Bodies out of line?
Corpo*realities* of Border Practicing and the Politics of Refugee Protection

By

Eeva Puumala [*]

Introduction

Inside-outside, self-other, citizen-refugee. These are some of the binaries that colour our political imagination and rhetoric nowadays. The present era is often characterized as one of migrations and movement – time when civilizations clash, and history ends. After 9/11 Slavoj Zizek welcomed us "to the desert of the real". He writes that "the awareness that we live in an insulated artificial universe [--] generates the notion that some ominous agent is threatening us all the time with total destruction" (Zizek 2001). Zizek writes from an American context, but this mentality of fear can be extended to what has been going on in Europe as well especially concerning debate on migration policies and practices at the EU borders. What is at work at the borders of the Union, is a game of inclusion and exclusion, morality and belonging. It is based on a notion of the EU as a naturalized geographical area, with a community within. The area is not as accessible to all who want to enter, and especially hard it is for asylum-seekers to find a legal way into it. There are several governmental techniques of border practicing and profiling out the risky migrants at work (see e.g. Mervola 2006, Aaltola 2006). However, I do not intend to address EU border policies as such, but instead focus on the corpo*reality* of these practices in relation to the obligation of states to give protection to the refugees. I want to examine at an ethical level what are the implications of the profiling from an individual's point of view, and where does the official

rhetoric leave the person who seeks to enter Europe. I will focus on the notion of migration flows in terms of refugee protection. This article is thus bound to obliterate many nuances of the question because of the adoption of such a narrow approach.

As mentioned in the beginning, western epistemology is to a large extent based on binary logic. It is about borders, frontiers, boundaries and lines. It also about categorizing things and people in neat groups that inhabit a specific territory. In Vivienne Jabri's words, this is a time when

> "[w]e are, in the present juncture of history, faced with mechanisms of control that are transnational in reach, that define politics through a discourse of fear and unease, that seen to permeate, circumscribe and monitor intellectual activity, that manipulate and codify the public sphere, that use emergency legislation to incarcerate those deemed a danger to safety and security, that juridically legitimize the use of torture, and that confine thousands of nameless individuals to detention and internment." (cited in Campbell 2005: 130.)

This line of thought has been both solidified and challenged for example by the growing flows of migrants that refuse to be categorized in compliance with either geographical lines or essential experiential categories. They challenge the notion of migrant/refugee as a separate figure from that of a citizen. These people in the move embody the challenge that political imagination now faces: that of defining our belonging and identity in terms of citizenship. What we face is a question of the status of borders, exclusions, limitations and distinctions (Walker 2006). To this question our old mental mappings do not give an answer; what is to be done when geographical and administrational lines do not match with the lived ones? Meanwhile death has become a prevailing factor in the immigration equation. By addressing the political question of "illegal migrants", "asylum-abusers" and "shoppers", and other bodies out of administrational lines, this article becomes a narrative on what these boundaries do.

Migration Flows and the Body Political Powers of Metaphors

The mixed and massive flows of migrants have reached the shores of the European Union. Each year hundreds of thousands of people apply for asylum in the EU. The flow is continuous especially in the Canary Islands where African migrants land after their long and dangerous boat trip. The boats are shaky and small. Hundreds have lost their lives before their feet ever touched the "promised continent of Europe". But how are their desperation and deaths used in the EU? They justify the establishment of tighter border control, and they evoke notions of human trafficking and illegal migration.

The idea of migrants flooding over national borders defying the powers of the sovereign state is an extremely powerful rhetorical tool. It implies the loss of control, and raises the demand for containment and prevention. The use of "mixed and massive flows" evokes feelings in national communities – fear, xenophobia, racism – and securitizes migration

(Ceyhan &Tsoukala 2002). 'Flow' as an uncontrollable natural force produces notions of illegitimate migrants and the evoked feelings, in those national communities to which it is directed, bear effects on the task of protecting the refugee. The burden of proof of legitimate reasons to migrate is on the individual moving; she is a potential drop in the wider flood of migrants. There is constant worry about "them" misusing "our" hospitality in the air. The will to control and harness these floods make migrants visible in a particular light; the real and legitimate refugees need to be screened from the horde of economic migrants/refugees, international criminals, human traffickers and terrorists.

