Ever Challenged Union: Exploring Ways Out of the Crises

Belfast, 29-30 June 2015

www.uaces.org

Rachael Dickson
Queen's University Belfast

The southern neighbourhood in crisis: the migrant crisis, governmentality and domopolitics

1. Introduction

The European Union (EU) has long been bordered by instability along its southern rim in the form of authoritarian regimes with questionable human rights records. The uprisings of 2010-11 presented a crisis of how to respond but also offered a window of opportunity for democratic reform, the implementation of rights-based regimes and economic opportunity (Hollis, 2012). The EU struggled as an international actor to implement a coherent response and faced criticism for being a reactionary despite having had a presence in those nations since the development of Union for Mediterranean and the ENP. Arguably, the opportunities for democratisation were not fully realised, with each state facing their own hurdles in the reform process. The EU is now facing different crises along its southern periphery. The current Mediterranean migrant crisis, resurgent on the political agenda since April 2015, will form the subject of this paper. The lawless nature of the Union's neighbouring North African states has resulted in them being exploited as routes for irregular migrants to seek entry to the EU via boat (Traynor, 2015). In light of the many deaths and arrivals on EU shores the Union has articulated a desire to tackle the 'root causes and implement policy 'based on principles of solidarity' and 'human rights' (Mogherini, 2015).

This paper will detail how adopting a lens of governmentality allows the exploration of alternative truths within the EU's response (Sokhi-Bulley, 2013). It will suggest a holistic approach based on virtues of solidarity and sharing does not stem solely from a desire to resolve the crisis along humanitarian lines, upholding human rights, but rather on the need to regain control of the 'EU home' and enhance the security of its own citizens. In order to do this, the usefulness of adopting a governmentality approach to analyse the EU's attempts to manage the crisis will be detailed. The usefulness of the concept of domopolitics, as used by Walters (2004) and Darling (2011) to assess national responses to past immigration 'crises', will be presented before its application to the current situation detailed. By way of a conclusion, the author will set out avenues for further

research in the area which will enable a wider assessment of the EU as an international actor and the consequences of reading the situation in such a manner.

2. Development of the crisis

On 18th April 2015 news outlets were in a spin after the latest migrant boat catastrophe in the Mediterranean. The Guardian (2015) reported that the EU has been overwhelmed by the surge of migration north and struggled to formulate a coherent policy response which was 'playing into the hands of traffickers'. The crisis had been building for a while, with increased numbers of people seeking entry into the EU as a result of economic decay, war, persecution and unemployment (Traynor, 2015). The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) at its conference in November 2014 stressed the need for the EU to take action and implement a 'comprehensive and sustainable policy'. In light of the April developments, FRA re-iterated this call for a 'holistic, fundamental-rights oriented EU migration policy in order to save lives and combat the smugglers that seek to make financial gain out of the desperate situation of people in need of protection' (FRA, 2015). Therefore, it can be said that there is certainly a crisis in the EU's southern neighbourhood relating to migration and that human rights have a role to play in the provision of a solution.

However, in the process of finding this solution a number of interesting questions are raised, such as whose rights are to be protected? What does a holistic approach look like? And what impact will this approach have on concepts of the EU as a human rights actor? By undertaking a governmentality analysis, existing scholarship on the EU as an international human rights actor can be both supplemented and challenged as seemingly rational migration policy choices can be framed in terms of rules, processes and techniques and how rationalities of rule seek to produce specific types of actors (Neumann & Sending, 2006). The work of philosopher Michel Foucault has had significant ramifications on both legal and political research. Lemke (2002) notes that his work

comprised of two dissimilar projects. The first, the subject of his books, involved ethical questions or a 'genealogy of the subject' which explored the construction of the individual as a 'subject'. It was through his lectures and interviews that Foucault explored the second aspect, political rationalities or a 'genealogy of the state' which looked at concepts of power. Lemke (2002, 51) identifies the 'problem of government' as the missing, yet vital, link between these two endeavours, noting how it is through the act of governing we can connect the technologies of the self to technologies of power and domination. Foucault's work offers a poststructuralist view of society which allows the questioning of laws, policies and practices. He saw himself as the creator of a toolkit for other scholars to utilise (Foucault, 1974). This paper seeks to evaluate the ways in which EU migration policy has changed in response to the increased numbers of migrants crossing the Mediterranean by using Foucault's concept of governmentality as a tool. In order to show how this is a useful way of investigating this process the concept must be clearly defined and an explanation given as to why these particular conceptualisations of power and government are most useful for undertaking this project.

