The State of Emergency at Home

House Arrests, House Searches, and Intimacies in France

Flora Hergon

■ **ABSTRACT:** This article focuses on the massive house searches and house arrests that occurred during the state of emergency in France between 2015 and 2017. It draws from critical studies on counterterrorism as well as sociology of the intimate to analyze the aftermath of these measures on the Muslim households that experienced these procedures without being sentenced afterward. It examines how house arrests and searches redefine the respondents' relationships to their domestic space and local environment as these places become spaces of fear, surveillance, discipline, and self-control. The analysis reveals a set of embodied and discursive strategies to prove an innocence that implies a reappropriation of state categories around social integration and the promotion of an acceptable and non-suspect religiosity.

■ **KEYWORDS:** discipline, domesticity, emotions, integration, intimate, religion, security, suspect

Between November 2015 and October 2017, 4,469 house searches were conducted and 754 house arrests were ordered in France.¹ These measures were implemented in the context of the state of emergency declared after the terrorist attacks in Paris on 13 November 2015.² Searches and house arrests targeted subjects suspected of having a “dangerous behavior that constitutes a threat for public order and security.”³ It mainly concerned Muslim or considered-to-be Muslim subjects who were suspected of religious “radicalization”⁴ and were already under surveillance or reported by relatives, neighbors, colleagues, or public authorities as potentially dangerous after 13 November.⁵ The article more specifically focuses on the 4,181 house searches and 647 house arrests ordered during the first year of the state of emergency.⁶ These searches resulted in 20 investigations for criminal conspiracy in matters relating to terrorism and 41 procedures for acts of apology for terrorism.⁷ Additionally, 93 individuals remained under house arrest in December 2016.⁸ Considering the significant disparity between the number of implemented measures and the small number of resulting legal procedures, some could argue that such procedures were nevertheless necessary to update intelligence services and neutralize the individuals, who cannot be charged of criminal activity but remain suspect in the eyes of state institutions. In this perspective, legal sentences would not be the only result to evaluate the efficiency of the state of emergency.

In order to overcome the debate focused on the efficiency or dysfunction of the state of emergency in countering terrorism, this article offers a sociological analysis of the intimate impacts on targeted subjects who were not legally charged afterward. These two measures had never been so massively used in French metropolitan territory before 2015. The article argues

for a multiscale approach to these unprecedented measures that both operate through a control of houses. It starts from a focus on the domestic scale to an analysis of the impacts on respondents' emotions and bodies as well as their subjectivities. It more specifically examines the modification of self-presentation and behavior in public spaces as well as subjects' representations regarding citizenship and religiosity. I argue that this analysis offers a new perspective on how these exceptional measures are situated at the intersection between coercive and preventive procedures that lead to a blurry distinction between security policies and a narrowing of the definition of an "acceptable Islam" in the secular context of France.

The results presented here are based on formal, recorded, and repeated interviews with ten subjects who experienced a house arrest or a house search in 2015 or 2016 and who were not subsequently convicted. The interviews were conducted in the period between 2018 and 2020. They are part of an ongoing PhD research project in sociology on the enactment and the contestation of these two measures. It interrogates both the role and interpretation of institutional actors related to these procedures and subjects who were directly or indirectly—including relatives and the neighborhood—concerned by them.

Considering the sensitive, and potentially intrusive, nature of such conversations, I took great care to avoid making respondents feel interrogated or surveyed. The meetings were organized in safe places with wide, open-ended questions. Some respondents showed initial mistrust to my research and to me, a situation that for some highlighted the fear of being misled or suspected again. I discussed my background and the ethical reasons for my research at length with them. Once respondents agreed to participate in the study, long interviews eventually allowed us to establish relations of trust and for respondents to open up on their experiences and feelings during and following the house search or the house arrest. Several informants compared our discussions with therapy sessions, as they can become a moment to claim recognition, self-assertion, and empowerment (Clair 2016; Grard 2008).

This article aims to offer an in-depth analysis of how counterterrorism differently impacts citizens, beyond usual public policy or state-centric approaches. I begin by situating the state of emergency in the context of the evolution of counterterrorism in France. First, I draw on literature that analyzes the broadening of the "suspect" category (Ragazzi 2016) and the resulting increasing control and management of Muslim activities in the name of counterterrorism and counter-radicalization (Blackwood et al. 2016; Heath-Kelly 2017). This examination of an overlap between security and the narrower definition of an acceptable Islam (Lambert 2008) is further complemented by a focus on counter-radicalization in France (Sèze 2019), given its specific secular context (Fernando 2014; Jouanneau 2017). Considering the colonial genesis of the state of emergency (Thénault 2007), I interrogate the function of the state of emergency, not as necessarily exceptional and unprecedented (Bigo and Bonelli 2018) but as a set of administrative measures (Hennette-Vauchez 2019) located at the intersection between hard (coercive) and soft (preventive) counter-terrorism (Ragazzi 2016). This observation leads to the literature that updates Paddy Hillyard's concept of the "suspect community" (1993). While the risk of using this concept is to homogenize a single "Muslim suspect community" (Greer 2010; Pantazis and Pemberton 2009), I rather rely on literature that analyzes how being part, or feeling to be part, of a "suspect community" affects representations, behaviors, and emotions (Choudhury and Fenwick 2011; Jarvis and Lister 2013; Ragazzi et al. 2018). This approach of security policies through the lens of experience therefore explains my second theoretical section on the intimate. This concept encompasses privacy, informality, the personal, feelings, attachments, and emotions (Mountz and Hyndman 2006) beyond domesticity itself (Wilson 2012). I explain how the intimate refers to a normative concept given that different ways of life are historically classified along gender and racial norms (Stoler 2010). I also define its interactional dimension since the

intimate relies on the ability to control the gaze of others (Laé and Proth 2002; Thalineau 2002). Finally, I explain how the intimate is embodied, that is to say, how it materializes through the body and its affects (Ahmed 2014).

Drawing on this conceptualization, the empirical analysis is divided into two main sections. In the first, I analyze how the very event of a house search and a house arrest operate through the redefinition of domesticity. On the one hand, house searches constitute a coercive control of religiosity and privacy, which relates to the overlap between these administrative security measures and the control of religious norms. On the other hand, house arrests redefine domesticity as a quasi-carceral space. Because house searches and house arrests disrupt domesticity, they necessarily lead to a long-lasting modification of social relations and identities in- and outside the household. That is why the second empirical section deals with the period after the event of house searches and house arrests, beyond the domesticity scale. I analyze how these intrusive procedures produce a new set of embodied emotions including fear, anxiety, and depression. The analysis of these emotions clarifies how hypervisibility and suspicion after a search or a house arrest lead to changing experiences of respondents' mobility and self-presentation in public spaces. Changes in appearance—including adjustments of religious signs—refer to a disciplinization in order to cope with suspicion and emphasize an innocence (Sayad 1999). Finally, I focus on respondents' discourses and analyze their counternarrative on the reasons for their search or house arrest. However, these discourses do not exclusively focus on countering the specific criteria that make them suspect in the eyes of state representatives. Instead, the interview becomes a larger medium to highlight respondents' patriotism and everyday citizenship (Jarvis and Lister 2013) as well as a compatibility between Islam and liberal values. In doing so, informants reappropriate state categories on suspicion, secular and liberal norms, in order to differentiate themselves from the suspect label (Appleby 2010) and to denounce everyday suspicion around Islamic features. The article therefore sits at the intersection between critical studies on counterterrorism and sociological analysis focused on the enactment and experiences of security policies, through an intimate spectrum.

The State of Emergency and the Intimate

Between Hard and Soft Counterterrorism: The Broadening of the “Suspect” Category?

