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Introduction

The ‘war on terror’ has had implications for the legal dimension of citizenship through re-defining the legal status of citizens suspected of terrorist activity (Lyon 2007; Mueller 2004; Thomas 2009). Interestingly, what Pantazis and Pemberton (2012: 651) call the discursive ‘trades’ of the ‘freedoms of the ’minority’ or ‘Muslim Other’ for the protection of the ‘lawabiding majority’ have led to a reconfiguration of the evidence based criminal justice system. The actus reus is a notable absence in the pre crime logic of counter terrorism thereby meaning that individuals do not
have to commit a criminal act to be criminalised as the mens rea, the intention to commit a criminal act can lead to the criminalisation of an individual. ‘In the name of justice and democracy’ the existence of threats and risks of unprecedented levels have been used to contest the rights attributed to citizens under legislation such as the Human Rights Act 1998 (Hudson 2009: 702). Though making legitimate procedural law violations which under non counter terrorism legislation would constitute injustice, counter terrorism legislation has led to questions regarding police legitimacy, trust and policing by consent (Grabosky 2008; Klausen 2009). Counter terrorism policing reflects a form of policing where due process is not prioritised and this is of central importance given that due process prioritises fairness, justice and liberty – which are vital components of citizens’ legal status.

Within this context it is possible to contend that whereas traditionally as Turner (2009) notes, one of the principle markers of full citizenship rights has been the possession of a passport; it is now the case that even individuals with a passport are at risk of reduced citizenship, with the word citizen no longer simply separating ‘those who “belong” from those who do not’ (Faulkner 2003: 288). However, within the ‘war on terror’ the mere conceptualisation of those that belong and those that do not belong is not the only binary construction because as Rothe and Kauzlarich (2014: 9) argue ‘those swept up in mass raids seeking “terrorists” that end up in a black-hole such as Guantanamo or Abu Ghraib’ are labelled as criminals and not as victims of human rights abuse.

Although the focus of criminology on ‘structural violence’ has existed since the 1970s (Rothe and Kauzlarich 2014) it could be argued that the ‘war on terror’, with its inherent reframing of citizens’ rights will further increase the focus on state criminality and state institutions. A recent development within criminology
has been the exploration of the role of criminal justice institutions in shaping citizens’ identities and sense of belonging and attachment to their identities, with research by Millings (2013: 1075) exploring the role the police play in young British Asian men’s ‘negotiation of belonging and identity’. In summarising this relationship Millings (2013: 1090) argues, social institutions are important ‘mechanisms through which individuals and groups negotiate their sense of attachment to, or distance from, the state’. This relationship gives institutions power in shaping ‘the extent to which individuals feel their membership of (at an individual level) and recognition within (at a social group level) a coherent political community’.

The ‘war on terror’ and what Lyon (2007: 116) calls ‘new regimes of identity management’ have made the link between identity and policing one of the most notable features of ‘new terrorism’. It could be argued that due to the vast alteration of citizens’ legal rights within the ‘war on terror’ and states ‘inherent drive to fulfill their own selfinterest and not define harmful and problematic behavior as criminal (especially their own)’ (Rothe and Kauzlarich 2014: 6) there exists a need to use an alternative framework from which to define state harm and document state harm. There has been a lack of empirical groundwork which has explored citizens’ perceptions of their citizenship (Hussain and Bagguley 2005) and yet it is perhaps through going beyond identity and understanding the more intricate nuanced ways in which the state and the police have impacted Pakistani Kashmiri British Muslims’ loyalty, belonging and attachment to their various identities that it is possible to understand the interplay between perceived injustices, exclusion, marginalisation and radicalisation.
Legal status, belonging and attachment

Citizenship has been used to explore political participation, the social and economic conditions which shape citizenship and institutions that deliver citizenship rights (Hussain and Bagguley 2005; Nash 2009; Turner 2009). According to Bloemraad, Korteweg and Yurdakul (2003: 154) citizenship includes ‘legal status, rights, political and other forms of participation in society, and a sense of belonging’. Having their origins in the Enlightenment and the ‘language of rights’, and now forming ‘a central part of contemporary citizenship’ (Bloemraad, Korteweg and Yurdakul 2003: 155) the legal dimension of citizenship represents citizens’ legal status since with citizenship comes rights and the state has a duty to meet these rights (Nash 2009). In the contemporary era citizens’ rights are those rights which are guaranteed by constitutions such as the European Convention on Human Rights or by statutes such as the Human Rights Act 1998, with the international legal arena providing another mechanism through which states can be criminally liable and accountable for not maintaining citizens’ rights (Faulkner 2003; Rothe and Kauzlarich 2014).

