[86] However, in *Homeland*, one can see the relationship between nations as structured through the War on Terror with Bios (the U.S. CIA and counter terrorism forces) and the capacity to kill 'foreigners' and 'terrorists' as Zoē. This capacity to kill required a reconfiguration on international law.

The basis of power seen in *Homeland* represents the paradox that in political context of the juridical-constitutional grounds, or a state of exception, which takes the legal form of what cannot have legal form.[87] It is the suspension of law that abandons the living being to law. The first episode of *Homeland*'s fourth season titled *Drone Queen* reveals that a drone strike Carrie ordered, one intended to kill a Taliban leader was at a wedding, missing the intended target but killing 40 of his family members.[88] Right afterward we see a group of CIA staff singing happy birthday to Carrie. This depiction of hunting and killing human life is the interplay between representations and the schematic assembly of knowledge as the basis for the preservation and destruction of human life.[89] As Foucault claimed, "the principle underlying the tactics of battle-that one has to be capable of killing in order to go on living-has become the principle that defines the strategy of states."[90] The power that *Homeland* depicts in Pakistan is beyond the power to define, control, and correct.[91] The show reveals a power to kill outside the confines of law promoted - not in the direct protection of an individual- but one promoted in the defense of society.

Homeland is manifested in the tension at the limits of politics and the law, or in the imbalance between public law and political fact.[92] For the prisoners in Guantanamo-- bare life reaches is maximum indeterminacy.[93]In other words, there is a radical new form of human subjectivity, with unclassifiable beings. It is life moved outside the juridical order, life deemed unworthy of living. The same can be said of those classified as terrorists in Pakistan. These are individuals implicated in law without any necessary references to reality.[94]This situation is dependent on the representations of Pakistan through a 'discourse of danger' and the imaginative geographies, those central to *Homeland*.

In *Homeland,* as in U.S. foreign policy relative to Pakistan, beneath the law continues to rage in all the mechanisms of power.[95] Carrie's actions in Pakistan might be deeply personal, but they are only possible because they are supported by U.S. political power.[96] Likewise, as the war on terror becomes closer to a way of life than a traditional war, this acceptance is justified though the types of images and representations central to *Homeland*.

Conclusion

President Obama, who once praised *Homeland* as among his favorite shows during a recent visit to a mosque called for U.S. television shows to feature more Muslim characters "that are unrelated to national security."[97] Since September 11, 2001 there has been an absence of academic and cultural engagement between Western nations and Pakistan. The desire of the Pakistani people to engage culturally and educationally with the United States is evident.[98]Unfortunately, shows like *Homeland* and negative portrayals in the media have come to dominate the shared perception of two countries. These negative portrayals are captured in the show's content, imagery, and promotional material.

Returning to the promotional poster for season four of *Homeland*, the one where a red-cloaked Carrie wanders distressed among a sea of burqa-clad women, we find the Pakistani populace portrayed like the shadowy dangerous forest that Little Red Riding Hood wandered through before being accosted by the wolf. The story is meant to illustrate both innocence and vulnerability. One moral to the story of Little Red Riding Hood, is that you should never talk to strangers, or you might end up as dinner for a wolf. However, the danger posed by the stranger is manifested in the inability to distinguish real from perceived threats. This inability to differentiate real threats from perceived ones is an implicit and underdeveloped tension in *Homeland*. In one of the early episodes, Carries confronts a character that discovers her anti-psychotic medication shouting, "you know maybe it is all in my head, but you're in it now." [99] Perhaps, this is what *Homeland* should try more convincingly to convey to its viewers.

References

Adams, Tim. "Going Rogue." *The New York Times*, 2012.

Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998.

———. *State of Exception*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Ali, Rozina. "How "Homeland" Helps Justify the War on Terror." *The New Yorker*, December 20 2015.

Branco, Sergio Dias. "The Terror of Control: Surveillance and Imperialism in Homeland." In *Images of Terror, Narratives of (In)security: Literary, Artistic and Cultural Responses*: University of Lisbon, 2013.

Douglas, Mary. "Red Riding Hood: An Interpretation from Anthropology." *Folklore* 106 (1995): 1-7.

Dreyfus, Hubert, and Paul Rabinow. *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. 2nd ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Foucault, Michel. *Abnormal: Lectures at the College De France 1974-1975*. Lectures at the College De France 1974-1975. edited by Valerio Marchetti, Salomoni, Antonella Davidson, Arnold Ira. 1st ed. New York, NY: Picador, 2003.