Counterterrorist policies have been accumulating in France since the 1980s in order to adapt to new forms of attacks (Alix and Cahn 2017; Bonelli 2008). However, “hard counterterrorism”—that is, repressive judicial and administrative measures such as “stop and search,” longer pre-charge detention, raids—has been progressively supplemented by a “soft counterterrorism” based on anticipatory surveillance, detection, and awareness programs on radicalization (Gouville 2017; Ragazzi 2016). Although in France such programs were implemented a few years after the United Kingdom, United States, and the Netherlands, they present similar preventive patterns, especially based on “radicalization signs” and the diversification of actors—from police services to fellow citizens (Blackwood et al. 2016)—charged with detecting “risky” everyday behaviors (Ragazzi 2016: 733). Literature on counter-radicalization programs have observed the resulting broadening of the “suspect” category that more and more implies a control on religious behaviors than on strictly illegal activities.⁹ This evolution consequently narrows the conception of an “acceptable” Islam (Lambert 2008), which must fulfill republican expectations in France (Fernando 2014; Jouanneau 2017). Indeed, the secular context in France officially implies a non-intervention of state actors in religious affairs. Yet, the progressive overlap between counter-radicalization programs and the control and management of religious activities—in schools,

workplaces, mosques, or in domestic spaces as studied here—redefines a “more intrusive” *laïcité* (Sèze 2019: 171), which participates in the definition of religious norms and values in the name of national security.

In this overlapping context, the literature updated Hillyard’s concept of the “suspect community” (1993) to analyze the effects of counter-radicalization policies on Muslim communities in Western contexts (Pantazis and Pemberton 2009). While the risk of using this concept is to homogenize a single “Muslim community” (Greer 2010), here I draw on Francesco Ragazzi’s reflection to focus on “the performative character of these state policies on Muslim identities. By ‘performative,’ I mean that these studies imply that state practices have a direct influence on how Muslims both perceive themselves and are perceived by the rest of society” (2016: 725). Indeed, this article addresses the changes of the representations and practices of subjects who have been targeted as “suspect” by public authorities and who consequently perceive themselves as part of this subgroup of suspects (Breen-Smyth 2013). I more specifically rely on the literature that analyzes how being the target of some security measures, ethnic profiling, and/or surveillance can lead to an experience of “disconnected citizenship” on an everyday basis (Jarvis and Lister 2013), a mistrust toward state policies (Ragazzi et al. 2018), disenchantment and exclusion (Lindekilde 2012), the production of a “safe” identity in search of respectability (Mythen et al. 2009), or the very appropriation of the suspect label (Appleby 2010). While most of this literature is based on Muslim communities in general, here I choose to address these issues through a more specific focus on Muslim subjects who have been directly targeted by state representatives in their domestic spaces, and who were eventually not convicted. On the one hand, it complexifies the “suspect community thesis” in highlighting “the differentiated experience of counter-terrorism linked to the inherent heterogeneity of the ‘community’” (Ragazzi 2016: 729). On the other hand, the focus on specific state measures enables me to go beyond an analysis that does not “limit itself to the analysis of legal or policing categories in official discourse” but considers “everyday routines and practices of their enactment, as well as the differentiated effects that these techniques produce on the populations they target” (Ragazzi 2016: 734).

In order to analyze this enactment of specific policies, it is however important to consider its specific context, that of the state of emergency in the post-attack context of France from 2015 onward. Indeed, a focus on the specific period of the state of emergency interrogates this distinction between “hard” and “soft” terrorism. Here I argue that the state of emergency is situated at the intersection between these two security programs, between coercion and prevention, especially concerning house searches and house arrests.

The French president can declare the state of emergency “either in the event of imminent danger . . . , or in the case of events presenting, by their nature and seriousness, the character of public calamity”¹⁰ (my translation). The state of emergency consequently aims to immediately reduce the threat and maintain order. In doing so, it appears to be an innovative way to counter an unprecedented threat, while it neutralizes long-term thinking (Bigo 2019: 8). However, its historical temporality is necessary to consider. The state of emergency was created by the law of 3 April 1955 at the beginning of the Algerian War of Independence. This exceptional political regime enabled the French colonial government to implement a temporary but renewable “state of exception” (Thénault 2007). The Department of Homeland Security and its local executives can decide measures such as house searches, house arrests, the closure of places of worship, dissolution of organizations, bans on demonstrations, all without any authorization from a judge or a prior investigation. Anonymous documents with no date or signature—called *notes blanches*—vaguely describe what is suspected and they are enough to justify a specific measure on an individual (Odinet 2017: 279). The state of emergency was further employed during anti-colonial revolts in New Caledonia in 1985 and in Tahiti in 1987. In 2005, Minister of Interior

Affairs Nicolas Sarkozy used it to impose a curfew in some specific counties to counter revolts in French *banlieues*. This historicity of the state of emergency, both in colonies and in metropolitan inner cities, avoids a reading of this political regime as exceptional and innovative. Rather, it constitutes a set of administrative and anticipatory techniques (Hennette-Vauchez 2018)—not only distinct from common law, but also from a total state of exception (Bigo and Bonelli 2018).

In 2015, the state of emergency mainly translated into house searches, house arrests, and closure of places of worship.¹¹ Intelligence services ordered less than half of the house searches.¹² Mainstream police services ordered the other half, which dealt with subjects who have been filed as (Muslim) “radicals,” but who were not a “priority” for intelligence services, and/or, who were targeted for drug or weapon ownership, that is, common law infractions.¹³ Therefore, house searches do not aim to arrest subjects who have already committed an offense. Such procedures rather constitute an opportunity for public security services to easily update their intelligence knowledge on specific households labeled “radicals,” but who have not committed any offense that would legitimate an arrest. This is what I call *prevention through coercion*. Besides, these two measures present the specificity of operating through an intrusion to domestic spaces. What does an unexpected intrusion at home imply? Why this operational mode and what does it produce? Such interrogations require a preliminary definition work on domesticity and the intimate.

The Intimate: From Domesticity to Bodies and Subjectivities

Counterterrorism is inherently spatial, as it aims to prevent citizens from plural attacks at different scales. Similar to crime prevention through environmental design, it implies a set of architectural devices in Western cities (Graham 2016): protection perimeters with concrete blocks, reinforced protection of institutional buildings (Coaffee 2004), and CCTV (Bonnet 2012; Lemaire 2019) among others. Counterterrorism also impacts mobility at borders. Restrictions on mobility can deal with bans from staying in certain areas or from leaving the country (Guild 2008), house arrest, “stop and search” measures in airports or train stations (Foegle 2018). In other words, counterterrorism has effects on places, such as cities and borders, and it operates through the very use of these spaces. However, a shift, from national and city scales to the scale of domesticity and intimacy, offers an innovative perspective on the implementation of counterterrorism (see Laketa, this issue).

At first glance, domesticity refers to the spatiality of the private sphere. Yet domesticity includes more than the space of sanctuary, solidarity, and resistance against the outside world (Agger 1992). It can also encompass the space of potential domestic violence (Pain 2014) as well as transnational and domestic work (Ehrenreich and Hochschild 2004; Parrenas 2000). Following this literature, here I do not refer to domestic space as an apolitical bounded geographical and passive unit, but rather as a political space (Massey 1994). I especially draw on historians who studied the production of a Western home in colonial contexts (Blunt 1999; Stoler 2010). Indeed, such research denaturalizes the home as a sphere of the non-political private and instead interrogates domesticity as part of a state project that produces Western, modern, and secular citizens. In doing so, it insists on the state’s ability to influence and control the organization of specific domesticities, which is important to consider in the context of contemporary house arrests and searches.