This research draws on the framework of citizenship developed by Carens (2000: 162). Interestingly this conceptualisation of citizenship highlights that where the state, or apparatus of the state fail in providing citizens with their full citizenship rights then the legal dimension can negatively impact the psychological dimension of citizenship, which incorporates citizens ‘sense of emotional attachment, identification, and loyalty’ (Carens 2000: 166). In utilising this framework the study explored how the change to the legal dimension of citizenship in the ‘war on terror’ has impacted the psychological dimension of citizenship and thus related the actions of the state and the police to Pakistani...
Kashmiri British Muslims’ sense of identification, loyalty, belonging and attachment to their British identity and their Islamic identity (Carens 2000; McPhee 2005).

The creation of Islamic legal identities

The legal and political tenets of citizenship are based on categorisation and intervene in the lives of citizens through providing the legal and political framework in which citizens operate (Wetherell 2009). Through categorisation citizenship creates social divisions and social exclusion (Falkner 2003; Hussain and Bagguley 2005) which invariably impact citizens’ identities and their sense of belonging to their identities (Bloemraad, Korteweg and Yurdakul 2003; Carens 2000; Mcphee 2005; Hussain and Bagguley 2005). Thus, citizenship impacts belonging through defining identity and as Joppke (2007: 38) explains, citizenship as identity ‘refers to the behavioral aspects of individuals acting and conceiving of themselves as members of a collectivity’. The attacks of 9/11 fed into an existing discourse in which British Muslims were represented as ‘members of a “precarious transnational society”’, a society in which people want to ‘stone women’, ‘cut throats’, ‘be suicide bombers’, ‘beat their wives’ and ‘commit honour crimes’ (Kaya 2011: 10). The ‘war on terror’ has focused on Muslims’ Islamic identity and many of the citizens subjected to counter terrorism legislation have been Muslims (Travis 2009). It could be argued that in the ‘war on terror’ the state and the police have impacted Muslims’ Islamic identities through having the power to criminalize and influence the most important dimension of citizenship, the legal dimension and have therefore produced legal identities. According to Woodhead (2008: 55) ‘religious belonging may make life not only intellectually meaningful and morally
satisfying for its members, but emotionally resonant and practically live-able’. It is necessary to consider Muslims’ Islamic identity in order to contextualise this identity in terms of belonging and attachment and thus provide a framework in which changes to the institutional treatment of this identity can be understood.

Islamic identity is highly individualized and whereas for some Muslims, Islam is a cultural identity for others it is the centre of their life, informing how they live and every area of their life (Carens 2000; Mirza 2007). Thus ‘religious identity in Britain ranges from devout adherence to orthodox Islamic practice, to nominal affiliation, and is negotiated in complex, shifting and multi-faceted ways’ (Ansari 2005: 12). Just like any other identity, religion is a reactive identity, it has ‘the capacity to simmer and surface in the lives of individuals and groups over time. It can recede but also revive’ (Mitchell 2006: 1138). Deutsch (2006) refers to the relationship between the external portrayal of identity and subjective identity. Deutsch (2006) argues that oppressed groups are often under pressure to conform to and internalize the dominant group’s image of their group, leading to a double identity, one defined by the dominant group and the other coming from membership in one’s own group. There are variations of the extent to which a citizen conforms to their constructed image and the extent to which they internalize such an image. Concepts of resistance and domination highlight diversity, inter-individual differences and intra-individual differences. This research was concerned with Pakistani Kashmiri British Muslims’ resistance and thus ‘self determination’, as well as ‘domination’ (Jenkins 2000) of the labels applied by the state and the police. The next section explores how the selected methodology facilitated the aims of the study.
**Research and Methods**

The intersectionality of citizenship incorporates wider social conditions that Pakistani Kashmiri British Muslims might experience such as ‘social ostracism, discrimination, and denials of a right to identity’ (Rehman 2007: 831), more intricate forms of attachment to social and political communities (Millings 2013) and possible understandings of rejection and radicalisation, because as Young (2003: 400) states those who are otherised ‘create a hardening of themselves’… ‘in order to combat their humiliation and exclusion from society. The process of othering has, therefore, a self-reinforcing circularity’.

