Policing Borders, Producing Boundaries. The Governmentality of Immigration in Dark Times*

Didier Fassin

School of Social Science, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey 08540; email: dfassin@ias.edu

Annu. Rev. Anthropol. 2011. 40:213–26

First published online as a Review in Advance on July 7, 2011

The *Annual Review of Anthropology* is online at anthro.annualreviews.org

This article's doi: 10.1146/annurev-anthro-081309-145847

0084-6570/11/1021-0213$20.00

*This article is part of a special theme on Migration. For a list of other articles in this theme, see **http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/full/10.1146/annurev-an40**

Keywords

borders, boundaries, immigration, asylum, humanitarianism, detention, deportation, state, governmentality, migration

Abstract

The governmentality of immigration has become a crucial issue of contemporary societies. Ironically, although globalization meant facilitated circulation of goods, it has also signified increased constraints on the mobility of men and women. This evolution has been characterized by the policing of physical borders and the production of racialized boundaries, primarily studied by the social sciences in North America and Western Europe. Anthropological studies highlight the renewed role of the nation-state to impose a surveillance apparatus of the frontiers and the territories, regimes of exception for the detention and deportation of illegal aliens, and a dramatic decline in the right to asylum, sometimes replaced by forms of discretionary humanitarianism. These logics are embodied in the everyday work of bureaucracies as well as in the experience of immigrants.

INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, immigration has revealed two unexpected although predictable "contradictions of globalization" (Ekholm Friedman & Friedman 2008). First, whereas the circulation of goods was progressively facilitated through international trade agreements, the transnational circulation of persons became increasingly restricted, at least for the majority of the population of the planet (Bauman 1998). The erection of a "wall around the West" with restrictive and repressive immigration policies resulted in the massive production of "illegal aliens" in Europe and North America (Andreas & Snyder 2000). Second, although the promise of earlier migration was the social and economic incorporation of immigrants in the receiving countries under the alternative paradigms of multiculturalism or cultural assimilation, ethnic and religious divisions became the rule, leading to discrimination and violence (Appadurai 2006). The "racialization" of the first and even more of the second generations led to the constitution of stigmatized "minorities" (Anthias & Yuval Davies 1992). The two contradictions echo each other: borders as external territorial frontiers and boundaries as internal social categorizations are tightly related in a process in which immigrants are racialized and ethnic minorities are reminded of their foreign origin (Fassin 2010a). This dual reality of "migrant illegality" (De Genova 2002) and "immigrant racialization" (Silverstein 2005) has given birth to an important literature in anthropology and other social sciences—no distinction is made here, and the contribution of legal studies, political science, history, and sociology to this multidisciplinary field should be acknowledged—but in most cases as two separate bodies on borders and on boundaries. The articulation of the two phenomena and the form of governmentality that underlies them is the crux of the present review.

By referring to governmentality, I clearly inscribe our perspective in the legacy of Michel Foucault, in particular his 1977–1978 Lectures at the Collège de France on *Security, Territory, Population* (Foucault 2007), and in the field of studies inspired by this seminal work (Bröckling et al. 2011). Governmentality includes the institutions, procedures, actions, and reflections that have populations as object. It exceeds the issue of sovereignty and complicates the question of control. It relates the power and administration of the state to the subjugation and subjectivation of individuals. It relies on political economy and policing technologies. Applied to the field of immigration in present dark times (Arendt 1968), it has enriched our understanding of the subtle and complex games involved in the "biopolitics of otherness" (Fassin 2001a): a politics of borders and boundaries, temporality and spatiality, states and bureaucracies, detention and deportation, asylum and humanitarianism that is developed in these pages.

BORDERS AND BOUNDARIES

The anthropology of borders (Alvarez 1995) and the sociology of boundaries (Lamont & Molnár 2002) are domains of research that were developed as distinct fields. In a tradition inherited from Weber and Durkheim, borders were generally viewed as territorial limits defining political entities (states, in particular) and legal subjects (most notably, citizens), whereas boundaries were principally considered to be social constructs establishing symbolic differences (between class, gender, or race) and producing identities (national, ethnic, or cultural communities). This distinction between borders and boundaries was a more or less explicit critique of classical studies in anthropology, which accepted, strengthened, and ultimately reified the superposition of territorial borders and social boundaries by constituting discrete entities, such as "the Nuer" or "the Tiv," as the object of their inquiry (Donnan & Wilson 1999). In his famous research on Arab villages in the "triangle" between Israel and Jordan, Cohen (1965) showed how the "border situation" created by the birth of the Israeli state transformed the social organization of the Palestinian society, weakening local modern elites and revitalizing

traditional political forms. The border was no longer a backdrop of social change, but a crucial component that imposed its presence on social relations. In an influential text inspired by his ethnography of the Pathans of the Swat Valley in Pakistan, Barth (1968) questions the usual equivalence established between ethnicity, culture, and language, proposing instead an interactional approach that implies that the object of investigation should be "ethnic boundaries" rather than the "cultural stuff" that serves to legitimize social groups. To the self-definition of ethnic characteristics and cultural substance, anthropologists must therefore substitute the exploration of the phenomena of inclusion and exclusion, recruitment and ascription, that occur on the symbolic frontier between groups. By de-essentializing borders and boundaries, these works open new avenues for the social sciences. But as with most anthropological studies until recently, they keep the two concepts unrelated.