Beyond the question of domesticity, the article interrogates the meaning of the intimate. Indeed, the intimate is not synonymous with domestic or private spaces (Wilson 2012). Rather, it encompasses familiarity, privacy, love, sexuality, informality, the personal, feelings, attach-

ments and emotions (Ahmed 2014; Mountz and Hyndman 2006; Pratt and Rosner 2006). These different aspects of the intimate imply different ways of life “that social norms promote or depreciate . . . that are prioritized and controlled differently depending on race, class, gender, and age,” (Le Renard 2019: 20, my translation) as well as on religion as I suggest here.

In this context, the intimate refers to a social construct depending on the ability to control and choose what to hide from the gaze of others (Amiraux 2018; Thalineau 2002). The intimate “is undone when the other steals it. Intimacy is associated with the control of the other’s gaze” (Thalineau 2002: 41, my translation). This approach of the intimate “under supervision” (Laé and Proth 2002) reinforces its interactional dimension. It is here accentuated in the context of a control of the intimate by state representatives. The first part of the empirical section focuses on the moment of the search and house arrest as the control of the intimate at home. However, this relational approach also explains their long-term effects on respondents’ representations and self-presentation in public spaces. Indeed, the intimate “participates in individuals’ socialization, as an individualization moment of prime importance, that social relations allow and ratify” (Laé and Proth 2002: 6, my translation). Therefore, the control of the intimate by state representatives surely impacts the individualization and subjectification process, what requires an analysis.

This approach of the intimate as intrinsically relational and normative also implies a consideration of the body as a medium (Gökarıksel 2009) that enables one to control what part of oneself is available to the public gaze and what remains intimate. That is why a subsection of the empirical part focuses on changes in appearance, behaviors, and clothing of initially suspected subjects, in order to better understand the redefinition of their self-presentation and relationship to public spaces. Here I draw on Abdelmalek Sayad’s definition of the “immigrant body” as “an object of representation and self-presentation, the body as the place of affect and also of intellect (because the body is inhabited by the whole group that one carries within oneself), the body as a working instrument and the body as the place and as the expression of illness” (1999: 319, my translation). Therefore, the following analysis apprehends the state of emergency through the lens of the intimate that implies a normative, interactional, and embodied dimension.

Coercive Redefinitions of Domesticity

The Search: A Coercive Control of Religiosity and Privacy

They came at 6:00 a.m. I was sleeping with my wife in my bed. . . . Suddenly, I hear “open up, open up, it’s the police, open up!” I didn’t understand what it was, I say “yeah, yeah, no problem, I’m coming,” and [meanwhile] they were breaking the door with a ram, but they couldn’t get in! And [silence], then it went too fast. I didn’t have the time to understand what was going on. I was on the floor, I saw guns pointed at me, one hand on the trigger . . . [silence] Just talking about it again, it is [silence] difficult. . . . I mean, we didn’t even want to contest anything! At the end, I told them “there’s some Coke in the fridge, make yourself at home” . . . but despite that I had handcuffs behind my back, my head was on the floor, they were on top of me to handcuff me My wife was also handcuffed, next to me, without any respect for privacy or anything, something extraordinarily shocking.

This extract originates from an interview with Jalel,¹⁴ 35 years old, a computer scientist, born in France to Moroccan parents. Jalel identifies as a pious Muslim who was searched in November 2015 in a middle-sized city, mainly because of his religious activities that state authorities categorize as close to Salafism (Lambert 2008). Jalel was not sued for any infraction after the search, and he never heard again from the state authorities.

A shocking intrusion, the sudden awakening, the presence of weapons, which create fear and neutralize the household, is central to the process of the search. Jalel's story also emphasizes the spatial rupture that occurred during the search. When Jalel tells me that he said to the police "there's some Coke in the fridge, make yourself at home,"¹⁵ he underlines how his domestic space, supposedly private, is made available to the police. This sentence also brings out how he tried to maintain some semblance of control over this space as he invited the police to "have some Coke." Jalel's experience epitomizes the relationship between the state authorities and the control of home. House searches extend the level of the state gaze into private spaces, which are here perceived as places of danger and potential threat. The tacit continuum between domestic, private and intimate spaces is broken. The state of emergency comes home.

The house search often includes the seizing of computer data, which exemplifies another level of intrusion after the arrival of police. Physical and computer searches enable state representatives to make an inventory of all the family, religious, intellectual, and political activities of the household. Yasmine's search (41, executive secretary, Charente-Maritime) perfectly illustrates the preventive dimension of this measure and the broadening of the "suspect" category. Indeed, Yasmine was searched because of the relationship—deemed suspicious—between her volunteering activities in a Muslim organization and her profession as an executive secretary at an airport. This example underlines the tacit continuum between some Muslim religious activities and suspicion, which, in the context of the state of emergency, is enough to justify control of Yasmine's domestic space.

Yasmine starts the interview with a very specific description of the search itself. I can hear anger and frustration when she tells me how the police checked her personal belongings. Yasmine summarizes the search as "a total intrusion into private life." She also insists on the specific police gaze on religious objects: "In the police file, they wrote: 'religious books were found in the woman's house, which indicates a rigorous practice of Islam.' Well until proven otherwise, I think I have the right to own a Quran, like a Christian would own a Bible, there's nothing illegal, right?" Here Yasmine illustrates how religious books can be interpreted as potential signs of "radicalization" among other religious symbols and activities. It leads the household to interiorize that it is under surveillance because certain behaviors are considered "deviant compared to the common culture" (Sèze 2019: 171) and consequently potentially dangerous, although such religious activities are not illegal. Moreover, the extract highlights Yasmine's attempt to resist this categorization that may make her religious books equivalent to suspect objects.

Visible religious signs can also influence interactions during a search. Yasmine explains that she was able to take "five minutes" to dress and to "put on a scarf" before opening the door to the police. On the other hand, other women's testimonies express the way their piety was not respected as they wished and at times led to conflicts during the search. Juliette (31, secretary, Alpes-Maritimes) used to work for a charity organization that helps house insecure women. The organization space was searched in 2015. Juliette recounts the words of a policewoman during the search: "She was talking to one of the hosted women like 'you wear the veil, you're submissive, why are you doing this? You're young, you're beautiful, you're a little naughty girl.'"¹⁶ These offenses about the woman's hijab underscore how the search can constitute a time and space for state representatives to explicitly judge religious practices and intimate convictions that are considered inconsistent with French republican religious and/or gender norms (Fernando 2010; Scott 2009). This example illustrates how house searches locate themselves at the blurry intersection between a control of specific suspected activities in relationship to terrorism affairs and a "surveillance secularism"—*laïcité de surveillance*—which implies the participation of the state in the definition and control of acceptable religious values and norms (Sèze 2019: 171). Therefore, the search constitutes an infringement of privacy in which the

police can control the *religious intimate*—from specific objects to devout and gendered bodies (Gökarıksel 2009).

House Arrest: A Domestic Prison?

House arrests result in a different redefinition of domesticity. A house arrest includes a duty to check in three times a day at the police station and to be at home between 8:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. It can also include a ban on relations with certain persons or on leaving the city.¹⁷

Ahmed (30, taxi driver, Rhône) had been under house arrest for three months. The order for Ahmed's house arrest was initially addressed to a person who shared the same name as him but whose nationality was different. Yet, this homonym mistake was never explained to Ahmed and he does not know whether he was initially the one suspected or not. The unclear conditions of his house arrest result in his feelings of anger. They also illustrate the hasty dimension of the measures implemented the days right after the attacks. Ahmed compares his house arrest to the confinement of "a lion in a cage," which underlines a sense of animalization and a violation of dignity. House arrest is here experienced as a process of self-incarceration—the subject under house arrest becomes his own policeman (Codaccioni 2019) who knows when to clock in. Similar to electronic bracelet surveillance (Ollivon 2018), house arrest constitutes an effective security device, from an economic and disciplinary point of view. As Ahmed explains: "I was cut off from the world, because it was: home, police station, police station, home, and that's all." These descriptions illustrate how domestic space becomes the very space of a geolocated and pending quasi-incarceration, given that exits from home almost exclusively correspond to the police station. Domestic and carceral spaces blend into each other without any clear and defined boundaries between home, the police station, or the city border.