2.1 Notions of Power

Foucault offered an alternative conceptualisation of power than the traditional 'zero-sum game' analysis (Donnelly, 2008). Gordon (1991: 5) notes that for Foucault power was not a finite resource which once gained could not be lost but 'rather an endless and open strategic game'. Power, for Foucault, is not concentrated in the hands of the few, at the top of a hierarchical pyramid but rather power involves 'ceaseless struggle and confrontations' and can be embodied in a multiplicity of ways (Foucault, 1978). In *The History of Sexuality 1: The Will to Knowledge*, Foucault remarks that power relations are 'intentional and nonsubjective'. They are characterised by calculations, aims and objectives but these do not result from the choice or decision of an individual subject rather are the product of circumstances, assumptions and representations present in society (Foucault, 1978). Defining power in this manner is useful for undertaking an analysis of the EU as the power it claims

Rachael Dickson

Queen's University Belfast

to possess is unconventional, beyond the nation state and continually developing its governance in relation to the circumstances around it. Foucault defines three different types of power: disciplinary power, biopower and governmentality.

(a)*Disciplinary Power*

For Foucault (1977), disciplinary power was born in the classical age when the human body was conceptualised as both an object and target of power. In his seminal work *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of The Prison*, Foucault explains how institutions came to be created to control and reform the actions of the body; for instance, the army, schools and hospitals. These institutions perpetuated two divergent systems of control: submission to rules and improved functioning through explanation. Foucault coins the term 'docile bodies' to describe the joining of the analysable body to the manipulable body. A body characterised by this trait can be 'subjected, used, transformed and improved' by the institutions exercising disciplinary power. Disciplinary power was an innovation as it removed the use of costly and violent processes of control by engineering the production of at least equal levels of productivity through the alteration of patterns of behaviour:

> *The human body was entering a machinery of power that explores it, breaks it down and rearranges it. A 'political anatomy', which was also a 'mechanics of power', was being born; it defined how one may have a hold over others' bodies, not only so that they may do what one wishes, but so that they may operate as one wishes, with the techniques, the speed and the efficiency that one determines* Foucault, 1977).

Thus, discipline produces subjected and practiced bodies. Discipline increases the forces of the body (in economic terms of utility) and diminishes these same forces (in political terms of obedience). A number of mechanisms for exhibiting disciplinary power are identified such as the imposition of timetables, temporal elaboration and conventions of expected behaviour between the

body and the object of power, i.e. how prisoners were to adjust their behaviour when the warden entered the room.

When conceptualised in this way, power supposes a number of characteristics that deviate from the traditional, hierarchical view of power. Power becomes a more modest phenomenon, working in a nuanced and distrustful way as opposed to displaying a triumphalist nature. The form taken by disciplinary power involves calculations and economic analysis which results in seemingly minor procedures, in comparison to the grandeur of sovereign rulers, infiltrating the major power forms such as state apparatus to change their mechanisms and imposing procedures (Foucault, 1977). The success of disciplinary power derives from the use of simple instruments; hierarchical observation, normalizing judgement and their combination in a procedure that is specific to it, the examination (Foucault, 1978).

(b) Biopower/Population

Biopower was identified by Foucault as another key aspect of the development of power relations. Through this concept population becomes a battle ground for expressions of power:

> *One of the great innovations in the techniques of power in the eighteenth century was the emergence of 'population' as an economic and political problem: population as wealth, population as manpower or labour capacity, population as balanced between its own growth and the resources it commanded* (Foucault, 1978).

Rather than focusing on the body as a machine to be controlled through discipline, biopower seeks to control the body as a species. For example, biopower is exhibited through the supervision, interventions in and regulations of the population as a whole (Foucault, 1978: 139-140). Biopower thus seeks to control whole groups of people through the propagation of ideals such as health,

Rachael Dickson
Queen's University Belfast

wealth and posterity. The concept is also closely related to economics, Foucault credits it as an

'indispensable element' in the development of the capitalist system (Foucault, 1978: 139-140).

Bodies were required to carry out functions to maintain the success of the system; therefore

discourses were created to convince these bodies it was in their best interests to carry out these

functions: it was beneficial to be a part of this system.

The creation of biopower is, for Foucault (1978: 143), the explanation for the development of 'life

and its mechanisms into the realm of explicit calculations and made knowledge-power an agent of

transformation of human life'. Establishing biopower, as a starting point for the creation of

institutions and procedures to govern a population, leads to the next type of power which is

concerned with how these governing processes come into being.