Yet their combination is indispensable to the understanding of how immigration is governed and experienced, whether for Greek minorities in southern Albania and Albanian immigrants in northern Greece (Hart 1999) or for Mexican Americans and Mexican nationals on both sides of the U.S.-Mexico border (Vila 2000). In effect, immigrants embody the articulation of borders and boundaries, even beyond what is generally assumed by the studies of transnationalism (Kearney 1991). They cross borders to settle in a new society and discover boundaries through the differential treatment to which they are submitted. To Bohannan's (1967) formulation that "the frontier is all around us," one should certainly add that it does not impose the same constraints on everyone. Thus the way the British ethnicize south Asians and racialize black English illustrates the interaction between external and internal frontiers (Wallman 1978), a problematic by contrast ignored in France until recently, because immigration was analyzed in terms of "melting pot" (Noiriel 1992) and "integration" (Schnapper 1991), whereas phenomena of racialization and ethnicization were denied.

More generally the optimism of the sociology of assimilation, which posits the success of contemporary societies with their aliens, particularly in the United States (Waters & Jiménez 2005), obscures the "coercive efforts to build a nation-state society by excluding outsiders—via control of external borders—and to distinguish between members and unacceptable residents of the territory—through regulation of the internal boundaries leading to citizenship and legal residence" (Waldinger & Fitzgerald 2004). Nowhere are these logics of exclusion and distinction more visible than in the naturalization process, via which the state separates the wanted from the unwanted among immigrants, but eventually reminds its newly naturalized members how they still differ from their indigenous fellow-citizens, who are in France sometimes officially qualified as "Français de souche," that is, purebred French (Fassin & Mazouz 2009). Linking borders and boundaries, therefore, inscribes politics and the state—rather than culture or the market—into the question of immigration. But this inscription assumes various and even contradictory forms according to time and space.

TIME AND SPACE

The significance of borders and boundaries profoundly changes over time. It is related to broader contexts in which issues of security (Andreas & Bierstecker 2003) and sovereignty (Blom Hansen & Stepputat 2005), on the one hand, and of economy (Hanson & Spilimbergo 1999) and identity (Wilson & Donnan 1998), on the other, are raised. Certain historical periods are more favorable than are others for the development of barriers between territories and people. They correspond to moments of social, economic, and political tensions (Rudolph 2006). The sensitivity of the question of immigration, the hostility toward aliens, the consolidation of borders, and the delimitation of boundaries appear to be cyclic phenomena, as can be shown in the French case (Noiriel 2007). In particular, parallels are often drawn between the present time and the interwar

period. During the 1930s, in the aftermath of the economic crisis and in a context of rising perils, immigration came to be seen as a problem and immigrants were turned into potential threats, their rights were progressively restricted (Lewis 2007) and their policing became increasingly aggressive (Blanc-Chaléard et al. 2001). The historical comparison has its limits, and it has been argued that the changes in border controls across Europe during the past half century are "both radical and without genuine precedent" (Anderson 2000), but it underlines the permanence of complex interactions between economic and political logics, of the ideological manipulation of social fears, and of the obsessive deployment of surveillance technologies.

The end of the twentieth and the beginning of the twenty-first century are undoubtedly marked by the exacerbation of global tensions expressed through increasing restrictions of human mobility, especially in Europe and North America (Sassen 1999), and the erection of walls materializing the separation between countries, as in the southern United States or in the Palestinian Occupied Territories (Brown 2010). This trend contrasts with the situation prevailing during the previous period. From the end of World War II until the early 1970s, foreign labor was considered to be a decisive resource required for the reconstruction of Western Europe, and few restraints were imposed regarding immigration, particularly from the colonial empires and later newly independent states, as long as migrants accepted a marginal status and harsh exploitation (Sayad 2004). During those years, opening national borders was by no means contradictory with delimiting racial and ethnic boundaries. With the dissolution of the Communist Bloc and the end of the Cold War in the late 1980s, the horizon of a planet freed from its political and territorial divisions seemed to find its concretization in the fall of the Iron Curtain (Bornemann 1991). But as Berliners were joyfully crossing over their destroyed wall, they could not realize that, while an old world was ending, a new one was looming in which barriers would proliferate again.

Contemporary societies are increasingly bastions with borders and control (Walters 2006), walls and gates (Nevins 2002). Again, although this process primarily concerns the external frontier (Dunn 1996), it does not spare the internal ones (Low 2003), thus revealing the empire of security issues in America (Gusterson & Besteman 2009) as well as in Europe (Huysmans 2006). During the 2000s, it has accelerated, as in the United States, whereby the war on terror after 9/11 added its effects to the war on drugs at the Mexican border in a context of implementation of the North American Free Trade Agreement (Ackleson 2003), while in Western Europe, the moral panic over Islam combined with the political panic related to asylum seekers against the backdrop of the enlargement of the European Union to the East (Sasse & Thielemann 2005). In both cases, the "new migration world" has generated "new strategies and instruments of control" (Guiraudon & Joppke 2001), in other words, new policing of immigrants.