Moreover, such self-surveillance led Ahmed to question himself: "There was a moment when I even wondered whether I was really innocent or not." His experience highlights one of the psychological impacts on subjects under house arrest who end up internalizing the label of the suspect (Appleby 2010). Ahmed ends the description of his experience with the following sentence: "At the end of March, they tell you that you're free, but they already destroyed my life, you know!" For Ahmed, being free means the ability to leave his own home. Although I started discussions with Ahmed three years after the procedure, his discourse highlights how he remains affected. He expresses the lasting consequences of the house arrest on his mental health: "I'm trying to claim my rights because, you know, they still trashed my house, they deprived me of my rights, and I'll tell you the worst prison, it is the brain one. And I'm actually in a prison." Ahmed here relates the deterioration of his home and his house arrest to psychological imprisonment. He even describes himself as paranoid during our talk. This association between house arrest, "brain," and prison confirms the multiscale dimension of the measures of the state of emergency, simultaneously impacting domestic space, bodies, affects, and subjectivities of those under surveillance. Such analysis consequently leads to the study of the long-term and plural aftermaths of these measures on targeted households' daily lives.

The Intimate Aftermath of the State of Emergency

An Embodied and Emotional Approach of Administrative Measures

In the previous section, I analyzed how house arrests and searches brings about a rethinking of some security policies from the scale of the city to that of domestic space. Respondents' stories now invite us to go even further, from the domestic to the body scale. Indeed, interviewees' sto-

ries highlight a correlated relationship between these intrusive acts and the production of new embodied emotions—fear, anger, anxiety, or depression. Analyzing these embodied emotions constitutes a necessary step to further examine the modification of behaviors and self-presentation in public spaces.

Fear and surprise constitute the two first described emotions about the house search. An interview with two young women whose father was searched and under house arrest for two months presents some insights about the potential aftermath of house searches on children. Melissa and Samira were 13 and 15 years old at the time of the search. Four and a half years later, they describe, with lots of difficulty, how police officers lugged one of them around while taking aim at the other. Although the interview occurs in 2020, one of them begins with the following words: “2015 for me, it is just like yesterday.” The other cannot help weeping when she tells me how she still does not understand why the police acted like this. This traumatic fear translates into tears, silence, and even a six-week hospitalization for Samira in 2016. As Samira’s tears emphasize during the interview, experiences of fear are not only expressed, they are also felt as the body constitutes “the place of affect” and “the place and the expression of illness” (Sayad 1999: 319).

Yasmine (41, executive secretary, Charente-Maritime), previously quoted, describes other feelings after the search: “It was a real trauma for me. Still today, when I hear the doorbell from my house, it makes my stomach bump. And in the days after the search, it was impossible for me to sleep alone at home. . . . Every night, around 4:30 a.m., my eyes were open, and I was like, ok, they will come back. So, yes, it was a trauma, sincerely, a real trauma.” Yasmine’s experience is literally embodied as it implies an increased sensitivity to sounds, which alters her stomach, her ability to sleep, and her reflexes. Similarly, Catherine (44, hospital secretary, Ile-de-France) was searched in 2017 while the police made a floor mistake and wrongly targeted her apartment. The police broke her front door to come into her apartment. Her experience echoes Yasmine’s hypersensitivity to sounds when she describes the noise of a “jail door” that was arranged before a new front door arrives. She recounts: “My neighbors were saying ‘you left at 6:00 p.m. last night, we heard it,’ ‘you left this morning at 8:00 a.m.,’ so each time, when you open the door, even the gestures, yeah it reminds you some things.” Catherine’s description emphasizes the importance of the neighbors’ gaze, which reduces the possibility of controlling her own intimacy (Laé and Proth 2002; Thalineau 2002). Front doors, but also damaged walls or messy rooms, constitute objects and places in which emotions circulate (Ahmed in Laketa 2016: 665).

Considering the nature of the interactions with the police—sometimes very formal, sometimes violent—is it necessary to consequently understand the plurality of an emotional aftermath among the respondents and the difficulty to express it. As I highlighted in Jalel’s introductory extract, he expresses how “just talking about it again, it is [*silence*] difficult.” All male respondents stress the difficulty in talking with the police during the search. They all remained handcuffed on the ground for more than an hour, unable to get information on the reasons for the search. The interlocking of their age (between 30 and 40), gender (male), racial and religious appearance (Black and Arab Muslims) may relate to the collective imaginary of “the” terrorist man (Dwyer et al. 2008; Hopkins 2007; Noble 2007; Selod 2019). However, it is noticeable to observe that respondents who have experienced both a search and a house arrest for several months do not really describe the search they experienced. They rather insist on the psychological impacts of the house arrest that more durably impacted their everyday life.

Although Yasmine did not experience any physical immobilization or explicit violent remarks, she still completes this observation with the following comment: “At the end they almost apologized, saying ‘yeah, sorry, but you know, it’s not us’. . . . But I still had a search, and a search remains violent.” Although the search of Yasmine’s household resulted in a calm interaction with the police, which differs from Catherine’s or male respondents’ experiences, she insists on how the event “remains violent” as it continues to intrude on the psychological well-being

and as it also led to her professional dismissal. Despite some differences in the proceedings of the search, Yasmine's extract consequently highlights how the house search remains an intrusion that affects the intimate, both the domestic space and "feelings, attachments and emotions" (Mountz and Hyndman 2006).

Afterward, respondents unanimously mention a feeling of humiliation. Farid (45, bodyguard, Rhône) was searched in a working-class neighborhood. The police were searching for specific weapons, although he has all the state authorizations to own specific security devices as a private bodyguard. Farid compares the search to a rape, which highlights a feeling of outrage. The reference to rape is also used by Ahmed (30, taxi driver, Rhône), who was under house arrest. During the broadcast of a short film on the state of emergency, Ahmed explains to one of his acquaintances that he still has several problems to solve, but that "the first one" is about respect: "They took my dignity, and they didn't give it back to me" (fieldnotes, June 2018). These kinds of emotions participate in the difficulty to overcome this experience and to talk about it.