———. *The Birth of Biopolitics*. Translated by Graham Burchell. Lectures at the Collège De France 1978-1979. edited by Michel Senellart New York: Palgrave 2008.

———. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. 1st ed. New York: Pantheon Books, 1977.

———. *The Government of Self and Others: Lectures at the College De France, 1982-1983* [in English; Translated from the French.]. Translated by Graham Burchell. edited by Arnold I. Davidson New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

———. *The History of Sexuality*. Translated by Robert Hurley. 1st ed. New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1978.

———. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège De France, 1977-1978*. New York, NY: Picador/Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

———. *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College De France 1975-1976*. Translated by David Macey. Lectures at the College De France 1975-1976. edited by Mauro Bertani and Alessandro Fontana. 1 ed. New York, NY: Picador, 2003.

Friedman, Benjamin. "Homeland Security." *Foreign Policy*, no. 149 (2005): 22-28.

Friedman, Benjamin H. "Managing Fear: The Politics of Homeland Security." *Political Science Quarterly* 126, no. 1 (2011): 77-106.

Gordon, Howard, and Alex Gansa. "Homeland." In *Season Four*: Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation, 2014.

Gould, Eric. "Main Titles up Close: Showtime's 'Homeland'." http://www.tvworthwatching.com/post/Main-Titles-Up-Close-Homeland.aspx.

Graham, Stephen. "Cities and the 'War on Terror'." *International Journal of Urban & Regional Research* 30, no. 2 (2006): 255-76.

Gregory, Derek, and Allan Pred. *Violent Geographies: Fear, Terror, and Political Violence*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2007.

Hameed, Mustafa, and Lee Ferran. "Department of 'Homeland' Controversy: Pakistan and Terrorism." *ABC News*, 2015.

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Horsman, Stuart. "Themes in Official Discourses on Terrorism in Central Asia." *Third World Quarterly* 26, no. 1 (2005): 199-213.

"Islamabad "a Grimy Hellhole and War Zone" in Homeland's Fourth Season." *Daily Pakistan Today*, 2014.

Jacobs, Jason. "Inner and Outer in Homeland." CST Online, http://cstonline.tv/inner-and-outer.

Jeong, Hyeseung, and Juliana Othman. "Using Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis from a Realist Perspective." *The Qualitative Report* 21, no. 3 (2016): 558.

Khalid, Salim Mansur, and M. Fayyaz Khan. "Pakistan: The State of Education." *Muslim World* 96, no. 2 (2006): 305-22.

Kurzman, Charles, and David H. Schanzer. "The Growing Right-Wing Terror Threat." *The New York Times*, June 16 2015.

Levine, Sam. "Obama: Muslims on Tv Deserve to Be Portrayed as More Than Just Terrorists." *The Huffington Post*, February 3 2016.

Locker, Melissa. "Pakistani Officials Really Didn't Like Homeland's Fourth Season." *Vanity Fair*, 2014.

Morton, Stephen, and Stephen Bygrave. *Foucault in an Age of Terror: Essays on Biopolitics and the Defence of Society*. New York: Palgrave 2008.

Nazir, Muhammad. "Democracy and Education in Pakistan." *Educational Review* 62, no. 3 (2010): 329-42.

"Pakistani Officials Displeased at Homeland's Portrayal of Pakistan." *Dawn*, December, 28 2014.

Raja, Masood Ashraf. "Neoliberal Dispositif and the Rise of Fundamentalism: The Case of Pakistan." *Journal of International and Global Studies* 3, no. 1 (2011): 21-31.

Roof, David J. "Problems of Common Interest: The Shaping of Education in Pakistan, 1970-2014." *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences* 9, no. 1 (2015): 35-51.

Rosenberg, Yair. "'Homeland' Is Anything but Islamophobic." *The Atlantic*, December 18 2012.

———. "Homeland Is Not Islamophobic Despite What Some Critics Claim." *The Guardian* December 23 2012.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. Vol. 1st, New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.

Schram, Jamie. "Pakistani Officials Furious over 'Homeland'." *New York Post*, 2014.

Smith, Jonathan A. , Paul Flowers, and Michael Larkin. *Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis: Theory, Method, and Research*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE, 2009.

David J. Roof & Sadaf Ali

Notes

[1]. Jamie Schram, "Pakistani Officials Furious over 'Homeland'," *New York Post*, December 27, 2014.

[2]. Melissa Locker, "Pakistani Officials Really Didn't Like Homeland's Fourth Season," *Vanity Fair* December 27, 2014.