Research has explored the relationship between citizenship and British Pakistani’s multiple forms of identification including their British, Pakistani and/or Muslim identity (Hussain and Bagguley 2005) and similarly, research by Basith (2009) showed how young Britons identify themselves through nationality, religion, ethnicity and country of origin. The acknowledgement of various identities goes against the ‘criminology of the alien other which represents criminals as dangerous members of distinct racial and social groups which bear little resemblance to “us”’ (Garland 1996: 461). This study used a minority perspective approach (see Phillips and Bowling 2003); it did not seek to reinforce Pakistani Kashmiri British Muslims’ ‘otherness’ through highlighting the ‘Muslim’ in Pakistani Kashmiri British Muslims but rather through emphasising no identity in the questions participants were asked, provided a platform where the ‘British’ and the ‘us’ could also be articulated.

Britain’s Muslim population is 2.7 million, thereby making Islam the second largest religion in the UK (Census 2011). In terms of religion and ethnicity 91.4% of all British Muslims are British Pakistani (Census 2011). Whereas 4.8% of the
national population identify themselves as Muslims, 21.8% of the Birmingham population identify themselves as Muslims (Census 2011). Birmingham also has a high percentage of Pakistanis with 13.5% of the Birmingham population identifying themselves as Pakistani (ONS, 2009) and as Abbas (2006: 3) states, the vast majority of Birmingham’s Muslims are defined as ‘Pakistani (74%)’ predominantly originating from the Mirpur district of Azad Kashmir and the surrounding areas’. Birmingham has received much attention in the ‘war on terror’, with various book shops raided, homes raided and arrests under counter terrorism legislation.

In total 64 in depth semi structured interviews were conducted with Pakistani Kashmiri British Muslims from Birmingham and snowballing was found to be useful in helping to establish trust and rapport with participants. In depth interviews allowed participants to reveal their narratives in their own words and thus share their meaning and understanding of their identities (Dupont 2008; Hollway and Jefferson 2000). The interviews took place at the University, local community centres and in some cases participants’ homes.

Joppke (2007: 44) states ‘citizenship as identity has two possible meanings: the actual views held by ordinary people; and official views propagated by the state’. The findings revealed the interplay between these two meanings through highlighting the plethora of the interactions between the state / state institutions, citizenship, identities, belongings and attachments. The next section presents the findings of the study, exploring participants’ perceptions of the legal dimension of citizenship since the ‘war on terror’ and detailing how changes to the legal

---

1 All interviews were conducted in 2007, after the London bombings of 7 July 2005. The data is still highly relevant in terms of understanding British Muslims’ attachment to their various identities and although the data is from 2007, through relating the data to the concepts of attachment and belonging, this paper aims to make a contribution to non state centric criminological approaches to the ‘war on terror’. 
dimension of citizenship have impacted participants’ attachment and belonging to their British identity and Islamic identity.

**Deconstructing the legal dimension of citizenship: Legal rights, human rights and civil liberties**

The ‘war on terror’ has had severe implications for suspects’ civil liberties and human rights (Amnesty 2009; Liberty 2009). This section explores the diversity in participants’ perceptions of the legal dimension of citizenship through detailing the various facets of the dimension which were of concern to participants. Counter terrorism raids and systems of monitoring had led to very different experiences involving the police, with the preventive nature of counter terrorism legislation shaping participants’ perceptions of the police as Safia and Musarat explain.

> After September 11\textsuperscript{th}, things have changed I have seen places being raided and people are now scared. We believe that even though we have done nothing wrong the police will raid our shops at any time and they monitor us.

> One of my close relatives, he is a security guard and he helped the police to arrest a few people who were being very rowdy outside his club, and when the police took them, he went with the police to give a statement. And they kept him overnight because they had to do a check with Interpol to make sure he wasn’t on the wanted list. They took him in the morning, 1 or 2am and we didn’t see him until 7 pm the next evening,
we couldn’t communicate with him, we couldn’t talk to him, we couldn’t
do anything.