That this form of governmentality is for the most part a story about the Western world should not preclude the salience of these issues for the rest of the planet (Castles & Miller 2003). From this perspective, it should be highlighted that, whereas anthropology has developed a rich body of literature on migration and transnationalism (Brettell 2007) and the imaginary of border-crossing (Pandolfo 2007), it has yielded relatively little attention to the question of policing in the Third World countries and its human consequences, with notable exceptions (McDonald 2000). According to the United Nations, in 2010, although 120 of the 213 millions of international migrants are found in Europe and North America, the proportion is reversed when one considers more specifically forced migrations, with 14 of the 16 million international refugees living in the developing world, mostly Asia and Africa. It is, in fact, possible to oppose the government of displaced populations in the South, where refugees are confined in camps (Malkki 1995), and the West, where asylum seekers are dealt with on a case-by-case basis (Schuster 2000):

depersonalized masses on the one hand, individualized scrutiny on the other. The former is the condition of the latter, given that the casuistry involving the respect of human rights for asylum seekers supposes the selection of small numbers made possible by the extensive internment of refugees in poor countries and the strict control of their access to the benefits of the protection of wealthy nations.

STATES AND BUREAUCRACIES

Paraphrasing both Marx's expression about the means of production and Weber's formula on violence, Torpey (2000), who has reconstituted the history of the passport, writes that modernity is characterized by the "state monopolization of the legitimate means of movement." Indeed, since the end of the eighteenth century, the state has progressively expanded its empire over individual mobility as well as collective displacement (Freeman 1994), following irregular cycles that alternate liberal and repressive moments depending on the economy and on the variations in ideology (Fetzer 2000). The past three decades have been characterized by an upsurge of control at the borders to restrain the number of newcomers into the rich world, a policy with relatively limited effects, revealing the "gap" between restrictive policy efforts and expansive immigration in reality (Cornelius et al. 1994). However, the importance given to these issues in the public sphere is not strictly related to the quantitative presence of immigrants.

The government of immigration is thus an exemplary case study for an "anthropology in the margins of the state," because it concerns public action regarding a marginalized population usually conducted at the margins of the territory and the law (Das & Poole 2004). The three dimensions are essential. The state exerts its rule on the most peripheral segments of its subjects, develops increasingly sophisticated technologies at its borders, and tends to create laws of exception when it is "targeting immigrants" (Inda 2006). This political configuration explains why the scientific field of immigration has resisted the tendency of most studies on globalization to assert the decline of the nation-state and has even been accused of "methodological nationalism" by promoters of the transnational approach (Wimmer & Glick-Schiller 2002). This accusation, however, misses the point that the interpretation in terms of governmentality does not so much focus on the power of the nation-state as on the limits of its ideal-typical representation as coherent, impartial, and effective. On the contrary, it shows its illegality and illegibility, demonstrates its partiality and ineffectiveness, but also establishes the functionality of these apparent dysfunctions.

Paraphrasing the definition of deviance in the interactionist theory (Becker 1963), one can say that the state creates illegal immigrants by making and enforcing the laws whose infraction constitutes illegality of residence. This logic is certainly not new and has contributed to the building of the United States since the 1920s, when Congress first legislated numerical restrictions for permanent immigration, soon leading to an official politics of quota (Ngai 2004). Paradoxically, the state itself may not respect its own law and may engage in illegal practices (Heyman & Smart 1999), thus facilitating the blurring of limits between legitimate and illegitimate actions in favor of the immigrants (Coutin 1995). One illustration of such practices of the state is the so-called double sentence in France, which implies two punishments (detention and deportation) for the same offense (Mathieu 2006), in contradiction with the juridical principle expressed by the formula *non bis in idem*. More generally, the treatment of aliens easily falls within the province of the exception, in the name of sovereignty (Schmidt 1985), and immigration increasingly belongs to "this no-man's-land between public law and political fact, and between the juridical order and life" (Agamben 2005). The 2001 U.S. Patriot Act is often seen as an illustration of this evolution.

The production of illegality by the state has been described as a "racial criminalization of migrants" in Europe to underline its almost exclusive focus on African aliens (Palidda 2011).

It is indeed obvious when changes in legislation entail new restrictions, for example, in family reunification criteria, with the consequence of rejecting many spouses and children out of the legal sphere, or when administrative practices become more severe, for instance toward asylum-seekers, thereby mechanically provoking an increase in illegal immigrants (Ferré 1997). Therefore, far from being clandestine aliens sneaking in through deserts, on boats, or in trucks, as usually depicted in the media and the public discourse (Fassin 1996), most undocumented persons, in Southern Europe (Calavita 2005) as well as in North America (De Genova 2005), are long-term residents in the receiving country where they live, work, marry, and start a family, but where they always remain in a state of precariousness that facilitates their exploitation. Repression, however, is exerted almost exclusively on the undocumented immigrants (Chavez 1998), for whom the price of getting caught is quite high, rather than on those who recruit and hire them (Hagan & Phillips 2008). In so doing, the state not only demonstrates its partiality, but also shows its inconsistencies or ambiguities, as harsh policing is not incompatible with tolerance regarding illegality of migrant workers who significantly contribute to several economic sectors.