[3]. Mustafa Hameed and Lee Ferran, "Department of 'Homeland' Controversy: Pakistan and Terrorism," *ABC News* January 2, 2015.

[4]. Ibid.

[5]. Rozina Ali, "How "Homeland" Helps Justify the War on Terror," *The New Yorker*, December 20 2015.

[6]. Sergio Dias Branco, "The Terror of Control: Surveillance and Imperialism in Homeland," in *Images of Terror, Narratives of (In)security: Literary, Artistic and Cultural Responses* (University of Lisbon, 2013).

[7]. Hameed and Ferran, "Department of 'Homeland' Controversy: Pakistan and Terrorism," 4.

[8]. Locker, "Pakistani Officials Really Didn't Like Homeland's Fourth Season."

[9]. Muhammad Nazir, "Democracy and Education in Pakistan," *Educational Review* 62, no. 3 (2010): 130-31.

[10]. Salim Mansur Khalid and M. Fayyaz Khan, "Pakistan: The State of Education," *Muslim World* 96, no. 2 (2006): 310.

[11]. David J. Roof, "Problems of Common Interest: The Shaping of Education in Pakistan, 1970-2014," *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences* 9, no. 1 (2015): 36.

[12]. Yair Rosenberg, "'Homeland' Is Anything but Islamophobic," *The Atlantic*, December 18 2012."Homeland Is Not Islamophobic Despite What Some Critics Claim," *The Guardian* December 23 2012.

[13]. Branco, "The Terror of Control: Surveillance and Imperialism in Homeland."

[14]. Howard Gordon and Alex Gansa, "Homeland," in *Season Four* (Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation, 2014).

[15]. Ibid.

[16]. Derek Gregory and Allan Pred, *Violent Geographies: Fear, Terror, and Political Violence* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2007), 45.

[17]. Jonathan A. Smith, Paul Flowers, and Michael Larkin, Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis: Theory, Method, and Research, (Los Angeles, CA: SAGE, 2009).

[18]. Hyeseung Jeong and Juliana Othman, "Using Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis from a Realist Perspective," *The Qualitative Report* 21, no. 3 (2016): 562.

[19]. Ibid.

[20]. This approach was adapted from the work of Hyeseung Jeong: ibid.

21. Ibid.

22. Stuart Horsman, "Themes in Official Discourses on Terrorism in Central Asia," *Third World Quarterly* 26, no. 1 (2005): 199.

23. Michel Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College De France 1975-1976*, ed. Mauro Bertani and Alessandro Fontana, trans. David Macey, 1 ed., Lectures at the College De France 1975-1976 (New York, NY: Picador, 2003), 68.

24. Mary Douglas, "Red Riding Hood: An Interpretation from Anthropology," *Folklore* 106(1995): 1.

25. Masood Ashraf Raja, "Neoliberal Dispositif and the Rise of Fundamentalism: The Case of Pakistan," *Journal of International and Global Studies* 3, no. 1 (2011): 24.

26. Ibid.

27. The concept of imagined (also often called imaginative) geographies has evolved out of the work of Edward Said, particularly his critique on Orientalism. In this term, "imagined" is used not to mean "false" or "made-up", but rather "perceived." Imagined geographies are mostly based on myth and legend, often depicting monstrous "others". Edward W. Said, *Orientalism*, vol. 1st (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978).

28. The concept of imagined (also often called imaginative) geographies has evolved out of the work of Edward Said, particularly his critique on Orientalism. In this term, "imagined" is used not to mean "false" or "made-up", but rather "perceived." Imagined geographies are mostly based on myth and legend, often depicting monstrous "others". Ibid

29. Gregory and Pred, *Violent Geographies: Fear, Terror, and Political Violence*.

30. Stephen Graham, "Cities and the 'War on Terror'," *International Journal of Urban & Regional Research* 30, no. 2 (2006).

31. Ibid., 255-56.

32. Ibid.

33. Ibid.

34. "Islamabad "a Grimy Hellhole and War Zone" in Homeland's Fourth Season," *Daily Pakistan Today* 2014.

35. "Pakistani Officials Displeased at Homeland's Portrayal of Pakistan," *Dawn*, December, 28 2014.

36. Eric Gould, "Main Titles up Close: Showtime's 'Homeland'," http://www.tvworthwatching.com/post/Main-Titles-Up-Close-Homeland.aspx.

37. Ibid.

38. Louis Althusser quoted in Branco, "The Terror of Control: Surveillance and Imperialism in Homeland," 3.

39. Ibid.

[40]. Ibid., 3.

