

■ Litteraturöversikter

Kalm, Sara, 2008. *Governing Global Migration*. Lund Political Studies 153. Lund: Department of Political science.

IVER B. NEUMANN¹

Tucked away in footnote 88 on page 143 in this incisive dissertation, we find the following:

In the 1880s, German-English geographer Ravenstein formulated a series of general statements, or 'laws', on migration, on the basis of his observations in the UK. He explained that the demand for labour in the industrial and commercial centres was the prime cause of migration, and that his laws therefore merely map out 'the mode in which the deficiency of hands in one part of the country is supplied from other parts where population is redundant' (1885: 198). Ravenstein failed to take into account the effect of borders, and thus assumed that the same objective and natural 'laws' operated across borders as within them. As Zolberg argues, this omission has marked large parts of migration studies ever since (1989: 405).

The dissertation is an attempt to do something about this situation by bringing Foucauldian governmental analysis to the task. The concept of *gouvernementalité* was first introduced by Michel Foucault on 1

1 Iver B. Neumann is Director of Research at the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs and Professor in Russian Studies at Oslo University.
E-post: ibn@nupi.no

February 1978 in a lecture at Collège de France. In the quarter of a century that has passed since then, the concept has been further developed in a number of different directions. First by researchers who in their time cooperated with Foucault, later particularly by English-writing researchers, e.g. Australians such as Barry Hindess, and Britons such as Nikolas Rose. The concept has furthermore been utilised in a number of empirical works.

Foucault developed the concept of governmentality in order to understand exactly what characterises the exertion of power in modern societies. In his 1975-76 lectures to the Collège de France, he lay out this field as consisting of sovereignty and dominance. Taking stock in order to find new ground was one of Foucault's habits. In this case, it led him to formulating the concept of governmentality. Foucault's work on power placed himself in apparent opposition to half a thousand years of political theoretical tradition, where the key point had been to seek to understand power as something universal and eternally present; as a constant for human nature. Foucault's core argument, in contrast, is that speculative statements about the nature of man, as well as universally valid assumptions about political life as we know them from the entire range of political theorists from Hobbes, Kant and further, block empirical research on how power is in fact being exerted. If humans are shaped by their social environment, and if this social environment takes on radically different forms, such assumptions are not only a hindrance for understanding, but

Figure 1.

Mode of power	Relation	Institutionalised as part of	Key technique
Dominance	Directly, between master and servant	Settlement, hierarchical differentiation	Disciplining
Governmentality	Indirectly, even subject internal	The 1700s, social differentiation	Staging
Strategy	Directly, between equals	The 1500s, differentiation of space	Game

they can simply be misleading. Theoretical assumptions are replaced by empirical research, whereas universal suppositions are replaced by specific analyses.

Governmentality is a type of power relation which comes between dominance and strategy, and which is connected to the reflexive – that is; how the self governs itself. The degree of freedom the self possesses to do this; lies between one the one hand acting strategically, and on the other being dominated, because whenever one attempts to govern oneself, one will seek to draw on a set of technologies that are taken from various fields: From one's own experience with institutions such as the school system, from other's attempt to govern you, from technologies such as meditation and prayer. This is a power form which Foucault traced from free Greek men's *arche* in Antiquity's Greece; such as technologies to govern one's own sexual life. We may compare governmentality to the other two modes of power in Foucault as in figure 1.

On the one hand, globalisation represents a challenge to the governmentality perspective, because globalisation is a reminder that the unit which the concept of governmentality begins with – society – cannot be treated as a closed unit (either around itself or by the state). Historically,

it was a precondition for the emergence of government that the political Europe already had discovered a form based on sovereignty – a form which divided territory into units that were clearly separated from each other in the political sense. On the other hand, globalisation invites application of a governmentality perspective to the emerging social realities, where these borders are once again about to cease.

In chapter three, which presents the literature on governmentality, Kalm treats liberalism as yet another mode of power. This is, I think, not called for. Liberalism, understand as a really existing historical regime type, is rather characterised by a particular constellation of these three modes of power, with governmentality being ever more prominent amongst them. Be that as it may, Kalm (p. 20) rightly points out that while Foucauldian theorists within this tradition have interrogated into a wide variety of aspects of the constitution of the population as a target for modern governmental interventions, the formative role of national borders has attracted very little attention, and claims that

When migration politics is approached from an externalist perspective, its role for regulating the border between national and global populations becomes apparent.