The logics of democratic states may therefore be more complex than is often assumed. First, they are confronted by contradictory interest groups, with employers generally desirous of the cheap and docile workforce of immigrants, while the general public shows signs of impatience or xenophobia towards aliens. Second, they react differently according to the prevailing regime of immigration, which can be that of settler, as in the United States, of guest workers, as in Germany, or of postcolonial subjects, as in Britain; these sociological and historical elements account for the temporal and spatial variations observed in public policies (Joppke 1998). Moreover, for a given period in a given country, disparities exist within the state, revealing the "differential administration of illegalities" (Foucault 1978) and reminding us that not everyone is equal before the law (Fischer & Spire 2009). The ethnography of bureaucracies (Heyman 1998) is therefore crucial to interpret these discrepancies between the Weberian view of the fair and neutral state and its actual functioning.

In effect, the deployment of restrictive and repressive policies of immigration has been accompanied by the development of an administrative apparatus at the borders and within the territory to control immigration and hunt down the undocumented, to adjudicate the refugee status and guard the detained aliens. This street-level bureaucracy (Lipsky 1980) is not an impersonal machine mechanically rejecting immigrants; it is composed of men and women who routinely generate decisions affecting the lives of others (Gilboy 1991). The state thus delegates the dirty work of selecting the good immigrants from the bad ones to local bureaucrats who sometimes experience moral dilemmas between their obligations as civil servants implementing a policy (Spire 2008) and their emotions when confronted with tragic situations (Graham 2002). But officers in charge of immigration control and naturalization procedures are not passively obeying orders; they are also moral agents evaluating the politics to which they contribute (Heyman 2000). In spite of its marginality—or maybe because of it—immigration has therefore become one of the most crucial sites where democratic states are put to the test.

DETENTION AND DEPORTATION

Not only does the control of immigration involve bureaucracies, but it also supposes technologies for the surveillance of the borders and the territory and for the detention and deportation of illegal aliens (Pratt 2005). The surveillance and identification system has become increasingly sophisticated, from paper documents to biometric systems (Crettiez & Piazza 2006). It includes the points of entrance onto the territory, particularly airports, but its extension follows a dual movement on both sides of the physical border, which has been well described

in the case of the European Union. On the one hand, it concerns populations of settled migrants whose legal and residential situations are entered into international electronic databases (Broeders 2007). On the other, it involves consulate or embassy officials who practice a form of policing at a distance led by ministries of foreign affairs acting as home affairs and are viewed as a first line of defense against unwanted immigration (Bigo & Guild 2005). Although this surveillance apparatus seems purely technical and coldly impersonal, it produces its toll of casualties. As it has been analyzed for the United States (Cornelius 2001) as well as for Europe (Spijkerboer 2007), the human cost of border control has been particularly high in terms of fatalities as well as violations of human rights.

The production of illegality and the arrest of tens of thousands of undocumented obviously pose problems of confinement in Western countries. Although immigrants may crowd the regular carceral system, states have also developed specific detention facilities for them to avoid proximity with criminals and to facilitate their deportation (Welch 2002). During the twentieth century, camps have represented the exemplary form of internment of presumably dangerous others, leading Agamben (1998) to controversially assert that "today it is not the city but rather the camp that is the fundamental biopolitical paradigm of the West." Although detention centers were used by the Spanish Army in Cuba in the 1870s and by the United States in the Philippines in 1901, the term "concentration camp" was first used by the British during the Boer War from 1900 to 1902 to describe the massive internment of Afrikaners, mostly women and children, and of Africans, both captured during the "scorched earth" military campaigns and kept in dire conditions. In the following decades, concentration camps were generalized as a means of dealing with undesirable foreigners, including in the United States with regard to the Japanese during World War II (Hirabayashi 1999) or more recently the Haitians at Krome (Nachman 1993). In France, for instance, between 1938 and 1946, approximately 600,000 persons were confined in "concentration camps," beginning with the Spanish Republicans initially interned as refugees and later turned into prisoners (Peschanski 2002). "Regrouping camps" were also used to confine insurgents during the Algerian War in the 1950s and, after the 1962 Evian Accords, "internment camps" served for harkis who had fought with the French Army (Bernardot 2008). Confusion therefore existed between the imperatives of confinement and protection in the politics of the camps until the recent Sangatte Center, which from 1999 to 2002 hosted immigrants en route to Britain (Courau 2007). There is thus a long and ambiguous genealogy of the internment of unwanted others, whether enemies or aliens.

The network of detention structures has considerably increased during recent decades (Kobelinsky & Makaremi 2009). It includes waiting zones in airports (Clochard et al. 2003) and detention centers disseminated on the territory (Richard & Fischer 2008), both of which are sites of exception, where regimes of police prevail over regimes of rights, although some space is generally left to the rule of law via the minimal presence of nongovernmental organizations. This exception, however, generates difficulties for the states, because of social mobilizations as well as legal constraints, most notably in Europe, and has led to a strategy consisting of the externalization of border controls, euphemistically termed "European Neighborhood Policies" (Boswell 2003). These programs include delegating the regulation and repression of immigration to non-European states (Valluy 2010), such as Libya and Morocco (Belguendouz 2005), where Sub-Saharan immigrants are confined in formal and informal camps and prevented from crossing the borders or the sea toward Europe (Pian 2009). But whereas rich ethnographies of Asian and African camps are available, in Palestine (Peteet 2005) or Sudan (Abusharaf 2009) for instance, anthropological knowledge of these new detention sites, at the doors of Europe, remains limited.