The notion of a migration flow thus establishes a metaphorical border; the flow becomes a border between subjectivities and different manners of being in the world. The metaphor is used to naturalize this divide and make migration and refugee protection problems of the state or region, as in the case of the EU. Through repetitive use metaphors can start to function as "sticky signs" to use Ahmed's words (cited in Tyler 2006: 191). These sticky signs shape perceptions of others; the figure of the refugee is shaped through the stickiness of notions like flux and inflow. Through this kind of signs, some identities and subjectivities (e.g. refugee) become securitized in order to produce and secure other identities and subjectivities (e.g. citizen/national). Refugee protection and the functioning of migration metaphors are questions not only of international human rights regimes, but also of structuring national imaginaries (see Tyler 2006: 192) and activating the politics of boundaries.

The duty to protect the refugee becomes easily flooded by the securitizing logic now so prevalent in international relations. After all, the first and foremost task of the state – according to the realist argument – is to secure its own survival. A task now to be fulfilled by the "international police of aliens" (Walters 2002). Refugee flows are constructed as a threat not only to the nation's "geo-body", but also to the bodies of individual citizens (Rajaram & Grundy-Warr 2004: 54). The metaphor both enacts the violence of boundaries that establish states, and activates the politics of borders in order to produce a "citizen" against migrating "non-citizen". The two subjectivities are related, not oppositions to one another. They embody the western thought confined by dualisms, in that their being does not leave space for alternatives, for a subjectivity that is neither one nor the other, or that is both. (Longhurst 1997: 490.)

Boundaries are representational moves that construct subjectivities, both that of the refugee and that of the citizen or national, and they construct spaces in which both subjectivities can define their belongings and displacements. That is their *being in the world*. Ambivalent migration discourse with the metaphor of "mixed and massive flows" of migrants is used in order to narrow down the amount of those who are considered as legitimate migrants. Their powers are bodypolitical (see also Salter 2006). The objectified and essentialised understanding of borders and boundaries reify the notions of the 'Other'. Otherness becomes a prerequisite, an *a priori* of

knowledge, an institutionalized mode of thought (Puumala 2006). Migration in general is a very uncertain and unstable topic. It is a highly politicised and securitised topic in contemporary, post-9/11 ir/IR. According to Moorehead, the reason why migration is such an unsettled issue lies actually not in the "other" but in the "self", to use these two prominent concepts. It is because of the nature of Western states, which are "driven by the democratic will of their people, who are often hostile to refugees and migrants, but also by the rule of law which makes excessive exclusion impossible". (Moorehead 2006: 288.) The nature of the state is actually the problem here, not people moving. Moorehead contends:

> "To demand of a state that it shows equal concern for those who live outside its boundaries is to ask it to pursue policies which may undermine the very institutions that provide social justice and cultural autonomy for those who live inside them. If to restrict entrance is to accept a world in which differences of citizenship correspond to differences in quality of life, then the arrival of large numbers of people can undermine the existing 'provision of collective or public good' and profoundly alter the nature of a state." (Moorehead 2006: 286.)

The present migration policies are established on the profiling of different figures. There are notions of economic migrants, refugees, migrant workers, illegal aliens, terrorists, asylum-abusers and shoppers, anchor-children, and skilled migrants, to name but a few. These figures are tamed by naming. By this, I mean that through the act of naming – or identifying – the character and the intensions of the person become known, and she can be subjected to different governmental practices. In order to understand how the practicing of the border works and in order to problematize its working, it is necessary to concentrate briefly on the screening out the "true" and "real" refugee from the flooded masses of migrants. The subject category "refugee" plays a central role in this game of making discriminations, for many of the negative definitions are made against this figure. The states face the obligation to protect the refugee, which means that it is essential for them to make the distinction between different categories of border-crossers.