[41]. Benjamin H. Friedman, "Managing Fear: The Politics of Homeland Security," *Political Science Quarterly* 126, no. 1 (2011): 83.

[42]. Ibid.

[43]. Benjamin Friedman, "Homeland Security," *Foreign Policy*, no. 149 (2005).

[44]. Ibid., 22.

[45]. Friedman, "Managing Fear: The Politics of Homeland Security," 78.

[46]. Ali, "How "Homeland" Helps Justify the War on Terror." Also, see: Charles Kurzman and David H. Schanzer, "The Growing Right-Wing Terror Threat," *The New York Times*, June 16 2015.

[47]. "The Growing Right-Wing Terror Threat."

[48]. Friedman, "Managing Fear: The Politics of Homeland Security," 79.

[49]. Graham, "Cities and the 'War on Terror'," 273.

[50]. Stephen Morton and Stephen Bygrave, *Foucault in an Age of Terror: Essays on Biopolitics and the Defence of Society* (New York: Palgrave 2008), 1.

[51]. Ibid., 4.

[52]. For example: Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan, 1st ed. (New York: Pantheon Books, 1977).

[53]. Hubert Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow, *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, 2nd ed. (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1983).

[54]. Michel Foucault, Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège De France, 1977-1978, (New York, NY: Picador/Palgrave Macmillan, 2009). 488.

[55]. Ibid.

[56]. Ibid., 267.

[57]. Tim Adams, "Going Rogue," *The New York Times*September 21, 2012.

[58]. Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College De France 1975-1976*.

[59]. Ibid., 1.

[60]. *The Government of Self and Others: Lectures at the College De France, 1982-1983*, ed. Arnold I. Davidson, trans. Graham Burchell (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 377.

[61]. Gregory and Pred, *Violent Geographies: Fear, Terror, and Political Violence*, 4.

[62]. Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège De France, 1977-1978*. 221.

[63]. *The History of Sexuality*, trans. Robert Hurley, 1st ed. (New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1978), 137.

[64]. *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College De France 1975-1976*, 68.

[65]. Giorgio Agamben, *State of Exception* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2005).

[66]. Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College De France 1975-1976*.

[67]. Peter Quinn quoted in: Ali, "How "Homeland" Helps Justify the War on Terror."

[68]. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2000), 6.

[69]. Gregory and Pred, *Violent Geographies: Fear, Terror, and Political Violence*, 4.

[70]. Agamben, *State of Exception*.

[71]. Morton and Bygrave, *Foucault in an Age of Terror: Essays on Biopolitics and the Defence of Society*.

[72]. Agamben, *State of Exception*.

[73]. Ibid., 1.

[74]. Ibid., 3.

[75]. Ibid.

[76]. Ibid., 1.

[77]. Ibid., 3-4.

[78]. Ibid.

[79]. Gregory and Pred, *Violent Geographies: Fear, Terror, and Political Violence*.

[80]. Branco, "The Terror of Control: Surveillance and Imperialism in Homeland," 2.

[81]. Raja, "Neoliberal Dispositif and the Rise of Fundamentalism: The Case of Pakistan," 27.

[82]. Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998).

[83]. Ibid.

[84]. Ibid.

[85]. Ibid.

[86]. Raja, "Neoliberal Dispositif and the Rise of Fundamentalism: The Case of Pakistan," 24.

[87]. Agamben, *State of Exception*, 1.

[88]. Gordon and Gansa, "Homeland."

[89]. Michel Foucault, *Abnormal: Lectures at the College De France 1974-1975*, ed. Valerio Marchetti, Salomoni, Antonella Davidson, Arnold Ira, 1st ed., Lectures at the College De France 1974-1975 (New York, NY: Picador, 2003), 309.

[90]. *The History of Sexuality*, 137.

---

[91]. *The Birth of Biopolitics*, ed. Michel Senellart, trans. Graham Burchell, Lectures at the Collège De France 1978-1979 (New York: Palgrave 2008), 151.

[92]. Agamben, *State of Exception*.

[93]. Ibid., 4.

[94]. Ibid., 36.

[95]. Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College De France 1975-1976*, 1.

[96]. Branco, "The Terror of Control: Surveillance and Imperialism in Homeland."

[97]. Sam Levine, "Obama: Muslims on Tv Deserve to Be Portrayed as More Than Just Terrorists," *The Huffington Post*, February 3 2016.

[98]. Roof, "Problems of Common Interest: The Shaping of Education in Pakistan, 1970-2014."

[99]. Jason Jacobs, "Inner and Outer in Homeland," CST Online, http://cstonline.tv/inner-and-outer.