(c) Governmentality as Power

The idea of governmentality offers a way of differentiating between the exercise of power and

domination. Instead of control and authority, through this conceptualisation, guidance becomes the

key premise of power. Governmentality concerns the ways in which the governing of self-

government takes place and how a subject's field of possible action is shaped (Lemke, 2002).

Power, therefore, is not distinguishable by its solely destructive manner but rather can produce

outcomes which are useful to those governed by it. This conceptualisation of power is useful when

assessing the power of the EU conveyed through its governing relationship in migration as EU

policy initiatives are engendered to create benefits for both the Union and those subjected to it i.e.

the migrant. Questions can then be asked surrounding the conditions for acceptance of this power

and the reasons underpinning its operation in this manner.

The notion of power exercised through governmentality involves a re-examination of the definition

of the state. The idea of governmentality concentrates notions of power, not in the 'statization' of

Rachael Dickson
Queen's University Belfast

society but, in the 'governmentalization' of the state (Foucault, 2002). Foucault (1977) noted an overemphasis of the role of the state in power relations, stressing the need to broaden the agenda to examine processes of government and their effect on power relations. The processes of governmentality which exist both inside and outside the state circumscribe the state's nature as tactics of government allow the 'continual definition and redefinition of what is within the competence of the state and what is not', therefore an understanding of governmentality is required in order to understand the true nature of the state (Foucault, 2002).

Thus, for Foucault, a number of types of power exist and operate depending on present circumstances, historical events and the actors involved. Rather than seeing power as moving through one phase to the next, sovereignty, discipline and government exist in a triangle 'which has as its primary target the population and its essential mechanism the apparatuses of security' (Foucault, 2002). The apparent progression from 'power' to 'government' in the 1978 lectures does not result from a questioning of the methodological framework, but from its extension to a new object, the state, which did not feature in the analysis of the disciplines (Senellert, 2009). Foucault (1978: 92-3) saw the concepts he developed as flexible and applicable to a variety of situations; 'I would like my books to be a kind of tool-box which others can rummage through to find a tool which they can use however they wish in their own area… I write for users, not readers'. Governmentality has emerged as a research methodology in its own right and it able to provide a number of utilities which can be applied to a number of situations.

3. Governmentality as a methodology/governmentality lens

Foucault introduced the concept of governmentality in his 'Security, Territory, Population' lecture series at the Collège de France in 1977-8. In his 'Governmentality' lecture, he explained the concept to mean three things. Firstly, governmentality encompassed 'the ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analyses, and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise

Rachael Dickson
Queen's University Belfast

of this very specific albeit complex form of power, which has as its target population; as its principal form of political knowledge political economy; and as it essential technical means apparatuses of security (Foucault, 2002)[1]. Miller and Rose (1992) explain governmentality therefore handles how governing is thought about, taking into consideration the different rationalities or 'mentalities of government'. Larner and Walters (2004) highlight the emergence of a global governmentality which encompasses studies from a number of disciplines which 'problematise the constitution and governance of spaces above, beyond, between and across states'. Therefore it can be deduced that govermentality involves all aspects of government, not only institutions or actors but the thought processes and influences that cause certain acts of governance to be implemented.

Secondly, governmentality was the result of the development of government: it was brought into being by the knowledge created by the formation of institutions and apparatuses (Foucault, 2002). This knowledge then allows questions to be asked of governance regarding the choices that are made and assumptions that are held. It highlights and investigates the complex relationship which exists between thought and government (Larner & Walters, 2004). In his work, Foucault notes multiple forms of government, greatly exceeding that accounted for in the traditional conception of the state where a sole figure bore the responsibility for governing (Foucault, 2002). As Gordon (1991) explains, Foucault saw government as 'the conduct of conduct': a means of shaping, steering or affecting the behaviour of others. Government involved a wide variety of activities incorporating acts of governing the self as well as acts of governing others (Lemke, 2002). It can be undertaken by a multiplicity of authorities and agencies, employing a variety of techniques and forms of knowledge, that seek to shape conduct by working through 'desires, aspirations, interests and beliefs of various actors' for defined but changeable ends and with a range of relatively unpredictable 'consequences, effects and outcomes' (Dean, 2010: 18). Taking a governmentality perspective is interesting in this vein as some attempt to deliberate on and direct human conduct and

Rachael Dickson
Queen's University Belfast

government is viewed as an intensely moral activity whereby the bodies are presumed to know what constitutes a good, virtuous, appropriate and responsible way to govern a population (Dean, 2010).