What role is left for the refugee in the politics of her own protection in the light of these sticky signs? And what does the term "refugee" really mean? Who ultimately qualifies in processes of evaluation as a refugee, and what is the difference between refugee and illegal immigrant? The difference between legality and illegality is played with in the notion of migration flows, in order to suggest that the reasons for leaving are not always legitimate.

Refugeeism – Refugee as a Type of Migrant?

As noted, massive flows of migrants have led to the development of new administrative concepts. Here I must first draw attention to the conceptual difference between the administrative and governmental *figure of the refugee* and the lived experience of *being a refugee* (see Tyler 2006: 198 &

Agamben 1994). This paper does not make clear difference between these two aspects, but rather tries to analyze how the figure and being always come together in embodied experiences of lives on lines. Or, as in most cases in the European migration discourses lives out of lines and bodies out of their legitimate place. To do this, I need to briefly go through the discourse that partly constructs the figure of the refugee, the last part of this article focuses on the intertwining of these two aspects. One such is the term "refugeeism", which at least in the European context becomes easily connected to uncontrolled flows of migration. Furthermore, refugeeism is also often mentally linked with diverse negative side effects, such as human trafficking and clandestine immigration, prostitution, xenophobia and racism. As Samaddar (2003: 35 & 42) notes, presently two discourses are coming together under the term "mixed and massive flows of migrants". One is about illegal immigration and the other about refugees. The term "refugeeism", however, weaves these discourses even more tightly together, making it increasingly hard to separate between the two. The figure of the refugee becomes intertwined with the figure of asylum-abuser or illegal migrant. And this, in turn, bears its effects on what being and living as a refugee or as a migrant can mean.

The act of seeking refuge becomes in these interwoven discourses connected with socially negative phenomena, which further implies that the flows have to be controlled. The concept "refugeeism" as such does something: it institutionalizes the refugee situation. It makes it an -ism. This -ism is then seen to have its own dynamics; it becomes another factor in the order of things. The refugee becomes a natural figure; a person whose manner of being in the world is no longer questioned. The term refugee becomes an identificatory marker – another sticky sign. And refugees come to form yet another imagined – and manageable – community, a unitary group. The ones who fall in the cracks of the modern nation-state centric international system, whose identity is that of the refugee, the stranger, the 'Other', are in Anthony Burke's (2002: 21) words "prisoners of paradox". Our security depends on their insecurity; our identity on their abjection. However, it is important to notice that these subject categories like "refugee", "illegal migrant", "asylum-abuser" are actually the outcomes of the prevailing techniques and logic of governmentality. These identity markers become possible as subject positions because our political imagination is limited by the naturalized idea of a territorial nation-state. These states have their "insides" and outsides", which in turn involves inclusion (citizen) and exclusion of subjectivities. These possible modes of subjectivity materialize not only as social bodies or bodies of societies, but also in individual bodies which are conditioned by the figures created in governmental discourses. (See Foucault 1979 & 1983; Penttinen 2004.)

Can we then speak of a refugee situation or experience? The 1951 Convention gives rise to the characteristics on which individuals can be recognized as legitimate and "true" refugees. Thus, the existing refugee law points to the existence of a sweeping, unifying refugee experience, which

constructs the refugee as a type or kind of migrant. According to Malkki (1995: 506) the international regime in fact "produces the social, political and legal constructions that we now recognize as refugeeness". The question of the protection of refugees is thus also a Foucauldian question of power and knowledge – the power to produce knowledge and the power to produce subjectivities through knowledge production (see Foucault 1998: ch 5; Dillon 2005: 47). The idea of a single, essential and recognizable refugee experience leads to conceptualizing refugees as an experiential category. This categorization then gives states a way to implement their sovereign need to control the movement of people. This is the epistemological underpinning of the expression "mixed and massive flows of migrants", which naturalizes the governmental technologies of power and objectifies the refugee as a natural object of knowledge.