Bertram (2005: 78) argues that for individuals to have perceptions of justice and
moral status, an individual’s actions must determine their fate. The next quote by
Matloob highlights how individual autonomy is no longer perceived to exist.

My opinion of the police has completed changed before I trusted them. I
have had so many experiences with them since September 11th and it is
guilty until proven innocent now.

‘Victims may or may not be recognized as such by formal institutions of control’
(Rothe and Kauzlarich 2014: 9) and thus ‘loss cannot be worked through when
there is no public recognition or discourse through which it might be named and
mourned’ (Butler 1997: 139). The state manufactured culture of the ‘war on terror’
conceptualises measures which would constitute injustice as legitimate with the
legitimisation of inequality repressing some participants’ feelings of injustice as
Nabeela explains.

If we were to complain and say this is what they did who is going to
take our word against the police? They are going to protect the police
first and then us.

‘Equality before the law is regarded as an aspect of equal citizenship’ (Gearty 2004:
63). The deprivation of legal rights and due process, how the state has responded
to previous forms of terrorism and the criminalisation of an Islamic identity contributed to perceptions of inequality, as Nabeela, Rafia and Musarat explain.

I think the police have been trained to be harsh and target the Muslim community. I have seen it and people say to me, you can't fight the system, keep your head down and do what you have been told to do, but I say fight the system where is the justice?

You have people who talk about Islamic extremists, Islamic fundamentalists, a fundamentalists is a fundamentalist and a terrorist is a terrorist they didn't call the Irish the Protestant terrorists or the Christian terrorist they said it's the IRA. And you didn't see their religion as the important thing they were fighting for so for me it's a way of labelling and terrorising people.

After 9/11 my son was driving very slowly in the traffic, it was 5 o clock traffic and he had my daughter sitting there, he had picked her up from work. The police followed him and he said to my daughter look the police are following me, the police came to our house and my daughter ran out the car because she didn’t want the police near her. They made him open his boot, they searched his boot, before 9/11 they wouldn’t have done that, they then searched him they body searched him, and I got a bit angry and I said he wasn’t speeding and he said Mum it doesn’t matter. And I said no, he wouldn’t do that to a white man, he wouldn’t body search him.
Most participants referred to the fear associated with their Islamic identity and the fear associated with ‘black’ communities, arguing that the greater the constructed level of fear and risk, the greater the level of discrimination, as Mazar highlights.

There’s another stream of discrimination developing around Muslims because this form of racism that impacts Muslims is very different, there was no real threat from the black community or the Indian community to mainstream society but Muslims are seen as a threat, as a danger within.

This section has demonstrated how since the ‘war on terror’ participants no longer perceive the same legal rights as non Muslim citizens and therefore they believe they have a reduced legal status. Inequality was perceived to exist for many different reasons and due to this it could be argued that participants are ‘marginal citizens’, ‘who have full citizenship rights but who nevertheless do not enjoy full citizenship status’... ‘socially, by racism’ (Nash 2009: 1073). The next section explores the impact of perceptions of marginal citizenship on participants’ sense of belonging and attachment to their British identity and therefore the psychological dimension of citizenship.

**To belong or not to belong: British identity**

Carens (2000: 162) argues that people have multiple memberships within the legal, political and psychological dimensions which ‘interact with each other in complex ways’. This section explores how the legal dimension of citizenship
impacted the psychological dimension and therefore participants’ ‘sense of emotional attachment, identification, and loyalty’ to their various identities (Carens 2000: 166). The study revealed that participants have expectations that the state will maintain equality and the freedom and liberty which have been constructed as being synonymous with British identity. Perceptions that these expectations have been violated impacted the pride associated with British identity and attachment to this identity as Mazar and Rafia explain.

I always believed society was based on freedom and how they have overcome that and restricted and mistreated other people and damaged the very fundamental beliefs society was based on.