Government refers to the 'conduct of conduct' (Gordon, 1991), therefore it is an activity/practice that aims to shape, guide or affect the conduct of some persons or person. Governmentality can be understood as both a process of government (the art of government) and as a methodology (rationality of government) which is a way of thinking about the practice of government and hence whom, or what, is being governed, what is governing and what can be governed, etc (Sokhi-Bulley, 2013). Sokhi-Bulley (2013) states that governmentality is useful as a methodology to understand the various practices and processes in law as it helps to challenge typical conceptions of government as implying state power, sovereignty and hierarchy and examining instead the various technologies and tactics, often mundane processes, through which power circulates in a heterarchical fashion. Foucault (2002) saw government as an art, he was interested in the activities which comprised it; what they consisted of; how they came into being; how would they develop and continue. The terminology 'rationality' and 'art' were used interchangeably to describe government. Rationality, it is explained, provided a means of thinking about the practice of government and the practicability of governing processes to both practitioners and the practiced upon (Gordon, 1991). Rationality encapsulates a process of reasoning or practice of thinking about, calculating and responding to a problem, which is generally systematic and draws upon formal bodies of knowledge or expertise, favouring systematic thought processes over symbolic, mythic or poetic modes (Dean, 2010). Foucault's vision of government was also closely linked to economy. The essence of government, he said, involved exercising power in the form of economy (Foucault, 2002). Foucault was not advocating that monetary concerns were the root of all governmental action; instead he believed government was based on calculations of 'the possible and the probable (Gordon, 1991: 35-36). Therefore government is related to economy in that it is a transactional process, one which involves assessment of impact, outcomes and potential problem areas.

Rachael Dickson
Queen's University Belfast

Thirdly, Foucault saw governmentality emerging in the Middle Ages as the state developed from being characterised by justice to become "governmentalised" and administrative. Governmentality is concerned with the tactics and mentalities of government which for Foucault made possible 'the continual definition and redefinition of what is within the competence of the state and what is not' (Foucault, 2002: 221). Governance was no longer to be classified by territorial scope but by population and economy which can transgress state borders. Studies of governmentality are, therefore, concerned with how thought operates within this organised system of doing things and our regimes of practices (Dean, 2010).

(a) Methodology facilitates

Foucault (2002: 221) saw government and power as unfixed, fluid and ultimately changeable:

> *The art of government, instead of seeking to found itself in transcendental rules, a cosmological model or philosophico-moral ideal, must find the principles of its rationality in that which constitutes the specific reality of the state.*

The events of the 20 April 2015 which unfolded in the EU's southern neighbourhood altered the specific reality of EU migration policy, therefore the research methodology used to examine them is born from this idea. The European Parliament (2014) passed a resolution and the European Commission (2015) has been developing a formal agenda on migration policy which make reference to potential changes to be made with the instruments of governance to be applied to migrants presenting along the southern border. Adopting governmentality as the methodological stance from which to investigate the ways in which this governance has changed allows a deeper analysis of the rationalities, calculations, and thought processes that have informed these changes. By taking a critical approach research can delve beyond the official statements published by the EU and attempt to assess other motivations and influences governing the relationship of the EU with the migrants and the human rights agenda. Assessment would not only attempt to consider how successful the changes have been on the EU itself, as an international actor, with the competence to

Rachael Dickson
Queen's University Belfast

implement reform, action, and commitment from Member States, but also challenge commonly held assumptions about the Union's position in the international system.

(b) Utility of 'Governmentality' for investigation of EU migration policy

Adopting a governmentality perspective has been seen as advantageous for examining the EU as a system of government. Münch (2010) highlights that governmentality allows the EU to be analysed outside of the traditional theories of international relations. He argues that while intellectual debate seeks out evidence of a democracy in the multilevel system, which is strongly built along lines of national representative government, what is actually evolving is a form of multilevel governance that features strong elements of liberalism. He states this system increasingly gets the upper hand of republican and representative traditions of national government and therefore fits with the concept of European governmentality as outlined by Foucault (Münch, 2010). Democratic decision-making in the liberal sense does not search for procedures that help generate and implement the general will of the citizens or will of the majority, but searches for procedures that allow the greatest variety of interest to be articulated in a never-ending process of trial and error. Therefore any political decision is a snapshot of endless bargaining and entails errors that need corrected by further decision-making (Münch, 2010). A governmentality perspective enables assessment of these developments to be taken into consideration, which is useful for understanding the policy choices made by the EU in the wake of the crisis. In addition, Münch (2010) also argues that liberal governmentality is particularly called for when governance reaches beyond the national monopoly of power, territorial rule and disciplinary power over the individual (Foucault, 2007, 2008). Exercise of EU legalisation and jurisdiction breaks up limitations of national decision-making and establishes new arenas in which political actors can realise interests previously prohibited on the national level because of long-established, and hitherto unquestioned, traditions and narrow mindedness (Münch, 2010). Therefore questions can be asked and answers proffered as to how the EU is able to enact such measures and how government changes/functions at a different level.