Etienne Balibar (1991) has posed a question on the existence of 'neo-racism'. Migration and refugee discourses – and notions like migration flows – are seen to provide interpretative keys not on what individuals are experiencing, but to what they *are*. Balibar then comes close to Malkki's notion of the refugee as a privileged source of knowledge in the (inter)national order of things. The discourses weave together the figure of a refugee and being a refugee. Even though the governmental logic of these discourses is tightly connected to the corpo*reality* of these subject-positions, it is useful to make a conceptual distinction between the two. This way we can better examine what the practicing of the border does and how bodies become differently positioned in these practices. The body is a site of power; a site on which power materializes and is turned into lived experience, a corpo*reality*.

In the logic of refugeeism body plays on the intersectings between forced migration and the politics of citizenship. By producing and constructing the refugee as a type of migrant, body-political discourses create categories and classifications, which then are followed by instituted sets of restrictions and rights. The right to protection – that is the inclusion of the refugee as a legitimate body – comes only after the individual has been classified as a refugee. The practice of the border, that is the process of subjectivating and a technique of regulating bodies, is a game of life, death, obedience, truth and identity.

Ma(r)king Bodies

The line represents us and actualizes our subjectivities, its idea needs not to be taken as essential or objective, but its effects cannot be dismissed or simply wished away. Paraphrasing Sara Ahmed (1999: 99) I would claim that what is seen as the asylum-seeker is already structured by knowledges that keep the other in a certain place. The space/place displays the other to us, but also simultaneously constrains our knowledge of her. The embodied boundary that the notion of flows of migrants is building is between politics and bodies – it is a bodypolitical boundary.

Bodies are social entities inscribed with notions of normality, control and discipline (Parr 2001: 160). One way to control and discipline bodies is to inscribe categorical identities to them (Calhoun 2003: 548). Such identities could entail e.g. nation, gender, class, race, clan, but also asylum-seeker and its "sub-categories" are ways of disciplining bodies. These notions invoke ideas of sharp lines and boundaries and clear compositions, and they work in order to control the chaotic flows of migrants. Categorization is also a necessary prerequisite of protection giving, which makes these two discourses intertwine in a complicated way. These two discourses do, however, bear material effects. They work to mark and make bodies and subjectivities. These bodies "out of line" are connected by the material effects of such discourses. They are conquered, disciplined and organized into new spaces (see Calhoun 2003: 548).

Bodies, located at the line that is seen to separate inside from outside, are sites of political struggles. Their stories are weighed in terms of credibility in relation to 'official' knowledge. Their hearings when their right to have an asylum is pondered can be conceptualized as auto-confessional, where not only their stories, but also their gestures, face and expressions are interpreted (Salter 2006: 182–183). The body comes to testify and this testimony is then mirrored against the criteria of credibility. The burden of surveillance is on those seeking refuge. They are the products of this particular order of things, its "abjects" and to blame them for its abusing is to actually strengthen the system. After all, as Paul Rabinow (1986: 240) states "representations are social facts", or they can turn easily into ones. Subjectivities and bodies both are made visible and given to be seen in the existing system in particular ways, in which other ways of being – like that of a citizen – seem more legitimate or natural than others. This logic also guides our thoughts and translates easily in the language of the other as a threat. These are questions of power and authority; questions of power to produce subjectivities and subject categories.

The centrality of the modern nation-state in the task of producing the figure of the refugee cannot be left unnoted. It is the field that most bluntly structures notions of agents and legitimate actors. Idea of a territorial state with a knit community inside, which the governmental practice of the border tries to establish and maintain, has led to the conceptualization of spatialized identifications and identities (Agamben 1998). Underlying this philosophy is the idea of place and identity being somehow tied together. This in Malkki's (1995: 508) words leads to "the assumption that to become uprooted and removed from a national community is automatically to lose one's identity, traditions and culture". The country of refuge is thus automatically made strange, and the refugee an *a priori* stranger, an outsider in it. She – together with other abject bodies – leads a life in line, lives (out of) line. The subject-category limits her possible lived spaces, and the position of the refugee, "illegal" or "abuser" is a result of subjectivation (cf. Penttinen 2004: 49 & 80). Bio-power turns individuals into subjects and creates a limited amount of possible identity narratives. The politics of

borders and boundaries lays the ground on which diverse spatial and spatialized discourses intersect and mix. After all, power is a certain type of relation between individuals, not a substance (Foucault 1979: 253). The drawing of lines makes things familiar or strange. The practice of the border tells us who is a body out of line, the "Other".