Mehdi (41, real estate agent, Seine-et-Marne) was searched in November 2015 after one of his colleagues reported him to the *Stop-Djihadisme* counter-radicalization platform as potentially "radical." Mehdi converted to Islam two decades ago and openly talked about his faith in the office where he had worked for several years. Yet in her report on the platform, the colleague especially mentioned his conversion, the fact that he would not shake women's hands, and that he was not at work on 13 November 2015. Mehdi's report on this preventive platform epitomizes the broadening of the "suspect" category (Ragazzi 2016) that can lead acquaintances to report individuals that match some "radicalization" criteria, although they have known them for years. This "monitoring of others" (Jarvis and Lister 2013: 661) also highlights the progressive decentralization of surveillance and preventive policing from intelligence representatives to common citizens (Blackwood et al. 2016: 604). After four hours of discussion and only during a second interview in 2018, Mehdi reveals to me, while he lowers his voice as if in a shameful way: "At the time [in 2015] when we talked about it, there were always tears running down, I was pissed off, that's it."¹⁸ Mehdi ends up confessing that he had depression after the search. He shows me pictures of his youth and tells me that he lost all his hair and twenty pounds in one year following the search. Depression, a divorce, a dismissal resulting financial issues, and social marginalization have impacted his everyday life for the past few years. When we meet a fourth time in 2020, this situation is slightly changed. Mehdi explains he has been feeling better for a few months. He describes how he found energy, self-confidence, and determination again thanks to his faith and with the help of Chinese medicine. Although his financial situation is still unstable, Mehdi has slowly gotten back to work. A long-term interview relationship with Mehdi therefore helped to follow the different psychological steps he underwent in the aftermath of the house search. Yet, during an interview about her own experience of the state of emergency, a friend of Mehdi told me about a bad joke she recently made about his search. This joke led to a strong argument with him. Although Mehdi wants to emphasize a very positive mood during interviews, such an anecdote highlights how he remains sensitive about it. These different examples consequently underline the different emotions resulting from house searches and house arrests. The analysis of fear, anxiety, embodied trauma, humiliation and depression—and the difficulty to express such emotions—helps in understanding the modification of respondents' self-presentation and mobility in public spaces.

Surveillance of Intimacies in Public Spaces: Discipline on Bodies and Religious Signs

As I previously analyzed, searches and house arrests disturb the relationship of the subject with his/her domestic space. It can become a space of surveillance, control, and restriction. Besides, these procedures modify the ability to get out of the house and face fellow citizens and the

police. Indeed, Ahmed explains to me his reluctance to “hang out” in Paris if he does not have the “utility.” He tells me that he anticipates that if a terrorist attack takes place, he could be “in the wrong place, in the wrong moment,” and could be consequently suspected of participating in the attack. Although Ahmed is now “free” to leave his home, to use his term, his routine mobility in public space is modified and limited. Paris now refers to the fear of being targeted again, not necessarily by a terrorist attack, but as a potential suspect by state institutions or fellow citizens (Najib 2019). During our interview in a Paris café, he remains vigilant and acts suspicious of his surroundings. He lowers his voice when he refers to the “events” to avoid mentioning the term “house arrest.” He appears anxious, looking around him when I ask further questions. Such behavior illustrates a desire for invisibility. It betrays a difficulty to control the other’s gaze (Amiraux 2018; Thalineau 2002) and consequently his public intimacy (Laé and Proth 2002). Compared to lots of citizens who feel protected by preventive architectural devices and military, Paris here constitutes an emotional landscape (Laketa 2016: 665), which is related to anxiety and surveillance from others.

The feeling of hypervisibility in cities, the embodied emotions resulting from the measure and the collective imaginaries of a “suspect community” (Breen-Smyth 2013) consequently participate in some changes of respondents’ self-presentation in public space. When I ask Jalel (35, computer scientist, Haute-Savoie) whether he changed his behavior or social practices after his search, he replies without any hesitation: “Concretely I am afraid, I am not myself, my behavior changed in the sense that I no longer go out with a djellaba, I go less often to the mosque, I am simply not myself anymore. . . . It’s something sad, suddenly, in the everyday life, I am no longer the same, I am no longer the same.” This extract reveals a profound and well-aware change in Jalel’s lifestyle and identity. Jalel links the fact of no longer wearing a djellaba and going to the mosque with no longer being himself. It is therefore not only a change of religious signs but a change of Jalel’s subjectivity, who no longer feels “to be the same.” Clothes relate to “an intimate aspect of the experience and presentation of the self, [which] transforms that self physically and emotionally” (Gökıksel 2009: 661). The house search leads Jalel—and also Mehdi, who explains that he replaced his *kameezes* with loose clothing—to change, by themselves, their appearance in order to regain control over other’s suspicion and to overcome the “terrorist” label (Appleby 2010) in daily interactions. This modification of religious signs can be interpreted as a disciplinarization of bodies (Foucault 1975) to perform normative expectations. Jalel and Mehdi actively attempt to assimilate to secular norms, which implies work on symbols and bodies—“as an object of representation and self-presentation” (Sayad 1999: 319)—in order to erase the stigma (Sayad 1999: 453–454, 498). To preserve their own security, they reassure their fellow citizens (Sayad 1999: 502) through the performance of an embodied safe identity (Mythen et al. 2009: 747). Therefore, searches challenge respondents’ representations of what constitutes an acceptable religious practice, for institutions, fellow citizens, and for themselves.

House searches and house arrests therefore contribute to a lasting modification of behaviors, self-presentations, and consequently subjectivities in public spaces. Urban landscapes can become emotional spaces of anxiety and fear, which modify respondents’ mobility and the way they interact with their environment. Respondents attempt to challenge the “suspect” label and change the other’s gaze through a control of their clothes and bodies. Such changes are finally part of a larger discursive strategy of proving an acceptable identity.

Restoring Innocence: Exemplary Citizenship and Respectability

Previous sections have highlighted different embodied strategies to cope with the fear of suspicion in public spaces. This last section completes this analysis through a focus on respondents’

dissenting discourses on their identity as Muslims and respectable French citizens (Dazey 2018). Here I analyze how they reappropriate state categories of what constitutes a suspect to better distinguish themselves from this classification. I examine the different criteria that originate from a specific discursive—republican and liberal—framework, in order to analyze how respondents attempt to regain control over their identification by others, including state representatives and fellow citizens.

First, respondents refer to their French nationality as the first piece of evidence to prove their respectability: “I am French, I have always lived in France, I arrived when I was two months old. My country is not Tunisia, it is France” (Farid, 45, bodyguard, Rhône); “My native country is France, I was born in Paris” (Mehdi, 41, real estate agent, Seine-et-Marne); “I’m French, I’m happy to be French” (Juliette, 31, secretary, Alpes-Maritimes). Here interviewees actively insist on their French nationality as part of a loved identity, as if there was a need to emphasize an honest patriotism. Drawing on Mireille Eberhard’s concept of the “republican habitus” (2010), I analyze this discourse as part of the “integrationist principle”—*credo intégrationniste*—of the nationality. In doing so, respondents emphasize what they consider to be legitimate and attempt to counter marginalization from the national community after terrorist attacks. Farid’s expression—“my country is not Tunisia, it is France”—even illustrates a questioning of a second nationality, as if it would be more suspicious to be Tunisian rather than French. This justification of a French nationality must be also put into perspective with the initial project of nationality deprivation, issued by President François Hollande on 16 November 2015 (Mazouz 2016). Such a legal project, in a post-attack context, may have participated in the will to prove identification in being French.

Discourse on civic-mindedness also completes respondents’ presentations: “I have a clean criminal record; I have never done anything wrong to anyone. . . . I am a very social person, I have never had a problem” (Jalel, 35, computer scientist, Haute-Savoie); “I have never stolen, I have never had any problem with the law, I have always worked, I have always paid my taxes” (Yasmine, 41, executive secretary, Charente-Maritime); “I have an ultra-blank criminal record, but when I say blank, I have never been to prison, I have never been in police custody, I have never stolen, I have never done anything stupid” (Farid, 45, bodyguard, Rhône). Jalel, Farid, and Yasmine use different criteria—judicial, social, and interpersonal—as well as the opposing adverbs *never* and *always*, in order to prove their moral and judicial exemplarity as well as their economic integration into society. Given that their “status as citizen is brought into question due to their suspected holding of, or proximity to, particular political beliefs or opinions” (Jarvis and Lister 2013: 660), respondents identify as “respectable” citizens (Noble 2007) through categories of social and economic integration. In doing so, they counter stigmatization through a normative identification that relies on citizenship values.