I think they have shamed our country because I believe I am part of this country I think we had real respect around the world, we had high standards, people saw this country as a country with morals and standards and it didn’t matter who you were, when you came to England you became equal to everyone else so for me the government has lost all that. The best thing in the world was to be able to say I’m British. When you went to Pakistan you were proud to say I’m British and now I feel really tainted by it and I don’t think the people in the government represent our view.

Citizenship places a duty on the state and highlights that where the state or apparatus of the state fail in these duties then citizens’ loyalty, sense of justice and belonging will be impacted (Carens 2000; Nash 2009; McPhee 2005). The research
revealed that after 9/11 Islamic identity had been constructed as being incompatible with British identity and together with perceptions of inequality within the legal dimension of citizenship, led to participants feeling that Britain is no longer their home, as Safia and Younis explain.

After September 11th for the first time perhaps we have certain beliefs existing like Muslims are killers, believe in a bad violent religion and cannot fit into Britain and live in this country.

The incidents have me very bitter and feel very unsafe. I now have feelings that I never thought I would and I do seriously think sometimes that I should just go back to Pakistan. Now this is something that I never thought I would feel, but I do and it hurts having to think like this because before September 11th I wanted to spend the rest of my life here and felt like I was part of this country.

Risk, intolerance, fear and terrorism led participants to believe they are no longer accepted in Britain and are powerless to change the fear associated with their Islamic identity as Azmat and Zulfiguar explain.

I have now realised just how helpless we, we are helpless when it comes to changing people’s opinions and views of us and this has made me feel that I can no longer call this country my own.
I think if you put the question differently and said to people, ‘do you think the UK would be safer without Muslims’, most would reply with a yes and this speaks volumes.

The interviews also revealed how belonging to an identity and feeling attached to an identity is actually a process and therefore how perceptions of unequal citizenship not only produce a sense of detachment in the present context but also concerns regarding future belonging, as Maria explains.

Before when our parents came into this country there was racism and they felt it and after a while when we were growing up, we had a bit of racism but we got on and lived with it but you know our youngsters, now say like my daughter, who is nine and I think they are going to have an even harder time because the young generation that’s growing up with them is so brainwashed with the media that how are they going to adjust so are we going back fifty years? So instead of moving forward we have moved back because these young children they are going to grow up and they will be the next officers.

The introduction of counter terrorism legislation has led participants to perceive marginal citizenship (Nash 2009) and a severe sense of detachment whereby although all participants were born in Britain, almost half felt that they could no longer call Britain home. The police have an enormous amount of power to condition participants’ perceptions of human rights and legal rights. In this way the police have a unique role to play in how the three dimensions of citizenship
interact and it is through the police that not only can the psychological dimension of citizenship be damaged, but so can participants' sense of belonging and attachment to their British identity.

**The sacred nature of Islamic identity**

Through producing identity categories the state has a tremendous impact on individuals' conception of themselves (Skerry 2000). The ‘war on terror’ has changed participants' relationship with the state and the police through redefining the identity categories associated with participants and through doing so has impacted participants' perceptions of belonging to their other identities, notably their ethnic, and/or British identity. Prior to discussing how the ‘war on terror’ has impacted participants’ Islamic identity, it is worth noting the significance of belonging to this identity. Carens (2000) remarks on the diversity of Islam stating how for some Muslims, Islam is merely a cultural identity. Participants spoke about how their religious identity is different from their other identities because it represents faith and is a personal identity which interacts with individual agency as Bilal and Mohammad explain.

Religion because it is your faith, it is something you honour and are devoted to and when someone is trying to take that liberty away it's heart breaking.

Religion hurts more, because religion is something that is personal to someone, even though many people read the Quran their understanding is personal and everyone has certain values that they
pick up from the religion and are personal to them, so it becomes a personal attack on the individual, its more than culture because culture only affects the society you are in or something you do in an certain way.

For participants the ‘war on terror’ had led to an intra Asian differentiation, leading to a greater sense of marginalisation and intolerance with Islamic identity being the primary signifier of difference and therefore producing a Muslim - non Muslim binary in society, as Mazar and Jangir explain.

It’s all these people, whether they are from African or Caribbean background or whether you’re from a white background or Indian background, it’s all collectively seeing Muslims as separate and distinct and to be worried and feared.