Practicing Borders and the Body as a Battlefield

Now I will move from subject production to the question of protection in its relation to (border)lines and the notion of body as a battlefield. By now it might be useful to underline that I approach the issue of protection from a political point of view, not so much from the aspect of international humanitarian (refugee) law. Thus, it is *the politics of protection* with its connections to *the corporeal practices of border,* which are addressed. What is that line that needs to be secured and supervised when deciding on the politics of protection? And, who has the power/right to protect and give protection, and thus also to demand obedience? As noted above, we cannot think of refugee protection without addressing the question of power and politics.

Giving protection to the refugee is in my view most of all a political task, for it is de-differentiable from the principle of sovereignty – here defined as the authority of discriminations[1]. According to Walker (2006) there are three sites of authorized discriminations: at the boundary of the modern individual subject, at the boundary of the modern sovereign state, and at the boundary of the modern system of sovereign states. All these are questions on who should be in and who is to be left out. The political view on refugee protection and the discussion of the figure of the refugee, tell officially a story of inclusion. Inclusion in the sense of taking the refugee in and giving her protection either from or instead of her "own" state. But, at the same time there is a more crepuscular story told. And it is just this shadowy story which has gained prominence in the western political imagination lately. It is a story of exclusions – of how to profile as meticulously and precisely as possible the figures who are moving in the spaces of the international. It is a story of bodies as battlefields on which power inscribes certain meanings, characteristics and qualities. It is also a story of fear and suspicion. The desire to manage and control migration has lead in the (western) states to the creation of what Peter Nyers (2003: 1070) terms deportspora – an abject diaspora.

The dynamism of mixed and massive flows has been met with the invention of a whole array of new ways of excluding. These ways have taken the sticky form of "safe third countries", "illegal aliens", "asylum abusers/shoppers", "anchor children", and other such stigmatizing notions that make it difficult to plea for one's right to protection. The state's ability to decide who will be provided with protection is also a claim to monopolize the political (Nyers 2003). Refugees can notice quite quickly that by boundary-crossing they entered the sphere of the floating logic of

protection, in which they are considered either as threats or as victims, legitimate or illegitimate movers (see Malkki 1995: 518). Their lives and bodies become politicized to the extreme, while as agents, active subjects, they are depoliticized, moved beyond and above politics. Protection is ultimately about politics, about authority of discriminations. As Nyers (2003: 1071) notes, "whenever a state ponders whether or not to grant asylum to an individual, it is making an intervention in the politics of protection".

This politics of protection is thus a manifestation of the border practicing. The abject bodies, which do not show obedience to the state and citizen-centred narratives of belonging embody a displaced condition. They are the wretched of the earth in the contemporary world. The abject body is someone who represents a social other. It is a deviated and disorderly body, a body out of line, in relation to which the citizen-subject is formed. Rose (cited in Nyers 2003: 1074) states that

Abjection is a matter of the energies, the practices, the works of division that act upon persons and collectivities such that some ways of being, some forms of existence are cast into a zone of shame, disgrace or debasement, rendered beyond the limits of the liveable, denied the warrant of tolerability, accorded purely a negative value.