Finally, a discourse that would anticipate an incompatibility between Islamic faith and liberal and secular values is very significant. Respondents repeatedly refer to the syntactic structure “I am Muslim/pious/religious but”: “I am pious, but I am a peaceful person. I am the president of an organization” (Farid); “I am Muslim, but I like to go to the cinema, listen to music, read. I am an open-minded person. I listen to rap, funk, Mozart. I eat at McDonald’s and I even started smoking again” (Ahmed); “We say ‘Muslims, Muslims,’ but my favorite volunteer [in her organization] is gay, Jewish and *pied noir*, right!” (Juliette). These different sentences illustrate the anticipation of an amalgam between being a Muslim and being perceived as obviously opposed to customs that can be considered as liberal or to be de facto considered homophobic or anti-Semitic. These extracts also emphasize the reappropriation of a liberal and secular habitus, that is, a “matrix of representations, perceptions and practices” (Eberhard 2010: 71, my translation) along secular and liberal lines, in order to reclaim their innocence through identity normalization. In doing so, respondents do not focus on producing a counternarrative regard-

ing what state representatives have suspected, like their specific religious activities and acquaintances. The mention of these different criteria is even more heuristic to understand which values are considered by respondents as priorities to prove normality in addition to innocence. They rather attempt to “challenge ignorance and misunderstandings about Islamic faith and traditions” (Mythen et al. 2009: 746) and to prove their compatibility with secular and liberal values, especially in a post-attack context. This discursive strategy underlines a reappropriation of the “republican Islam” discursive framework (Sèze 2019) that results from the broadening of the suspect category and the general suspicion around Islamic features,¹⁹ all the more in the context of counter-radicalization and secular policies in France (Ragazzi et al. 2018). In order to denounce what they perceive as an illegitimate measure; respondents however resort to criteria that can implicitly exclude other people perceived as less economically or socially integrated. To prove oneself innocent is to admit, at least implicitly, that the structure of the state of emergency is legitimate, but that there was a mistake in one’s case.

In parallel with the promotion of exemplary identities, some respondents can also express a lasting hatred and disenchantment (Lindekilde 2012) toward state institutions. This is especially seen in subjects who have made an administrative appeal to legally counter their measure and who have not obtained any recognition from an administrative judge that the measure was illegal. Respondents remain frustrated by this result, although they attempted to gather a lot of evidence of their social integration. Experiences of Islamophobia, feelings of injustice, and socio-professional marginalization, accentuated after a house search or house arrest, interrogate their future fulfilment, which can materialize in the wish of leaving France. On the other hand, two respondents disagree with this discursive strategy of emphasizing expected norms. Indeed, they criticize integrationist discourses; they claim that they have not modified their public behaviors or self-presentations to better fit secular norms. Yet I noticed that they actually stopped publishing posts on the political situation in France on social networks after 2016. Although these multilayered experiences and strategies require further analysis through more interviews, I notice that the political socialization constitutes a significant dimension of the different interpretations of these measures, whether it deals with a house arrest or a search. While for most of them, the measure constitutes a first unexpected experience with state coercion, some present more familiarity with surveillance issues, either because they have experience mobilizing and publicly sharing their views about political issues or because they participate in antiracist political movements. They consequently appear less surprised and disappointed after a search and react differently, both individually and collectively. Although respondents may disagree on the best strategies to start from scratch after a search or a house arrest, their discourses on respectability, innocence, patriotism, departures, or political mobilization highlight the lasting effects of the state of emergency on their identity and trajectories, beyond the domestic place, and beyond the night or the period of a house arrest.

Conclusion

The article examined the intimate effects of house searches and house arrests on households that were initially suspected of presenting “a threat for public order and security” and not eventually convicted. A specific focus on the intimate experience of these suspected subjects—their modified relationship to domesticity, their embodied emotions and their discourses on an acceptable identity—provided readers with a different perspective on the 2015 state of emergency in France.

First, I analyzed the moment of the search and the house arrest per se. I interrogated how these procedures create a rupture with usual meanings of domesticity. Interviews reveal how

the search transforms domestic spaces into public and police areas in which private activities are examined. I highlighted how the moment of the search epitomizes the increasing overlap between a security control on considered-to-be dangerous activities and a control on a religiosity considered as potentially deviant from secular norms. Meanwhile, the house arrest redefines the home as a quasi-carceral space; being free now refers to the ability to leave home. Such redefinitions of domesticity constitute the most obvious intimate impacts of the state of emergency.

Yet interviews have also underlined more complex subjective and embodied dynamics after searches and house arrests. A second scale of analysis deals with respondents' bodies as dynamic sites through which policing is negotiated and adjusted. Focusing on their embodied emotions—hypersensitivity to sounds, anxiety in crowded places, constant surveillance of the environment—reveals a continuity between the night of the search, or the period of the house arrest, and their contemporary and daily experiences of home and the public sphere. In parallel, some respondents have decided to change their appearance—mainly to make their religiousness less visible—in order to be perceived as less suspect. Some of them have also changed their daily itineraries in large cities in order to avoid police controls and areas where they think they could be targeted as potential suspects. Finally, these different scales—domesticity, bodies, emotions—have emphasized the ways house searches and arrests participate in the production of respectable self-presentation. Respondents' interviews reveal a constant need to restore their innocence. Interviewees use state and liberal categories—the fact of being French, integrated, not too religious, consumer—as a strategy to prove an exemplarity. Their discourses illustrate a reappropriation of secular and republican categories to better distance themselves from the suspect category, while potentially suspecting other less exemplary citizens. House searches and house arrests do not eventually constitute singular events. They rather extend across time and space and impact bodies, emotions, and subjectivities of Muslim subjects who were initially targeted and eventually not convicted. In doing so, these measures constitute coercive reminders of what refers to an acceptable and normal citizen and to what extent respondents differ from this standard.

Considering these long-term impacts enables one to overcome an exclusive approach on the success or failure of this exceptional political regime to better evaluate its large-scale aftermath on social cohesion and potential fragmentation between state authorities and citizens, especially those belonging to religious minorities. While the state of emergency officially ended in October 2017, house searches and house arrests were introduced into common law from November 2017.²⁰ Further analysis will consequently require taking into consideration the introduction of exceptional measures into common law as well as the increasing recourse to administrative procedures—including closing of places of worship and private schools—in order to analyze the growing overlap between security and the governance of religious issues.

■ **FLORA HERGON** is a second-year PhD candidate in Sociology at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (EHESS) in Paris. Her research focuses on the implementation of the state of emergency in France since 2015. | Email: flora.hergon1@gmail.com

■ **NOTES**

1. Minister of Interior Affairs, "Sortie de l'état d'urgence: Un bilan et des chiffres clés," November 2017, p. 3.
2. On 13 November 2015, three simultaneous attacks occurred in Paris and in Saint-Denis—130 people died and 354 were injured. The state of emergency was declared on the night of the attacks and lasted until 30 October 2017.