By contrast, deportation studies have mushroomed during the past decade, creating

a subfield in the domain of the anthropology of immigration (De Genova & Peutz 2010). The expulsion of immigrants—whether they are qualified as "illegal aliens" because of their lack of documents or as "criminal aliens" because of an offense they have committed, in both cases independent of the length of their stay in the receiving country—has become a powerful sign of contemporary politics (Ellerman 2009). Certainly, it should be recalled that there is a long history of deportations, including during World War II in Europe when Jews and Roma were transported to Nazi extermination camps, but also in the United States during its entire construction as a nation, marked by the removal of Native Americans and expulsion of Chinese emigrants, among others (Kanstroom 2007). However, after half a century of interruption, it is remarkable that this process has recommenced, including in Israel where 100,000 "unauthorized migrant workers" were recently deported (Willen 2010). Beyond the apparently simple subtraction of an illegal population in excess, as it is publicly depicted, the meaning of such violent practices implying roundups, hunting, arrests, expulsions, and sometimes deaths has to be explored (Walters 2002). The politics of deportation must not be judged primarily on its quantitative efficacy, but on what it performs and, perhaps more precisely, on the form of abjection it entails (Nyers 2003). In France, for example, after the election of Nicolas Sarkozy, the deportation of illegal immigrants became a symbol of the politics of the newly created Ministry of Immigration and a spectacle offered to the right and far-right constituency of the President (Collectif 2009). Not only does the signification of the removal concern the government that deports, but it can also be studied on the side of the deported, as Peutz (2006) did in the Somaliland with Somalis suspected of criminal activities after 9/11 and expulsed from the United States. From surveillance to detention to deportation, the spectrum of repressive activities is remarkably rich and dense. Our understanding of the governmentality of immigration would be incomplete, however, if we did not take into account the question of asylum and the drifts of humanitarianism.

ASYLUM AND HUMANITARIANISM

As Arendt (1951) clearly anticipated, refugees have become a major issue of our time—a test for the nation-states as well as for human rights, as she notes in the last chapter of her study of imperialism. Somewhat less lucidly if we consider the recent evolution, Marrus (1985) predicted at the end of his classical history of this question that "what is extraordinary is the apparent end of a European refugee problem which has bedeviled political leaders since the First World War." Indeed, two decades later, a book was published with the title *Rejecting Refugees* (Bohmer & Shuman 2008). The question is, therefore, in the interval, what has happened to the ethics and politics of asylum in liberal democracy? (Gibney 2004). In other words, what is left of the specificity of the status of refugee in an age of control of immigration?

Only a quarter of a century after the ratification of the 1951 Geneva Convention by the United Nations, the proportion of asylum seekers granted refugee status began a rapid decline to reach noticeably low levels: In France, for instance, this proportion fell from 95% in 1976 to 6% in 2006 at the Office of Protection of Refugees and Stateless. This evolution has been interpreted by public authorities to be not the result of a more suspicious politics of asylum, but the consequence of the augmentation of so-called bogus refugees. However, the discredit of asylum seekers as individuals signifies the delegitimization of asylum as an institution. Mistrusting refugees implies doubting international protection (Daniel & Knudsen 1995). An indication of this trend is the normalization of the imprisonment of refugees at their entrance onto U.S. territory when they do not appear "clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to land," thus signifying the assimilation of their condition to that of criminals (Simon 1998). Similar trends have been described in Europe as well as on other continents (Hughes & Liebaut

1998). Thus, instead of the protection for which they strive, asylum seekers are increasingly the objects of repression all over the world, as repeated abuses and killings of refugees in Morocco, Egypt, or China, among others, have been reported in recent years.

As a result of the suspicion asylum seekers arouse, more evidence is expected from them, as their credibility tends to diminish (Sweeney 2009). Rather than relying on the story related by the applicant, which is viewed all the more suspect as the multiplication of cases heard in court induces a sense of repetition of stereotyped narratives, the advice of experts is frequently requested, including sometimes that of anthropologists (Good 2007). Significantly, the certificate produced by a physician or a psychologist affirming the existence of physical or psychic traces of persecution becomes a crucial document in the application (Fassin & d'Halluin 2005). The paradox, however, is that as asylum is disqualified both quantitatively and qualitatively, states develop increasingly sophisticated instruments to scrutinize the "truth" of the applicants who, in the great majority of cases, will be rejected and end up added to the pool of illegal aliens after they have exhausted every possible appeal. They will thus confirm empirically the increasing convergence of the politics of immigration and of asylum, in spite of the official affirmation to the contrary.