Rachael Dickson
Queen's University Belfast

A governmentality perspective in turn explores issues relating to the broader European integration agenda, which is conceived as a broad and deep transformation of society. Governmentality has a different focal point compared to the traditional theoretical perspective. It is not only interested in in the forces driving European integration, for example the interests of national governments, their relative power and the outcome of their negotiations, in the way intergovernmentalism (Moravscik, 1998). Additionally, it is not only interested in the functional dynamics of cross-border trade and its subsequent spillover into legal and political integration, like neofunctionalism is (Haas, 1958 & Stone Sweet, 2004). And unlike constructivism it is not only interested in the construction of European institutions as an outcome of intellectual struggles (Delanty, 1995). Rather governmentality finds its focus beyond the technical questions of how and its interests lie in the transformative power of European integration in deconstructing the old system of national societies and constructing a new structure of governance, solidarity and identity, which are closely linked together (Münch, 2010). Therefore adopting a governmentality lens through which to view and analyse the changes to EU migration policy and their implications for rights and integration allows a different type of critique which taps into wider processes of how European society and government operates.

4. Domopolitics

(a) Defining the concept

By adopting a governmentality perspective it is possible to undertake analysis of concepts not feasible through other research methodologies. The paper will now examine the concept of domopolitics and how it can be a useful tool to examine the EU's response to the migrant crisis. The concept has already been used in literature to assess implications of migration policy in the national setting. Walters (2004) notes that Foucauldian genealogies of government have

Rachael Dickson
Queen's University Belfast

acknowledged the line of emergence that produces modern political economy can be traced back to the Greek notions of *oikos*, meaning household. He writes that until the mid-18th Century the state is conceived as a vast household requiring the wise stewardship of a patriarchal sovereign The rise of liberalism is said to have largely displaced the house-holding portrait of governance as the economy became a more or less autonomous sphere which did not call for regulation but rather indirect government at a distance. It is deduced, therefore, that if modern political economy echoes the project of government in the image of the household, domopolitics refers to the government of the state (but also other spaces) as a home (Walters, 2004). Walters states then that domopolitics implies a reconfiguring of the relationship between citizenship, state and territory. At its heart is a fateful conjunction of home, land and territory. Darling (2011) develops this notion by suggesting the emergence of complex and varied modes of governance, discipline and regulation, are all designed to secure the boundaries of this home and to reassert ideals of security, stability and cohesion. Darling (2011) writes that the mode of governance, named *domopolitical,* is structured around two articulations of the word *domos*; governing the state as a home and also seeking to tame and domesticate those forces seen to threaten such a homely image[2]. Domopolitics might be seen to represent a highly specialised 'rationality' of government or mode of 'governmentality', that governs through mechanisms and techniques of security (Darling, 2011).

A resonance with shift towards a 'society of security is, therefore, able to be identified (Darling, 2011). Foucault (2007: 18) notes a key move within the governance of the state when discipline as a mode of power is supplemented with techniques of security 'which involved not so much establishing limits and frontiers, or fixing locations, as above all and essentially, making possible, guaranteeing, and ensuring circulations'. Foucault (2007: 18) suggests a move from a focus upon discipline as a mode of power acting within a given space, to a series of techniques of security

---

[2] Darling 264-5

which seek to organise circulation itself 'eliminating its dangerous elements, making a division between good and bad circulation and maximising the good by diminishing the bad'. Foucault writes that such governmentality:

> *is simply a matter of maximising the positive elements, for which one provides the best possible circulation, and minimising what is risky and inconvenient...while knowing they will never be completely suppressed. One will therefore work not only on natural givens, but also on quantities that can be relatively, but never wholly reduced, and, since they can never be nullified, one works on probabilities'* (Foucault, 2007: 19)

Domopolitics, therefore, has represented a concern with allowing certain forms of mobility, flow and movement according to predefined categories of risk, a characteristic of security as a technique of governance (Darling, 2011). Any mode of governmentality is, though, a productive force; a constantly shifting arrangement of modes of power (Darling, 2011).