3. Loi n° 55-385 du 3 avril 1955 relative à l'état d'urgence (my translation).
4. Quotation marks intend to emphasize the polysemy of the term "radicalization," both as a state category and a sociological concept. Here "radicalization" refers to the state category.
5. A minority of these measures also affected leftist activists, who were searched, banned from demonstrating, or under house arrest during the United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP21) in November 2015 or during the protest movement against the reform of the Labor code in Spring 2016.
6. National Assembly, "Synthèse des mesures administratives prises en application de la loi du 3 avril 1955," 18 July 2016 and 21 December 2016.
7. National Assembly, "Rapport d'information n°4281 au nom de la Commission des lois sur le contrôle parlementaire de l'état d'urgence présenté par MM. Dominique Raimbourg et Jean-Frédéric Poisson," December 2016, p. 49.
8. It has been impossible so far to find the number of resulting investigations for criminal conspiracy in matters relating to terrorism and procedures for acts of apology for terrorism regarding the whole period of the state of emergency (November 2015–October 2017). That is why I focus here on the first year only, which accounts for 93 percent of the house arrests and 85 percent of the total of house arrests between 2015 and 2017.
9. We can also notice the terminological modification of the state of emergency law in 2015, which replaces the word "activity" with "behavior" regarding the justification of measures on "someone whose dangerous *behavior* constitutes a threat for public order and security" while it used to concern "someone whose dangerous *activity* constitutes a threat for public order and security" (my emphasis, Loi n° 2015-1501 du 20 novembre 2015 prorogeant l'application de la loi n° 55-385 du 3 avril 1955 relative à l'état d'urgence et renforçant l'efficacité de ses dispositions).
10. Loi n° 55-385 du 3 avril 1955 relative à l'état d'urgence, article 1.
11. National Assembly, "Rapport," 2016.
12. National Assembly, "Rapport," 2016, p. 39.
13. National Assembly, "Rapport," 2016, p. 40.
14. For the sake of anonymity, names and locations have been systematically modified.
15. "Oui voilà, c'est-à-dire que même pas on voulait contester quoi que ce soit, c'était vraiment, voilà moi à la fin je leur disais 'y'a du coca dans le frigo, faites comme chez vous.'"
16. "T'es une petite coquine."
17. Loi n° 55-385 du 3 avril 1955 relative à l'état d'urgence, article 6. Between 2015 and 2017, house arrests could be revoked or extended each time the state of emergency was renewed for a maximum period of 12 months.
18. "À l'époque quand on en parlait, systématiquement il y avait les larmes qui coulaient, j'avais les boules, voilà."
19. See in (Ragazzi et al. 2018: 8) a summary of the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2018), "Chapter 4: Racism, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance," in European Union Fundamental Rights Agency (2018) Second European Union minorities and discrimination survey. Luxembourg, Publication Office. <http://fra.europa.eu/en/project/2015/eu-midis-ii-second-european-union-minorities-anddiscrimination-survey>.
20. Loi n° 2017-1510 du 30 octobre 2017 renforçant la sécurité intérieure et la lutte contre le terrorisme.

REFERENCES

- Agger, Inger. 1992. *Blue Room: Trauma and Testimony Among Refugee Women: A Psycho-Social Exploration*. London: Zed Books.
- Ahmed, Sara. 2014. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Alix, Julie, and Olivier Cahn. 2017. "Changes in Anti-terrorism and the Emergence of a Repressive National Security Law." [In French.] *Revue de science criminelle et de droit pénal comparé* 4 (4): 845–868. <https://doi-org/10.3917/rsc.1704.0845>.

- Amiriaux, Valérie. 2018. "Citizens, Piety and Democracy: Reflections on the Occultation of Believing Bodies, Intimacy and the Right to Secrecy." [In French.] *Social Compass* 65 (2): 168–186. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0037768618762907>.
- Appleby, Nicholas. 2010. "Labelling the Innocent: How Government Counter-Terrorism Advice Creates Labels that Contribute to the Problem." *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 3 (3): 421–436. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2010.521643>.
- Bigo, Didier. 2019. "The Modalities of State of Emergency Mechanisms." [In French.] *Cultures & Conflicts* 113 (1): 7–15. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27005462>.
- Bigo, Didier, and Laurent Bonelli. 2018. "Neither Rule of Law nor State of Emergency. The State of Emergency as a Specific Device?" [In French.] *Cultures & Conflicts* 112 (4): 7–14. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27005452>.
- Blackwood, Leda, Nick Hopkins, and Stephen Reicher. 2016. "From Theorizing Radicalization to Surveillance Practices: Muslims in the Cross Hairs of Scrutiny." *Political Psychology* 37 (5): 597–612. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12284>.
- Blunt, Alison. 1999. "Imperial Geographies of Home: British Domesticity in India, 1886–1925." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 24 (4): 421–440. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0020-2754.1999.00421.x>.
- Bonelli, Laurent. 2008. "The Characteristics of French Anti-terrorism: Parrying Blows Rather than Healing Wounds." [In French.] In *Au Nom Du 11 Septembre: Les Démocraties à l'épreuve de l'antiterrorisme*, ed. Didier Bigo, Laurent Bonelli, and Thomas Deltombe, 168–187. Paris: La Découverte.
- Bonnet, François. 2012. "Controlling Populations through Space? Situational Crime Prevention and CCTV in Railway Stations and Shopping Centers." [In French.] *Politix* 97 (1): 25–46. <https://doi.org/10.3917/pox.097.0025>.
- Breen-Smyth, Marie. 2013. "Theorising the 'Suspect Community': Counterterrorism, Security Practices and the Public Imagination." *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 7 (2): 223–240. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2013.867714>.
- Choudhury, Tufyal, and Helen Fenwick. 2011. "The Impact of Counter-Terrorism Measures on Muslim Communities." *International Review of Law, Computers & Technology* 25 (3): 151–181. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600869.2011.617491>.
- Clair, Isabelle. 2016. "Doing Some Fieldwork as a Feminist." [In French.] *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 213 (3): 66–83. <https://doi.org/10.3917/arss.213.0066>.
- Coaffee, Jon. 2004. "Rings of Steel, Rings of Concrete and Rings of Confidence: Designing out Terrorism in Central London Pre and Post September 11th." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 28 (1): 201–211. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0309-1317.2004.00511.x>.
- Codaccioni, Vanessa. 2019. *Repression: The State against Political Protests* [In French.] Paris: Textuel.
- Dazey, Margot. 2018. "In Search of Respectability: The Politics of the Union Des Organisations Islamiques de France." PhD dissertation. Cambridge: University of Cambridge.
- Dwyer, Claire, Bindi Shah, and Gurchathen Sanghera. 2008. "'From Cricket Lover to Terror Suspect'—Challenging Representations of Young British Muslim Men." *Gender, Place & Culture* 15 (2): 117–136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09663690701863208>.
- Eberhard, Mireille. 2010. "Republican Habitus and Treatment of Racist Discrimination in France." [In French.] *Regards Sociologiques* 39: 71–83.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara, and Arlie Russell Hochschild. 2004. *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. New York: Holt McDougal.
- Fernando, Mayanthi L. 2010. "Reconfiguring Freedom: Muslim Piety and the Limits of Secular Law and Public Discourse in France." *American Ethnologist* 37 (1): 19–35. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1425.2009.01239.x>.
- Fernando, Mayanthi L. 2014. *The Republic Unsettled: Muslim French and the Contradictions of Secularism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Foegle, Jean-Philippe. 2018. "Foreigners, Targets of the Permanent State of Emergency." [In French.] *Plein droit* n° 117 (2): 7–11. <https://doi.org/10.3917/pld.117.0007>.