Parallel to this decline in asylum, immigrants have also been increasingly submitted to discretionary forms of "humanitarian reason" (Fassin 2011). This has been established most clearly in the French context, wherein a law was voted into effect in the late 1990s authorizing the issue of residence permits to illegal aliens suffering from serious medical condition and not able to receive treatment in their home country (Ticktin 2006). As a result of the introduction of this criterion, a growing number of immigrants have been granted documents on the basis of a health problem, therefore defining a new condition of the diseased immigrant and, more generally, creating a remarkable confusion between repression of illegal aliens and compassion for suffering others (Fassin 2005). Such an extension of the domain of humanitarianism as a complement to policing and at the expense of individual rights is not entirely novel, as has been noted in the early years of recognizing the status of refugees (Feldman 2007). However, in recent years, the invocation of moral sentiments has become commonplace in politics, and the deployment of pathos in public affairs has led to new forms of action. Undocumented immigrants on the verge of being deported often risk their lives via hunger strikes (Siméant 2009) or self-mutilations (Fischer 2010) as desperate signs of protest. As is the case in critical situations, the body appears to be the ultimate resource they can mobilize to legitimize their social existence and obtain legal recognition.

CONCLUSION

Immigration is a crucial issue in contemporary societies as well as a major object of modern governmentality. The considerable moral and political investment in what remains a marginal phenomenon in demographic terms calls for an explanation. On the one hand, immigration is related to the construction of borders and boundaries, in other words, of sovereignty and identity, whether the nation recognizes its debt to immigrants, as the United States, or denies it, as France. On the other hand, it is located at the crux of what constitutes the three pillars of governmentality, that is, economy, police, and humanitarianism. The arrangement of the immigrant question regarding these three pillars has been changing dramatically over recent decades, with policing becoming the principal instrument to govern those who were increasingly viewed as aliens. Remarkably, however, the policiarization of immigration has proceeded almost regardless of the changes of political majorities, and the differences between liberals and conservatives have not concerned so much their adhesion to the international repressive orientation as the demagogic utilization of immigrants as scapegoats of the latter contrasting with the more discrete exercise of constraints by the former. Besides, this

evolution is not exempt from complications and contradictions, because of mobilizations and resistances, or simply as a result of shifts in the moral economies of democratic regimes, opening new political subjectivities.

In this preoccupying and moving context, the social sciences in general, and anthropology in particular, have developed an important body of multidisciplinary research to explore the ideologies and technologies at work in the policing of borders and the production of boundaries. This research has yielded innovative ethnographies of the state and has contributed to the public debate. In many countries, the governmentality of immigration has become one of the major sites of encounter between the academic field and the political sphere, thus highlighting the role of anthropology as critique. Noticeably, most studies have been conducted in the Western world, leaving the question of the policing of borders and the production of boundaries in Latin America, Africa, Asia, and Oceania relatively unexamined. Considering the importance and, in several cases, the urgency of this problematic, its exploration would definitely enrich our understanding of both specific national configurations and the global governmentality of frontiers.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The author is not aware of any affiliations, memberships, funding, or financial holdings that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this review.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This article is based on the scientific program "Frontières" supported by the French National Research Agency under the coordination of the author, who expresses his gratitude to Nicolas Fischer for his bibliographical and intellectual contribution.

LITERATURE CITED

Abusharaf RM. 2009. *Transforming Displaced Women in Sudan. Politics and the Body in a Squatter Settlement.* Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Ackleson J. 2003. Directions in border security research. *Soc. Sci. J.* 40:573–81

Agamben G. 1998. *Homo Sacer. Sovereign Power and Bare Life.* Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press

Agamben G. 2005. *State of Exception*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press

Alvarez RR. 1995. The Mexican-US border: the making of an anthropology of borderlands. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 24:447–70

Anderson M. 2000. The transformation of border controls: a European precedent? In *The Wall Around the West. State Borders and Immigration Controls*, ed. P Andreas, T Snyder, pp. 15–29. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield

Andreas P, Bierstecker TJ, eds. 2003. *The Rebordering of North America. Integration and Exclusion in a New Security Context*. New York/London: Routledge

Andreas P, Snyder T, eds. 2000. *The Wall Around the West. State Borders and Immigration Controls in North America and Europe*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield

Anthias F, Yuval Davis N. 1992. *Racialized Boundaries. Race, Nation, Gender, Colour and Class, and the Antiracist Struggle*. London: Routledge

Appadurai A. 2006. *Fear of Small Numbers. An Essay on the Geography of Anger*, Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

Arendt H. 1951. *The Origins of Totalitarianism: Imperialism*. New York: Harcourt

Arendt H. 1968. *Men in Dark Times*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace

Barth F. 1968. Introduction. In *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Culture Difference*, ed. F Barth, pp. 9–38. Boston: Little, Brown