(b) Previous utility of the concept

Walters (2004) compared the domopolitics of the homeland and similar securitisations with the governmentality of social security in order to analyse security and citizenship in the UK as presented in the 2002 White Paper 'Secure Borders, Safe Haven' which sought to make a connection between enhanced immigration and asylum controls and an improved sense of citizenship and community within British society (Walters, 2004). By adopting a governmentality perspective he was able to argue that 'Secure Borders, Safe Haven' could be related to the emergence of a relatively new domain of concepts between the state, citizenship and territory. Walter's adopted domopolitics to assist in his aim of mapping the space of security emerging from the White Paper in order to offer ways to analyse the types of rationalities, subjectivities, knowledges and spatiality's that it set in motion. Subsequently, Walters made a contribution to the genealogy of security by placing the emergence of domopolitics within a trajectory that was previously overlooked, linking it with the apparatus of social security. He stated this was a 'valid

Rachael Dickson
Queen's University Belfast

and timely move' (Walters, 2004: 242) for two reasons: firstly, both social security and domopolitics are govern mentalities and thus concerned with the government of population, therefore cannot be adequately explained if domopolitics remained confined to the field of international security studies. Secondly, both social security and domopolitics are more than public policies merely pursued by the state and need to be understood in terms of diagrams which. The concept of the diagram was clarified by Rajchman (1999) who stated, the diagram is an expression 'of something at work in many different institutions and situations, spread out in several countries, working in a manner not given the map of social policies and prescriptions, planned as such by no one'. For example, the panopticon provides a diagram of the disciplinary society, revealing how a certain set of techniques and logics - methods of organising space and time, accumulating bodies, regulating activities,etc - can be found at work across the social space during the 19th Century in spaces such as prisons, schools, factories, barracks and hospitals (Walters, 2004). Walters makes the point that domopolitics should also be read in terms of its diagrams; of crime, vulnerability, threat and abuse, technologies of 'managed borders', identity checks and its archipelagos of detention. From this perspective, the concept, it is argued, is becoming increasingly influential in the definition of identity of the people, the state that governs them and how that government is to operate.

Walters undertakes his analysis by exploring the rationalities and technologies of government contained within the White Paper. He comments on the dividing practices involved in this new type of immigration policy to highlight how official definitions of the refugee emphasise person who have fled from political violence but acknowledges how less serious political and economic factors are often tightly interwoven which creates a new system to differentiate the legitimate and illegitimate claims. He discusses the process of deterritorialisation which 'Secure Borders, Safe Haven' creates where border policies and practices are spread out amongst a range of actors including other states (through Schengen), intergovernmental organisations and private agents such

as airlines. In the spaces between the nation and these controls, Walters argues, new configurations of power can be found as well as new conceptions of territory and control. Another finding involves the deterritorialisation of citizenship where the host population is problematised due to citizens not experiencing citizenship. He highlights a deficit of citizenship and identity in the UK manifest and partly due to a loss of faith in governmental systems.

Overall Walters (2004:) concludes:

> *If migratory movements involve an assertion of subjectivity, a right to flee oppression whatever its nature, or simply to live otherwise and elsewhere, domopolitics resists this assertion. It mobilises images of home, a natural order of states and people, of us and them, in such a way as to suppress and deny these subjectivities. It casts the mobilities of survival and the assertion of a right to settle as 'illegal' and 'dangerous'. Domopolitics is an attempt to contain citizenship, to uphold a certain statist conception of citizenship in the face of social forces that are tracing out other cultural and political possibilities. That Western societies are presently diagramming themselves in terms of domopolitics is not necessarily a sign of strength of official definitions of citizenship, but perhaps their weakness.*

By analysing the domopolitics of the EU it will be possible to assess the differences between its supranational, intergovernmental approach and characteristics of the statist, national home. The EU can be conceptualised as a home, it has a citizenry and a foundational system of values, but it is well known for being weak in terms of political affiliation and feelings of citizenship.