I think society has become a lot more intolerant of difference. First they were like we don’t care, you do your own thing and we don’t mind but then people go and blow themselves up and drive planes into buildings it gives people who are always on the fringe, the right, it gives them a voice, it gives them a platform, and power and they have exploited it.

Islamophobia and marginalisation have been identified as ‘pull’ factors which contribute to the radicalisation of British Muslims (Barnes 2006; Silke 2008). The research demonstrated how participants perceive a greater sense of marginalisation because discrimination and othering is based on the identity that
is perhaps the most sacred identity they possess and further an identity which dismisses inter ethnic / cultural commonality through prioritising religion.

**The reactive nature of Islamic identities**

This final section considers the diversity amongst participants through exploring the different ways in which the ‘war on terror’ has positively and negatively impacted participants’ sense of belonging and attachment to their Islamic identity. According to McPhee (2005) an attack on an aspect of identity can lead to this identity taking over the entire identity of the person, with expressions of this identity being liberating and / or the attack leading to feelings of togetherness and therefore strengthen community identity. The research revealed that the state introduction of counter terrorism legislation not only impacted participants’ attachment and belonging to their British identity but also their sense of attachment and belonging to their Islamic identity. All participants identify with their Islamic identity to a greater extent because it is this identity that the ‘war on terror’ has highlighted and further, since the ‘war on terror’ it is through this identity that experiences of exclusion and discrimination exist as Matloob and Musarat explain.

Islam has become more important to me because I now see myself as a Muslim and not an Asian person. Before we were seen as Asian but now we are seen as Muslims and this part of our identity has become really significant for other people first and then this has made us change the way we see ourselves. I do feel proud to say that I am a Muslim and try to do my duty and tell people what Islam is about.
The incidents have made me stronger and now I do take more of an interest in the Muslim community, simply because if you know what is going on, you then know what your position is. What I think it did was it made me realise that I was a Muslim, before I thought of myself as a British Asian, but I realised that people looked at me as a Muslim that’s the major impact and you know after 2001 people started to show their prejudice towards me being a Muslim. I think I’ve said that previously I was just an Asian or a Pakistani but now it didn’t matter what colour I was, if I was a Muslim I was targeted for following my religion more than my colour. It definitely made my identity stronger.

The external labelling and categorisation of Pakistani Kashmiri British Muslims has impacted participants’ labelling and understanding of their own identities. Interestingly due to Islam being such a core part of the ‘war on terror’, many participants explained how the ‘war on terror’ had actually made them want to know more about Islam and made this identity stronger, as Zulfiguar and Sikander explain.

It made my religious identity stronger and tested my faith because it would be very easy for me to change what I wear, so that I do not get the looks and so on but I found that was something I was unable to do and instead I became prouder of my faith and of who I am.
After Sep 11th I became more aware of my Muslim identity, before I had always defined myself in terms of ethnicity.... I felt that I had to know more about my religion.

The study demonstrated how identities are reactive and how important perceived legal status, recognition and external labelling are to identities and citizens sense of attachment and belonging to their identities. The ‘war on terror’ has facilitated religious belonging through participants wanting to learn more about Islam, which as Woodhead (2008: 55) suggests, can make life ‘morally satisfying for its members’. Some participants vocalised their reactive Islamic identity as incorporating practising Islam more and learning about the spiritual importance of Islam as Rafia and Shafquat explain.

I have a speech prepared as to why we cover up and why we don’t cover up and when I meet new people I expect them to come up with these questions. I can see that people want to ask certain things but don’t know how to. So you do feel like you have to justify, explain and defend and no other group would have to answer the kind of questions we do. It’s made me more proud of my faith. I’ve read up more and become more practising than I was and I will make sure I sit down and talk to my sons unlike my Mum, who never had the time. So it’s made my faith stronger and it’s become stronger in my life. I am like a defender of my faith when I meet people I explain my religion, give them a whole ethos whereas before I would have said I’m Muslim, and this is what I believe in, why we pray.
I think it’s more important I’ve taken more time to learn about it, as a child my father used to pray five times a day, when you’re young you learn about the practical side but now I’m learning about the spiritual side, I’ve taken it upon myself to learn. You know reading namaz can get very ritual you go and perform the actions and done. But what is it suppose to mean? It’s not suppose to mean standing there it’s meant to mean a connection and I’ve only learned that now, it’s only after, well post 9/11 that I’ve become aware of what Islam is really about, well I’ve become more aware of what it’s about from the spiritual perspective and not just the ritualistic perspective.