We are, thus, talking here about institutional modes of subjectivation and subjectivity production (see Radhakrishnan 1993: 761). Abject bodies are the residue of the nation-state system. These bodies tell the crepuscular story, or continuation/extension, of national communities. These social others as far as they are both "inside" and "outside" the political community embody the practices of the border, they live the line, their lives are in – and out of – line. The lines that both connect and separate the identities of citizen-self and refuge seeking-other become very sharp and poignant once the notion of sovereignty is raised. The abject bodies become the battlefields of border practices. These practices take on spatial dimensions, which characterize and accentuate their corporeality – the practices define the spaces in which these abject bodies can exist. They are reception and detention centres, airports, waiting-zones, refugee camps. These are the "*mezzanine spaces of sovereignty*" (Nyers 2003: 1080) – spaces that are in-between the inside and outside of the state and in which the abject bodies wait.

These in-between spaces are, as mentioned, products of border practicing. They are a means of inscribing meaning on certain bodies and they form the corporeal materiality, the embodied framework of being a refugee/asylum seeker. These bodies and the spaces that have been introduced to control them tell the corporeal stories of what the prerequisites of citizenship are. Thus, the figures of non-citizen and citizen intertwine. This perceived dichotomy and a system of domination between the two bodies will prevail if the abject body is continuously described only as a negation of the citizen-self. In the following chapter, I want to examine the relation between the two modes of subjectivity, which both result from the practices of the border. Instead of asking how to establish a bond

between the two, we should maybe question in Nancyean spirit as does Jenny Edkins (2005: 383; see also Nancy 2000) " how have we come to consider the two separate in the first place"?

An individual experience of refuge and fear does not as such translate to the language of politics, ethics or justice. But then again these dimensions should not be disconnected from (inter)subjective, lived experiences, either. Our being in the world, may "we" here mean citizens, refugees or human beings in general, is dialogical in relation to the world and to others who inhabit the world with us (Merleau-Ponty 1993: 83–84). Even though individual experience *per se* is not a sufficient basis for regimes of protection, the ethical and moral *ought* should not be reduced to the political *is* (cf. Benhabib 2004: 67, 143). In research and policy-making more attention is called for to acts of hospitality. The politics of protection and citizenship obscure the possibility for alternative reconceptualisations and representations of subjectivity, which could constitute "moments of transcendence" (Doty 2006: 55). Here we come close to the persisting question of the limits of possible in refugee law and in international politics. Institutionalized international relations both as a discipline and practice are already tied to the notion of boundedness. The creation and introduction of more humane and ethical politics of protection requires the creation and introduction of new sites and logics of representation.

Can we explore and come up with new ways of seeing and also dealing with these bodies in movement and also with ourselves? To me the importance of the issue is related to the discursive and corporeal practices of 'othering' which lies at the centre of these discourses, and which shape our notions of belonging and excluding. These questions are crucial with regard to how knowledge about the issue of immigration is produced and used. In order to cope with increasing amount of border-crossings, national communities need to develop not only alternative institutional and organizational practices but also epistemological stances that would take into account the intersections of self/other, belonging/displacement and home/migration and not rely on exclusive narratives of us versus them.

From Borderlines to Lifelines

The binding logic of the *lines* – be they borders, frontiers, boundaries, borderlines or limits – needs to be questioned. This does not imply that there are no lines. Neither is it a demand for open boundaries, but for the need to acknowledge and theorize refugee and citizen as de-differentiable. The boundary not only separates them, but also connects them together – connects their fates together – and makes the boundary a lived one. We are all living boundaries, lines and borders, and in living we actualize them. This is then to be seen as a suggestion to try to break away from the notion of essential and objective lines, and to see the boundaries as porous, lived experiences.

If we are to better protect the refugee – and appreciate her as a unique individual and not treat her as a kind of person – then the epistemic principles giving rise to structural violence need to be addressed. The 'Othering' logic of the line and the otherness institutionalized in modern thought do not give much hope for the development of more just, ethical and humane discourses. And the refugee will remain in limbo. The question of "mixed and massive flows" of migration and its relation to the protection of the refugee is ultimately a power game. A game where sovereign power meets with biopower and body politics. This game activates the politics of border and thus shapes and changes our being in the world, may "we" be citizen-nationals or protection seeking refugees.