Darling (2011) uses the concept of domopolitics in his analysis of asylum accommodation regulation in the UK. He assesses how the articulation of border politics as domopolitics produces a series of modes and moments of governance and seeks to extends considerations of border practices

Rachael Dickson
Queen's University Belfast

by demonstrating how different modes of governance, control and regulation are continuously produced and how these become manifest in a 'spatial politics of exclusion and marginality' (Darling, 2011: 264). It is noted that discourses of the border bring together concerns relating to security, surveillance, identity and difference, into an array of practices of social control. This image of the border as a mode of classification associated with security, and as an extensive set of practices of social ordering, placement and control are foregrounded in his examination of the implications of domopolitics as a mode of governance for asylum seekers in the UK. Three main implications are raised; firstly, a system of classification and subjectification is found to exist through which categories of position and procedural processes are established and linked to the notion of ensuring security through the calculation of risk and the maintenance of circulation. Secondly, a regulatory system of asylum dispersals seeks to order and position circulation within distinct and defined locations. Thirdly, accommodation emerges as a regulatory tool through which sovereign authority emerges with governmentality in the form of managerial decisions without response and forges the affective construction of discomfort, marginality and insecurity for those accommodated (Darling, 2011).

Darling (2011, 269) concludes that the result is a politics of discomfort: 'an affective positioning of asylum seekers as those forever at the border, those produced as the other'. In discussing the governmental rationalities of domopolitics and illustrating the mechanisms of state power that accrue within such rationalities, there is a danger that not only these technologies are reproduced in ever more powerful forms, but also that such an account sees little beyond a repressive and increasingly disciplined future. One threat posed by such examination is in reproducing an image of the state as a singular, highly authoritative polity which acts in rational and unified manners and in overlooking the ways in which governmental rationalities are complex and conflicted configurations of interests, tactics and modes of power without a singular point of authority or

calculation. Therefore, from this perspective, UK asylum policy is not illustrative of a 'domo' to be defended but rather a 'domo' to be transformed (Darling, 2011: 270).

Thus, exploration of EU governance of the migrant crisis in relation to its home would be indicative of a number of things. Firstly, it would probe deeper into the relations between the EU and its citizens asking questions around their identity and their rights as well as what they need protected from or secured against. Arguably, the threat is not just physical but highly connected to the core values on which the Union is based and how the migrant crisis can threaten those. Domopolitical analysis also speaks to changing conceptualisations, or problematisations, or the migrant and shows how new mechanisms introduced to govern the problem can produce certain patterns of behaviour.

5. Application to current EU Migrant Crisis

There are a number of issues relating to the governance of the migrant crisis and the development of a EU migration policy that warrant more investigation from a governmentality perspective. Firstly, the idea of a holistic approach and. secondly, the concepts of solidarity and shared responsibility. The European Parliament (2014) advocated the development of a holistic approach in October 2013 so issues would be dealt with in a more comprehensive matter. The European Council adopted guidelines in June 2014 which added the desire for 'full respect for fundamental rights' when it set out the need for 'efficient and well-managed migration, asylum and border policy' in the EU (EC, 2014). The Commission President also stressed the need for a strong common asylum policy to 'protect those in need'. FRA (2014) has outlined that fundamental rights should not be just one element of any such policies but rather form a normative framework in which they should be situated.

The articulation of a holistic approach is characterised by a belief that the parts of the crisis are intimately connected and explicable/manageable only through reference to the whole problem. This

Rachael Dickson
Queen's University Belfast

leads to the question of what are the characteristics of the 'whole' being taken into account. It has been acknowledged that the EU must take steps to prevent more migrant deaths but it is also concerned with tackling networks of smugglers and traffickers and creating a shared system for managing the crisis amongst Member States (European Parliament, 2014). Domopolitics is useful in defining this whole as the EU's response will not just have implications for migrants but also the host populations.

Holistic does not just mean taking into consideration the whole situation but in the medical world has connotations with a particular type of treatment which is an alternative to the conventional and which, although it is still hoped to, if it does not cure the affliction can produce outcomes which change the affected subject's attitude to the problem. Thus, it could be posited that the EU's adoption of a holistic approach creates new spaces of governmentality such as migrant distribution quotas, newly defined entry channels and off-shore processing mechanisms which may not change the outcome for the migrant or the receiving state but can produce different mentalities and attitudes towards them.

The impact of a holistic approach on constructions of migrant identity need to be investigated to show how the subject is constructed within the rights discourse of the EU home and as a component of the holistic approach. Further, the processes and analysis of the holistic approach will be analysed in order to show what is being governed and what alternative outcomes this governance may have which will allow broader comment on how the EU has created space for itself on in the international arena with regards to migration policy.