The above data demonstrates the politicisation of Islamic identity in how the outside socio political context shapes inner understandings of identity. For a few participants the expression of their Islamic identity was about resisting the negativity associated with Islam as Musarat explains.

If I walk into a meeting with my black scarf I mean everybody is looking at me and now it is about Islam which is why white Muslims are also suffering abuse. But it is discriminating and if you walk in no one will look at you, and the meeting I had today, everybody was looking at me. My husband said don’t wear black today there will be many people there, I said no, let them learn the colour black has become an Islamic colour and if you wear it you somehow, well black has become a terrorists colour, but I don’t care, I’m going to walk anywhere I want
with my black clothes on why should I care..... I said to my husband I’m not going to change my scarf because it’s convenient for other people.

Of interest is how Musarat believes black has become synonymous with terrorism and therefore her expression of her Islamic identity is as much about resistance, as it is about belonging and attachment. This section has demonstrated how for some participants the negative discourse associated with their Islamic identity has had a positive influence on their life, leading them to experience a growing sense of attachment and belonging to their Islamic identity.

However, some participants felt that the ‘war on terror’ has had a negative impact on their attachment to their Islamic identity. Of interest is how some participants, due to believing that the politicised construction of their Islamic identity could be resisted, not only maintained but asserted their Islamic identity more, whereas for other participants the dominant group’s image of their Islamic identity was perceived as being so powerful that they did not think this construction could be resisted. Some participants believed that Pakistani Kashmiri British Muslims should move towards demonstrating a greater attachment and belonging to their national identity. What is of interest is how these participants, like Bilal cited oppression and marginalisation as the reasons for this, rather than an increased feeling of attachment to their British identity.

I feel disadvantaged in the sense that I can’t grow a beard and go anywhere. I could grow a beard but then at the same time I would have to put up with people saying things to me, I would have to put up with
potentially being stopped by the police, potentially people saying things
and throwing things at me.

Carens (2000: 141) states that Islam constitutes for many of its members,
‘something from which they cannot and do not wish to distance themselves’. The
‘war on terror’ and its perceived implications for justice and marginalisation have
led a few participants, like Matloob to believe that although their Islamic identity
has become their primary identity they should assimilate at the expense of their
Islamic identity.

We have to do what we need to do to be accepted in this country
because this country is not our country, and if you can’t do the right
things then you need to leave the country, there are mosques and if you
want to go and pray, you pray but these people, I can’t believe they
want to show they are different, because if we are different, we have to
go back. We have to follow them and not them follow us.

And finally, some participants believed that the ‘war on terror’ has demonised
their Islamic identity to such an extent that they have restricted their children’s
right to show their Islamic identity in the public sphere. Mazar explains how he
believes disadvantage is associated with maintaining a visible Islamic identity in
the public sphere.

Absolutely, it worries me, I’m 50 and it doesn’t matter one way or
another because I think I’ve lived most of my life but I worry about my
children and how it’s going to impact them so much so that one of my
daughters wanted to wear a scarf and she goes to college and I said no,
and I actually constrained her rights because for her own good and
she’s pleased that I did that now but back then she said but dad it’s my
choice and I said no because you’re going to be treated differently.

The ‘war on terror’ has impacted participants’ sense of belonging and attachment
to their Islamic identity in many different ways and this demonstrates the diversity
doing Pakistani Kashmiri British Muslims. Interestingly, through considering
belonging and attachment, what has emerged from the empirical investigation is
how the participants that perceived the most fear and negative consequences were
the ones that advocated assimilation and demonstrating a greater belonging and
attachment to British identity in the public sphere. According to the research
conducted Islamophobia is perceived as a much more exclusionary and painful
form of racism, therefore negatively impacting Pakistani Kashmiri British Muslims’
interactions with non Muslims and invariably this could feed into the process of
radicalisation through making British Muslims feel detached from society and thus
internalising their position as the ‘other’.