Through the stories and testimonies of individual refuge seekers the border is questioned; its excluding logic is contested and experiences of flowing spaces and floating logics brought forward. The borderline is a dynamic and ambiguous concept, not a stationary one. Migration flows – and lived experiences of what *being a refugee* is in relation to how *the figure of the refugee* is produced – put also the understanding of naturalized lines in flux. Living a line, leading one's life in line or being out of line are neither questions of essential experiential categories, nor of individual experiences. They are questions of limits of modern political life, of political authority and of the corpo*realities* of border practicing.

A way towards more inclusive narratives means introducing hospitality that would not be conditioned by the principle of state sovereignty and naturalized national belongings to the world characterized by migration flows and people on the move. This can become a promise of ethical encounters and of the right to have rights. These encounters are experienced in concrete places, at a certain moment in time and in these encounters it is possible to put the politics of protection aside and bring the promise of hospitality to life. The question of unconditional hospitality intertwines with the question of borders. It is about very small, even minuscule practices which may seem as completely irrelevant in the immigration debates. These practices, however, play a part in transforming the politics of borders and they can illustrate passing instances of unconditional hospitality. It is about the everydayness of migration. And, most of all, learning the language of a new ontology. This in Jean-Luc Nancy's words means that not only must being-with-one-another not to be understood starting from the presupposition of being-one, but on the contrary, being-one…can only be understood by starting from being-with-one-another (Nancy 2000: 84).

We have not began to explore what this might mean in terms of protecting the refugee and moving from strict and tight borderline thinking into the direction of lifelines that shape our understandings of each other and our ways of negotiating our belongings with others. Too often the human is lost in the discourses and practices of border practicing and migration. We need to explore the humane, and try to move from macro-level not to an individual one, but to an ontology of being-in-common. As

an ethical statement this could entail that we all are singular plural, responsible to and of each other. In politics, it would mean thinking and, ideally, also putting into practice how we are 'us' among us (see Nancy 2000: 26).

Notes

[1] This point was made by R.B.J. Walker in his keynote "Out of line?", Critical Approaches to Security in Europe II – Constructing insecurity and the political, 29 September–1 October 2006, Tampere Peace Research Institute.

References

Aaltola, Mika .2006. "The Changing Scales of Good and Evil: Morality Plays at the Profiled EU and U.S. Borders", *Refugee Watch,* no. 27, 29–57.

Agamben, Giorgio. 1998. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign power and bare life.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Agamben, Giorgio (1994): "We Refugees", available at

http://www.egs.edu/faculty/ agamben/agamben-we-refugees.html. Last accessed 29th March 2007.

Ahmed, Sara .1999. "'She'll Wake Up One of These Days and Find Out that She's Turned Into a Nigger': Passing Through Hybridity", *Theory, Culture & Society*, 16:2, 87–106.

Balibar, Etienne. 1991. "Is There a 'Neo-Racism'?", in Etienne Balibar & Immanuel Wallerstein (eds.): *Race, Nation, Class – Ambiguous Identities*, London: Verso.

Benhabib, Seyla .2004. *The Rights of Others: Aliens, Residents and Citizens.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burke, Anthony .2002. "Prisoners of Paradox: Thinking for the Refugee", *Social Alternatives*, 21:4, 21–27.

Calhoun, Craig.2003. "'Belonging in the cosmopolitan imaginary", *Ethnicities*, 3:4, 531–568.

Ceyhan, A. & A. Tsoukala.2002. "The Securitization of Migration in Western Societies: Ambivalent Discourses and Policies", *Alternatives*, 27: Supplement, 21–39.

Dillon, Michael (2004): "Correlating Sovereign and Biopower", in Edkins, Jenny & Véronique Pin Fat & Michael J. Shapiro (eds.): *Sovereign Lives: Power in Global Politics*, 41–60. London & New York: Routledge.

Doty, Roxanne Lynn.2006. "Fronteras Compasivas and the Ethics of Unconditional Hospitality", *Millennium*, 35:1, 53–74.