6. Next steps of research agenda

Rachael Dickson
Queen's University Belfast

In order to fully 'explore the EU's way out of the crisis', a number of issues need to be addressed. Firstly, what type of domopolitics operates in the EU; what is the nature of the EU 'home'. Second, what implications does the proposed EU response to the crisis have on the conceptualisation of the migrant and how this conceptualisation relates to the EU home; does it pose a threat or a risk or provoke questions of desirability? Thirdly, an examination of holism as a technique for governing the crisis and an analysis of the idea of governance as treatment, specifically in the minutiae of mechanisms which will be deployed. In conclusion, it will be possible to draw a new diagram of the EU as an international actor and challenge the traditional conceptions of EU power in order to show an alternative conception of how the values the EU is based on operate in the area of migration management and human rights.

Rachael Dickson
Queen's University Belfast

Bibliography

Burchell, G., Gordon, C. and Miller P., (1991) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Darling, J. (2011) 'Domopolitics, governmentality and the regulation of asylum accommodation' *Political Geography.* 30(5) 263-271

Delanty, G. (1995) *Inventing Europe: idea, identity, reality.* Basingstoke: Macmillan

Donnelly, J. (2008) 'The Ethics of Realism' in C Reus-Smit & D Snidal (eds.) The Oxford Handbook of International Relations. Oxford: OUP

Dean, M. (2010) *Governmentality; Power and Rule in Modern Society.* 2nd edn. London: Sage Publishing

European Parliament Resolution (2014). The situation in the Mediterranean and the need for a holistic EU approach to migration (2014/2907) Dec, 11

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2015) *FRA reiterates call for rights-based EU migration policy following latest deaths in Mediterranean.* Available at: http://fra.europa.eu/en/news/2015/fra-reiterates-call-rights-based-eu-migration-policy-following-latest-deaths-mediterranean (Accessed: 06/06/15)

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2014) *Fundamental Rights Conference 2014: Fundamental rights and migration to the EU* Rome: 10-11 November 2014. Vienna: European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights.

Faubion, J.D. (2002) (ed) *Power: Essential works of Foucault 1954-1984 Volume 3* London: Penguin

Foucault, M. (1974) 'Prisons et asiles dans le mécanisme du pouvoir' in *Dits et Ecrits, pt.II* Paris: Gallimard

Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* London: Penguin

Rachael Dickson
Queen's University Belfast

Foucault, M. (1978) *The History of Sexuality:1 The Will to Knowledge* London:Penguin

Foucault, M. (2009) (eds Elwald, F & Fontana , A. trs Burchell, G.), *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College de France 1977-1978.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Haas, E.B. (1958) *The uniting of Europe: political, social and economic forces 1950-1957.* London: Stevens

Hollis R, (2012) 'No Friend of Democratisation: Europe's Role in the Genesis of the 'Arab Spring'' *International Affairs* 88, 81-94

Larner, W. & Walters, W. (eds), (2004) *Global Governmentality: Governing International Spaces.* London: Routledge

Lemke, T. (2002) 'Foucault, Governmentality, and Critique', *Rethinking   Marxism: A Journal of Economics, Culture and Society* 14, 49-64

Mogherini, F. (2015) http://eeas.europa.eu/statements-eeas/2015/150419_01_en.htm

Moracsik, A. (1998) *The Choice for Europe: social purpose and state power from Messina to Maastrict.* New York: Cornell University Press

Münch, R. (2010) *European Governmentality: the liberal drift of multilevel governance* Oxon: Rougtledge.

Neumann, I. B. & Sending, O.J. (2006) 'Governance to Governmentality: Analysing NGOs, States and Power' *International Studies Quarterly* 50, 651-672

Rajchmann, J. (1999) 'Diagram and diagnosis', in E. Grosz (Ed.), *Becomings: Explanations in Time, Memory and Futures.* New York: Cornell University Press.

Rice-Oxley, M. & Walker, P. (2015) 'Europe's worsening migrant crisis: the Guardian briefing' *The Guardian,* 20 April [Online] Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2014/sep/18/-sp-world-briefing-europe-worsening-migrant-crisis (Accessed: 06/06/15)

Rose, N. & Miller, P. (1992) 'Political Power Beyond the State: Problematics of Government', *British Journal of Sociology*, 43 (2) 173-205

Sokhi-Bulley, B. (2013) 'Alternative methodologies: Learning critique as a skill' *Law and Method* 3 (2) 6-23

Stone Sweet, A. (2004) *The Judicial Construction of Europe* Oxford: OUP

Traynor, I. (2015) 'Mediterranean refugee crisis: EU reduced to impotent handwringing', *The Guardian,* 20 April [Online] Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/apr/20/mediterranean-migrant-crisis-no-european-migration-policy (Accessed: 06/06/15)

Walters, W (2004) 'Secure Borders, Safe Haven, Domopolitics' *Citizenship Studies* 8(3) 237-260