- Foucault, Michel. 1975. *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Gökariksel, Banu. 2009. "Beyond the Officially Sacred: Religion, Secularism, and the Body in the Production of Subjectivity." *Social & Cultural Geography* 10 (6): 657–674. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649360903068993>.
- Gouville, Pauline Le Monnier de. 2017. "From Repression to Prevention: Reflection on Anti-terrorism Criminal Policy." [In French.] *Les Cahiers de la Justice* 2 (2): 209–225. <https://doi.org/10.3917/cdlj.1702.0209>.
- Graham, Stephen. 2016. *Vertical: The City from Satellites to Bunkers*. London: Verso.
- Grard, Julien. 2008. "Duty to Tell your Story: The Narrative of Oneself, Always Started Again" [In French.] *Les Politiques de l'Enquête: Épreuves Ethnographiques*, ed. Didier Fassin and Alban Bensa, 143–163. Paris: La Découverte.
- Greer, Steven. 2010. "Anti-Terrorist Laws and the United Kingdom's 'Suspect Muslim Community': A Reply to Pantazis and Pemberton." *The British Journal of Criminology* 50 (6): 1171–1190. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azq04>.
- Guild, Elspeth. 2008. "Foreigners in Europe, Collateral Victims of the War on Terrorism." [In French.] In *Au nom du 11 septembre . . . Les démocraties à l'épreuve de l'antiterrorisme*, ed. Didier Bigo, Thomas Deltombe, and Laurent Bonelli, 139–150. Paris: La Découverte.
- Heath-Kelly, Charlotte. 2017. "The Geography of Pre-Criminal Space: Epidemiological Imaginations of Radicalisation Risk in the UK Prevent Strategy, 2007–2017." *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 10 (2): 297–319. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2017.1327141>.
- Hennette-Vauchez, Stéphanie, ed. 2018. *What (Will) Always Remain from the Emergency*. [In French.] Bayonne: Institut Universitaire Varenne.
- Hennette-Vauchez, Stéphanie. 2019. "The Legislative Fabric of the State of Emergency: When Power Does Not Stop Power." [In French.] *Cultures & Conflicts* 113 (1): 17–41. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27005463>.
- Hillyard, Paddy. 1993. *Suspect Community: People's Experience of the Prevention of Terrorism Acts in Britain*. London: Pluto Press.
- Hopkins, Peter. 2007. "Young Muslim Men's Experiences of Local Landscapes after 11 September 2001." In *Geographies of Muslim Identities: Diaspora, Gender and Belonging*, ed. Cara Aitchison, Peter Hopkins, and Mei-po Kwan, 189–200. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Jarvis, Lee, and Michael Lister. 2013. "Disconnected Citizenship? The Impacts of Anti-Terrorism Policy on Citizenship in the UK." *Political Studies* 61 (3): 656–675. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2012.00993.x>.
- Jouanneau, Solenne. 2017. "Giving Rise to 'French Islam': The Paradoxes of an Uneasy Government Policy (1970–2010)." [In French.] *Sociologie* 8 (3): 247–264. <https://doi.org/10.3917/socio.083.0247>.
- Laé, Jean-François, and Bruno Proth. 2002. "The Territories of Intimacy, Protection and Punishment." [In French.] *Ethnologie Française* 32 (1): 5–10. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40990410>.
- Laketa, Sunčana. 2016. "Geopolitics of Affect and Emotions in a Post-Conflict City." *Geopolitics* 21 (3): 661–685. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2016.1141765>.
- Lambert, Robert. 2008. "Salafi and Islamist Londoners: Stigmatised Minority Faith Communities Countering al-Qaida." *Crime, Law and Social Change* 50(2): 73–89. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10611-008-9122-8>.
- Le Renard, Amélie. 2019. *The Western Privilege: Work, Intimacy, and Postcolonial Hierarchies in Dubai*. [In French.] Paris: Les Presses de Sciences Po.
- Lemaire, Élodie. 2019. *The Safety Eye: Myths and Realities of Video Surveillance*. [In French.] Paris: La Découverte.
- Lindekilde, Lasse. 2012. "Introduction: Assessing the Effectiveness of Counter-Radicalisation Policies in Northwestern Europe." *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 5 (3): 335–344. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2012.723522>.
- Massey, Doreen. 1994. *Space, Place and Gender*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mazouz, Sarah. 2016. "Delegitimation Politics: From Challenging Double Nationality to the Extension Project of Nationality Forfeiture." [In French.] *Mouvements* 88 (4): 159–167. <https://doi.org/10.3917/mouv.088.0159>.

- Mountz, Alison, and Jennifer Hyndman. 2006. "Feminist Approaches to the Global Intimate." *Women's Studies Quarterly* 34 (1/2): 446–463.
- Mythen, Gabe., Sandra Walklate, and Fatima Khan. 2009. "I'm a Muslim, but I'm Not a Terrorist': Victimization, Risky Identities and the Performance of Safety." *British Journal of Criminology* 49 (6): 736–754. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azp03>.
- Najib, Kawtar. 2019. "Geography and Intersectionality of Anti-Muslim Acts in Paris Region." [In French.] *Hommes & Migrations* 1324(1): 19–26. <https://doi.org/10.4000/hommesmigrations.8224>.
- Noble, Greg. 2007. "Respect and Respectability amongst Second-Generation Arab and Muslim Australian Men." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 28 (3): 331–344.
- Odinot, Guillaume. 2017. "The Role of the Administrative Judge in Controlling the State of Emergency." [In French.] *Les Cahiers de la Justice* 2 (2): 275–280. <https://doi.org/10.3917/cdlj.1702.0275>.
- Ollivon, Franck. 2018. "Wearing the Prison Mark: A Geographical Approach of Electronic Monitoring." Ph.D dissertation. Lyon: Université Lumière—Lyon 2.
- Pain, Rachel. 2014. "Everyday Terrorism: Connecting Domestic Violence and Global Terrorism." *Progress in Human Geography* 38 (4): 531–550. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132513512231>.
- Pantazis, Christina, and Simon Pemberton. 2009. "From the 'Old' to the 'New' Suspect Community: Examining the Impacts of Recent UK Counter-Terrorist Legislation." *British Journal of Criminology* 49 (5): 646–666. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azp031>.
- Parrenas, Rhacel Salazar. 2000. "Migrant Filipina Domestic Workers and the International Division of Reproductive Labor." *Gender and Society* 14 (4): 560–580.
- Pratt, Geraldine, and Victoria Rosner. 2006. "Introduction: The Global and the Intimate." *Women's Studies Quarterly* 34 (1–2): 13–24.
- Ragazzi, Francesco. 2016. "Suspect Community or Suspect Category? The Impact of Counter-Terrorism as 'Policed Multiculturalism.'" *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42 (5): 724–741. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1121807>.
- Ragazzi, Francesco, Stephan Davidshofer, Sarah Perret, and Amal Tawfik. 2018. "The Effects of Counter-terrorism and Counterradicalization on Muslim Populations in France: A Quantitative Study." [In French.] Paris: Centre d'Étude sur les Conflits.
- Sayad, Abdelmalek. 1999. *The Double Absence: From the Illusions of the Emigrant to the Sufferings of the Immigrant*. [In French.] Paris: Seuil.
- Scott, Joan Wallach. 2009. *The Politics of the Veil*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Selod, Saher. 2019. "Gendered Racialization: Muslim American Men and Women's Encounters with Racialized Surveillance." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 42 (4): 552–569. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2018.1445870>.
- Sèze, Romain. 2019. *Preventing Jihadist Violence: The Paradoxes of a Security Model*. [In French.] Paris: Le Seuil.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. 2010. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Thalineau, Alain. 2002. "Social Housing: Violated Spaces, Kept Secrets." [In French.] *Ethnologie Française* 32 (1): 41–48. <https://doi.org/10.3917/ethn.021.0041>.
- Thénault, Sylvie. 2007. "The State of Emergency (1955–2005): From Colonial Algeria to Contemporary France: The Destiny of a Law." [In French.] *Le Mouvement Social* 218: 63–78. <https://doi.org/10.3917/lms.218.0063>.
- Wilson, Ara. 2012. "Intimacy: A Useful Category of Transnational Analysis." In *The Global and the Intimate: Feminism in Our Time*, ed. Geraldine Pratt and Victoria Rosner, 31–56. New York: Columbia University Press.