Bauman Z. 1998. *Globalization. The Human Consequences.* Cambridge: Polity
Becker H. 1963. *Outsiders. Studies in the Sociology of Deviance.* New York: Free Press
Belguendouz A. 2005. Expansion et sous-traitance des logiques d'enfermement de l'Union Européenne: l'exemple du Maroc. *Cult. Conflicts* 57:155–219
Bernardot M. 2008. *Camps d'Etrangers.* Paris: Ed. Croquant
Bigo D, Guild E. 2005. Policing at a distance: Schengen visa policies. In *Controlling Frontiers: Free Movement Into and Within Europe*, ed. D Bigo, E Guild, pp. 233–62. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate
Blanc-Chaléard MC, Douki C, Dyonet N, Milliot V, eds. 2001. *Police et Migrants. France 1667–1939.* Rennes: Presses Univ. Rennes
Blom Hansen T, Stepputat F, eds. 2005. *Sovereign Bodies: Citizens, Migrants, and States in the Postcolonial World.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
Bohannan P. 1967. Introduction. In *Beyond the Frontier: Social Process and Cultural Change*, ed. P Bohannan, F Plog. New York: Nat. Hist. Press
Bohmer C, Shuman A. 2008. *Rejecting Refugees. Political Asylum in the 21st Century.* Lodon: Routledge
Bornemann J. 1991. *After the Wall. East Meets West in the New Berlin.* New York: Basic Books
Boswell C. 2003. The 'external dimension' of EU immigration and asylum policy. *Int. Aff.* 79(3):619–38
Brettell CB. 2007. Theorizing migration in anthropology. The social construction of networks, identities, communities, and globalscapes. In *Migration Theory. Talking Across Disciplines*, ed. C Brettell, JF Hollifield, pp. 113–59. London: Routledge
Bröckling U, Krasmann S, Lemke T. 2011. From Foucault's lectures at the Collège de France to the studies of governmentality. In *Governmentality. Current Issues and Future Challenges*, ed. U Bröckling, S Krasmann, T Lemke, pp. 1–33. New York: Routledge
Broeders D. 2007. The new digital borders of Europe: EU databases and the surveillance of irregular migrants. *Int. Sociol.* 22(1):71–92
Brown W. 2010. *Walled States, Waning Sovereignty.* New York: Zone Books
Calavita K. 2005. *Immigrants at the Margins. Law, Race and Exclusion in Southern Europe.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
Castles S, Miller MJ. 2003. *The Age of Migration. International Population Movements in the Modern World.* New York: Guilford
Chavez L. 1998. *Shadowed Lives : Undocumented Immigrants in American Society.* Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovich
Clochard O, Decourcelle A, Intrand C. 2003. Zones d'attente et demande d'asile à la frontière: le renforcement des contrôles migratoires? *Rev. Eur. Migr. Int.* 19(2):157–89
Cohen A. 1965. *Arab Border-Villages in Israel.* New York: Humanities Press
Collectif. 2009. *Cette France-là*, Vol. 1. Paris: Découverte
Cornelius WA. 2001. Death at the border. Efficacy and unintended consequences of US immigration control policy. *Popul. Dev. Rev.* 27(4):661–85
Cornelius WA, Martin PL, Hollifield JF. 1994. *Controlling Immigration: A Global Perspective.* Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
Courau H. 2007. *Ethnologie de la Forme-Camp de Sangatte. De l'Exception à la Régulation.* Paris: Ed. Arch. Contemp.
Coutin SB. 1995. Smugglers or samaritans in Tucson, Arizona: producing and contesting legal truth. *Am. Ethnologist* 22(3):549–71
Crettiez X, Piazza P, eds. 2006. *Du Papier à la Biométrie. Identifier les Individus.* Paris: Presses Sci. Po
Ekholm Friedman K, Friedman J. 2008. *Modernities, Class, and the Contradictions of Globalization. The Anthropology of Global Systems.* Lanham, MA: Rowman & Littlefield
Daniel V, Knudsen J. 1995. *Mistrusting Refugees.* Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
Das V, Poole D. 2004. State and its margins. Comparative ethnographies. In *Anthropology in the Margins of the State*, ed. V Das, D Poole, pp. 3–34. Santa Fe, NM: Sch. Am. Res. Press
De Genova N. 2002. Migrant illegality and deportability in everyday life. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 31:419–47
De Genova N. 2005. *Working the Boundaries: Race, Space, and 'Illegality' in Mexican Chicago.* Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press