Foucault, Michel.1998. *Seksuaalisuuden historia: tiedontahto, nautintojen käyttö, huoli itsestä* [*Histoire de la sexualiſe: La volonſe de savoir, L'usage des plaisirs, Le souci de soi*], Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Foucault, Michel.1983. "Afterword, The Subject and Power", in Dreyfus & Rabinow (eds.): *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics,* 208–225. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, Michel.1979. "Omnes et Singulatim: Towards a Criticism of 'Political Reason'", *The Tanner Lectures of Human Values*, delivered at Stanford University.

Longhurst, Robyn.1997. "(Dis)embodied Geographies", *Progress in Human Geography*, 21:4, 486–501.

Malkki, Liisa H.1995. "Refugees and Exile: From "Refugee Studies" to the National Order of Things." *Annual Review of Anthropology*, vol. 24, 495–523.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice.1993. *Silmä ja mieli.* [*L'Oeil et l'Esprit*, 1964]. Jyväskylä: Gummerus.

Mervola, Markus.2006. "Forced Displacement and Identity Formation in the EU", *Refugee Watch* no. 28, 72–87.

Moorehead, Caroline.2006. *Human Cargo: A Journey among Refugees*. London: Vintage.

Nancy, Jean-Luc .2000.*Being Singular Plural*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Nyers, Peter.2003. "Abject Cosmopolitanism: the politics of protection in the anti-deportation movement", *Third World Quarterly*, 24:6, 1069–1093.

Parr, Hester .2001. "Feeling, Reading, and Making Bodies in Space", *The Geographical Review*, 91:1–2, 158–167.

Penttinen, Elina .2004. *Corporeal Globalization: Narratives of Subjectivity and Otherness in the Sexscapes of Globalization.* TAPRI Occasional Paper 94. Tampere: Tampereen yliopistopaino.

Puumala, Eeva .2006. "Toiseuden politiikkaa ja poetiikkaa – kolme kertomusta kansainvälisestä ja sen politiikasta" ("The Poetics and Politics of Otherness – three stories of the international and its politics"), *Kosmopolis*, 36:1, 26–46.

Rabinow, Paul. 1986. "Representations are Social Facts: Modernity and Post-modernity in Anthropology", in James Clifford – George E. Marcus (eds.): *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 234–261.

Radhakrishnan, R.1993. "Postcoloniality and the Boundaries of Identity", *Callaloo*, 16:4, 750–771.

Rajaram, Prem Kumar & Carl Grundy-Warr.2004. "The Irregular Migrant as Homo Sacer: Migration and Detention in Australia, Malaysia, and Thailand", *International Migration*, 42:1, 33–64.

Salter, Mark .2006. "The Global Visa Regime and the Political Technologies of the International Self: Borders, Bodies, Biopolitics", *Alternatives*, 31, 167–189.

Samaddar, Ranabir .2003. "Introduction. Power and Care: Building the New Indian State", in Samaddar, Ranabir (ed.): *Refugees and the State: Practices of Asylum and Care in India,* 21–68. New Delhi: Sage.

Samaddar, Ranabir (1999): *The Marginal Nation: Transborder Migration from Bangladesh to West Bengal.* New Delhi: Sage.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty .1988. "Can the Subaltern Speak?", in Nelson, Cary & Lawrence Grossberg (eds.): *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture,* 271–313. Basingstoke: MacMillan Education.

Tyler, Imogen.2006. "'Welcome to Britain'. The cultural politics of asylum", *Cultural Studies*, 9:2, 185–202.

Walters, William.2002."Deportation, Expulsion, and the International Police of Aliens", *Citizenship Studies*, 6:3, 265–292.

Walker, R.B.J. 2006."The Doubled Outsides of the Modern International", *International Journal of Diversity in Organizations*, March 2006.

Zizek, Slavoj.2001. "Welcome to the Desert of the Real", available at http://web.mit.edu/cms/reconstructions/interpretations/desertreal.html. Last accessed 29th April 2007.