**Conclusion**

The study revealed how identities and feelings of belonging and attachment are
conditioned by contextual factors, including perceptions of legal status and
experiences involving the police. Through considering the inter linkage of these
themes it has been shown how the ‘war on terror’ is actually alienating Pakistani
Kashmiri British Muslims and therefore likely to contribute to radicalisation and
produce a generation of Pakistani Kashmiri British Muslims increasingly susceptible to carrying out acts of terrorism. It has been through considering belonging and attachment in relation to participants’ British identity and Islamic identity that the process of alienation can be understood and indeed examined as a process. When participants voiced their sense of detachment from their British identity what was clearly evident was how this process was perceived as being forced, thereby signifying that where participants feel a sense of detachment from their British identity, this isn’t through choice, but rather the reduced rights legitimised in counter terrorism legislation and policing. In this way the legal dimension of citizenship is instrumental in shaping Pakistani Kashmiri British Muslims’ perceptions of belonging and attachment, because the law and indeed the police convey the extent to which citizens can belong.

The research demonstrated how participants have expectations of the state and where the state is perceived to have gone against these expectations, then this has impacted participants’ feelings of belonging and attachment to their British identity. Therefore it appears that participants are pressed to show their loyalty to their British identity with the state advocating assimilation, yet it is also the state that has created the structural conditions whereby participants believe they cannot prioritise their British identity because they do not have the same legal status as non Muslim British citizens. The data revealed that the greater the perception of inequality, especially where the legal dimension of citizenship was concerned, the greater the negative impact on the psychological dimension of citizenship and participants’ feelings of belonging, loyalty and attachment to both the state and their British identity.
The ‘war on terror’ has evolved with groups with the Taliban and the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) having immense power and resources to carry out acts of terrorism. The recent attacks in Paris on 12 January 2015 and attacks on a school in Pakistan on 16 December 2014 have demonstrated the ideology of these groups to commit violence against any individual that does not agree with their interpretation of Islam. There is recognition that Syria is the biggest threat to UK security due to its capacity to radicalise British Muslims and an estimated 350 British citizens have visited Syria (Contest 2014; Security Service 2014). ISIL have made the ‘war on terror’ much more difficult to fight through providing a geographical territory where individuals that are in the process of being radicalised can go and train. Vulnerability describes factors and characteristics associated with being susceptible to radicalisation (House of Commons 2012) and the internalisation of the ‘other’, as well as the rejection of a British identity are factors which contribute to the radicalisation process. Radicalisation is not merely about identity but about belonging and therefore it is essential that British Muslims’ perceptions and experiences of the state, state institutions, their rights and place in Britain are such that they facilitate a greater attachment and belonging to their British identity and one that is compatible with their Islamic identity. Where individuals perceive rejection they are much more likely to no longer feel a sense of belonging to their British identity and thus loyalty to this identity and therefore travel to countries such as Syria in search of that belonging.

The empirical investigation elucidated how the ‘war on terror’ has impacted participants’ attachment and belonging to their Islamic identity in different ways. For some participants the ‘war on terror’ has made their Islamic identity
significant through providing them with the impetus to explore their Islamic identity, thus demonstrating how the socio-political context shapes the meaning of an Islamic identity. The data revealed how due to some participants perceiving that their Islamic identity has been politicised in the ‘war on terror’, they felt that expressions of this identity were liberating and empowering. However other participants felt that Pakistani Kashmiri British Muslims should restrict the visibility of their Islamic identity is the public sphere. The diversity of responses amongst participants demonstrates the importance of construction and how an identity is constructed is perhaps more significant in determining the expression of that identity than the subjective interpretation of that identity.

One of the notable weaknesses of the study was the focus on Pakistani Kashmiri Muslims from Birmingham and therefore future research could explore other ethnicities and localities since the research was conducted in Birmingham. The ‘war on terror’ necessitates that non state centric approaches are pursued and has therefore accelerated the need for critical criminologists to use concepts through which state harm can be explored and documented. This study has demonstrated the value of concepts of belonging and attachment to unmasking the often invisible harms that dominant approaches to criminological research can fail to uncover and as the ‘war on terror’ continues, it will be through widening the parameters through which harm is explored that it will be possible to understand the harm that has resulted from citizens being marginalised, demonised and criminalised in the ‘war on terror’.
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