Kalm thus follows in the footsteps of those who have brought governmentality studies to the global level, and she is the first to do so where migration is concerned. The state of cooperation in the policy area of migration is presented in chapter two. The key passage reads as follows:

If cooperation in the field of refugees can be characterized as responsibility-sharing for protection, and the cooperation over smuggling and trafficking as state-to-state assistance in fighting transnational organized crime, then a third form of cooperation can be seen in the trade agreements negotiated in the World Trade Organization (WTO). The link between trade liberalization and the movement of people has been forged through the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), where the “presence of natural persons” is one of the four ways (or “modes”) through which services can be provided (Mode 4) [...]. Mode 4 was originally included in GATS during the Uruguay round of trade negotiations, as a result of pressures from developing countries wanting to open up for the movement of labour as a counterbalance to the movement of capital represented by Mode 3 (“commercial presence”/foreign investment). Within the framework of GATS Mode 4, states negotiate binding commitments to admit temporary movements of “service providers”. The Agreement hence only covers the movement of persons whose presence is necessary in order to carry out trade in services – and not general access to labour markets. The Annex on Movement of Natural Persons makes explicit that states retain the right to regulate access to citizenship, residence and employment of a permanent character. Hence, when defining the affected cross-border movements as temporary movement of service providers, the point is

precisely that negotiations do *not* concern migration (p. 42).

With reference to Green and Thouez (2005: 3), she focuses on three characteristics of this nascent governance structure: it is unstructured in its organization and suffering from an unclear relationship with the UN; it is uncoordinated as it lacks a central organization and a broad range of actors are approaching the question; and states still dominate migration policy at all levels. There is a Global Migration Group and a Global Forum on Migration and Development, but they are only tenuously linked to the UN.

Chapter three treats the governmentality of global migration as a problematisation, by which Foucault meant “not behaviour or ideas, nor societies and their ‘ideologies’, but the *problematizations* through which being offers itself to be, necessarily, thought – and the *practices* on the basis of which these problematizations are formed” (Foucault 1992: 11).

“Problematization”, Foucault (1996: 456-457) adds elsewhere, “doesn’t mean the representation of a pre-existing object, nor the creation through discourse of an object that doesn’t exist. It’s the set of discursive or nondiscursive practices that makes something enter into the play of true and false, and constitutes it as an object for thought (whether under the form of moral reflection, scientific knowledge, political analysis, etc.)”.

Chapter four looks at the limitations of Foucault’s own work on governmentality. The populations that Foucault was concerned with were already territorialized. But, writes Kalm, “if we take the international sphere into account, the interrelation between the different forms becomes more conspicuous: ‘It becomes exceptionally difficult to elide the relation be-

tween sovereignty and governmentality, as Foucault tended to do, when the “populations” at issue are global rather than local. The complex relation that has always obtained between governmental and sovereign power becomes freshly posed as a consequence’ (Dillon & Reid 2000: [136]). Drawing on Barry Hindess’s (esp. 2000; 2002) work, Kalm does a nice job of rectifying some of these shortcomings so that the perspective may be used for the purpose at hand. A key point for Hindess, is that, if we understand government in its broadest sense as structuring “the possible field of action of others” (Foucault 1994: 341), then the modern system of states could also be seen as a regime of government, one that operates like civil society and the market: with no controlling centre. As Kalm (p. 104) phrases it, “modern governmental thought is simultaneously characterised by its concerns with managing the aggregate population encompassed by the state system”. The conclusion to this chapter highlights how

...the function of migrants is ambiguous for “statecraft”, i.e. the boundary-drawing practices which reproduce the state through differentiation from the international outside. On the one hand, migrants are deterritorializing – the presence of migrants seems to belie the naturalness of how the state system regime of governance divides people and places, thus exposing the contingency of this particular organization of humanity. On the other, migrants can be thought of as a resource for the reterritorialization associated with statecraft, as having the potential to reproduce this system simply by constituting its aberration (p. 132).

This is a very stimulating reading, which has immediate policy relevance for discussions and decisions regarding labour migration, in the Scandinavian states and

elsewhere. It is, in my opinion, also a point which has been made before, at book’s length, by Nevzat Soguk (1999) where refugees are concerned. Kalm mentions her fellow post-structuralist Soguk as a predecessor at the opening of her dissertation, but a bit more acknowledgement of his inspiration would only have added more grace to Kalm’s own work

In chapter five, Kalm discusses migration as one of many flows that circulate globally. Governance of the flow of persons is, as previously pointed out, much less institutionalised than is governance of the flow of goods. It remains heavily inscribed in a sovereign discourse where states have the right to deny citizens access (usual up unto the middle of the 19th century throughout Europe but frowned upon since) as well as denying aliens entry. In a word, migration has been differently problematised: “In a tone which sounds very unfamiliar today, the International Emigration Conference declared in 1889: ‘We affirm the right of the individual to the fundamental liberty accorded to him by every civilized nation to come and go and dispose of his person and his destinies as he pleases’ (p. 152).” The First World War brought such a liberal way of framing migration to a halt (but not before millions of Scandinavians had found their way to the US). Again, Hindess serves as a key stepping stone. This time, it is his historically important and Huntington-destroying underlining of how large-scale migration is an often-returning phenomenon in world history. By reference to migration discourse, Hindess holds that

The assumption here is that, even if they move around within it, people will normally be settled in the society to which they be-

long [...] In fact, the historical record suggests a different story; namely, that large-scale population movement is as normal a feature of the human condition as is long-term territorial settlement [...] Nevertheless, the system of territorial states and the techniques of population management developed within it have turned the movement of people around the world into an exceptional activity, something that can and should be regulated by the states whose borders they threaten to cross (Hindess 2000: 1494).

Kalm (p. 159) also aptly brings to play a key shift in liberal ontology here. As demonstrated by Foucault, a corollary of the early liberals representation of *homo oeconomicus* as following his interests and concurrently helping the collective by dint of the “invisible hand” was that the subject should be left alone. To neo-liberals, however, *homo oeconomicus* should adapt to changes in the environment, so may be manipulated, e.g. in the sense that he, and now also she, may be brought to chase jobs throughout a continent. The neo-liberal subject is thus a migrating subject.

Chapter six pairs up these themes by handling migration along the axes of knowledge about it, acknowledged ways of talking about it and moral ways of passing judgement on it. This chapter should be reworked into a shorter Swedish version, as it has considerable relevance as a ground-clearing exercise for ongoing political debates about migration. This dissertation is true to the Foucauldian ideal of not carrying its politics on its sleeve. The argumentation is transparent, and the presuppositions are well laid out. Old lefties will miss the fist and the blunt irony

and the yelling about workers' rights. To this reader, on the other hand, this work is politically effective exactly because it stays away from all that, and simply demonstrates the inner tensions and downright illogical traits of today's burgeoning governance of global migration. The candidate is to be congratulated on her academic work, but also on her political acumen.

Bibliography

- Dean, Mitchell, 2007. *Governing Societies: Political Perspectives on Domestic and International Rule*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Dillon, Michael & Reid, Julian, 2000. “Global Governance, Liberal Peace, and Complex Emergency”, *Alternatives*, 25(1), pp. 117-145.
- Foucault, Michel, 1992. *The History of Sexuality Vol. 2: The Use of Pleasure*. London: Penguin.
- Foucault, Michel, 1994ba. “The Subject and Power”, pp. 326-348 in James D. Faubion (ed.), *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984, 3: Power*. London: Penguin.
- Foucault, Michel, 1996. “The Concern For Truth”, pp. 455-464 in Sylvère Lotringer (ed.), *Foucault Live: Collected Interviews 1961-1984*. New York: Semiotext(e).
- Green, Jessica F. & Thouez, Colleen, 2005. “Global Governance for Migration and the Environment: What Can We Learn from Each Other?”, GCIM: Global Migration Perspectives No. 46.
- Hindess, Barry, 2000. “Citizenship in the International Management of Populations”, *American Behavioural Scientist*, 43(9), pp. 1486-1497.
- Hindess, Barry, 2002. “Neo-liberal Citizenship”, *Citizenship Studies*, 6(2), pp. 127-143.
- Soguk, Nevzat, 1999. *States and Strangers: Refugees and Displacements of Statecraft*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.