De Genova N, Peutz N, eds. 2010. *The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
Donnan H, Wilson TM, eds. 1999. *Borders: Frontiers of Identity, Nation and State*. Oxford: Berg
Dunn TJ. 1996. *The Militarization of the U.S.-Mexico Border 1978–1992. Low-Intensity Conflict Doctrine Comes Home*. Tucson, AZ: Univ. Tex. Press
Ellerman A. 2009. *States Against Migrants. Deportation in Germany and the United States*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
Fassin D. 1996. Clandestins ou exclus? Quand les mots font les politiques. *Politix* 9(34):77–86
Fassin D. 2001. The biopolitics of otherness. Undocumented foreigners and racial discrimination in French public debate. *Anthropol. Today* 17(1):3–7
Fassin D. 2005. Compassion and repression. The moral economy of immigration policies in France. *Cult. Anthropol.* 20(3):362–87
Fassin D. 2010a. Frontières extérieures, frontières intérieures. See Fassin 2010b, pp. 5–24
Fassin D, ed. 2010b. *Les Nouvelles Frontières de la Société Française*. Paris: La Découverte
Fassin D. 2011. *Humanitarian Reason. A Moral History of the Present*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
Fassin D, d'Halluin E. 2005. The truth from the body. Medical certificates as ultimate evidence for asylum seekers. *Am. Anthropol.* 107(4):597–608
Fassin D, Mazouz S. 2009. What is it to become French? Naturalization as a Republican rite of institution. *Rev. Franc. Sociol.* 50(5):37–64
Feldman I. 2007. Difficult distinctions: refugee law, humanitarian practice and political identificatin in Gaza. *Cult. Anthropol.* 22(1):129–69
Fetzer J. 2000. *Public Attitudes toward Immigration in the United States, France and Germany*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
Ferré N. 1997. La production de l'irrégularité. In *Les Lois de l'Inhospitalité. La Société Française à l'Epreuve des Sans-Papiers*. ed. D Fassin, A Morice, C Quiminal. Paris: La Découverte
Fischer N. 2010. Les corps-frontières. Atteinte physique et expertise médicale dans un centre de retention administrative. See Fassin 2010b, pp. 477–98
Fischer N, Spire A. 2009. L'Etat face aux illégalismes. *Politix* 87:7–20
Foucault M. 1978. *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books
Foucault M. 2007. *Security, Territory, Population. Lectures at the Collège de France 1977–1978*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
Freeman G. 1994. Can liberal states control unwanted immigration? *Ann. Am. Acad. Pol. Soc. Sci.* 534:17–30
Gibney MJ. 2004. *The Ethics and Politics of Asylum: Liberal Democracy and the Response to Refugees*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
Gilboy JA. 1991. Deciding who gets in: decision-making by immigration inspectors. *Law Soc. Rev.* 25(3):571–600
Good A. 2007. *Anthropology and Expertise in the Asylum Courts*. New York: Routledge-Cavendish
Graham M. 2002. Emotional bureaucracies: emotions, civil servants, and immigrants in the Swedish welfare state. *Ethos* 30(3):199–226
Guiraudon V, Joppke C, eds. 2001. *Controlling a New Migration*. London: Routledge
Gusterson H, Besteman C. 2009. *The Insecure American. How We Got Here and What We Should Do About It*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
Hagan J, Phillips S. 2008. Border blunders: the unanticipated human and economic costs of the U.S. approach to immigration control, 1986–2007. *Criminol. Public Policy* 7(1):83–94
Hanson GH, Spilimbergo A. 1999. Illegal immigration, border enforcement and relative wages. *Am. Econ. Rev.* 89(5):1337–57
Hart LK. 1999. Culture, civilization, and demarcation at the northwest borders of Greece. *Am. Ethnol.* 26(1):196–220
Heyman J. 1998. *Finding a Moral Heart for U.S. Immigration Policy. An Anthropological Perspective*. Arlington, VA: Am. Ethnol. Soc. Monogr.
Heyman J. 2000. Respect for outsiders? Respect for the law? The moral evaluation of high-scale issues by US immigration officers. *J. Rev. Anthropol. Inst.* 6(4):635–52

Heyman JM, Smart A. 1999. States and illegal practices. An overview. In *States and Illegal Practices*, ed. JM Heyman, pp. 1–24. Oxford: Berg
Hirabayashi LR. 1999. *The Politics of Fieldwork. Research in an American Concentration Camp*. Tucson: Univ. Ariz. Press
Hughes J, Liebaut F, eds. 1998. *Detention of Asylum Seekers in Europe: Analysis and Perspectives*. The Hague: Kluwer Law Int.
Huysmans J. 2006. *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, Migration and Asylum in the EU*. London: Routledge
Inda JX. 2006. *Targeting Immigrants. Government, Technology, and Ethics*. Oxford: Blackwell
Joppke C. 1998. Why liberal states accept unwanted immigration. *World Polit.* 50(2):266–93
Kanstroom D. 2007. *Deportation Nation: Outsiders In American History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
Kearney M. 1991. Borders and boundaries of state and self at the end of empire. *J. Hist. Soc.* 5(1):52–74
Kobelinsky C, Mkaremi C. 2009. *Enfermés Dehors. Enquêtes sur le Confinement des Etrangers*. Bellecombe-en-Bauges: Ed. Croquant
Lamont M, MolnárV. 2002. The study of boundaries in the social sciences. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 28:167–95
Lewis MD. 2007. *The Boundaries of the Republic: Migrant Rights and the Limits of Universalism in France, 1918–1940*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
Lipsky M. 1980. *Street Level Bureaucracy. Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*. New York: Russell Sage Found.
Low S. 2003. *Behind the Gates. Life, Security, and the Pursuit of Happiness in Fortress America*. New York: Routledge
Malkki L. 1995. *Purity and Exile. Violence, Memory, and National Cosmology Among Hutu Refugees in Tanzania*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
Marrus MR. 1985. *The Unwanted: European Refugees in the 20th Century*. New York/Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
Mathieu L. 2006. *La Double Peine. Histoire d'une Lutte Inachevée*. Paris: La Dispute
McDonald D, ed. 2000. *On Borders. Perspectives on Migration in Southern Africa*. Cape Town: SAMP/Idasa
Nachman SR. 1993. Wasted lives: tuberculosis and other health risks of being Haitian in a U.S. detention camp. *Med. Anthropol. Q.* 7(3):227–59
Nevins J. 2002. *Operation Gatekeeper. The Rise of the 'Illegal Alien' and the Making of the U.S-Mexico Boundary*. New York: Routledge
Ngai MM. 2004. *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
Noiriel G. 1992. *Le Creuset Français. Histoire de l'Immigration XIXe-XXe Siècles*. Paris: Seuil
Noiriel G. 2007. *Immigration, Antisémitisme et Racisme en France XIXe–XXe Siècles. Discours Publics, Humiliations Privées*. Paris: Fayard
Nyers P. 2003. Abject cosmopolitanism. The politics of protection in the anti-deportation movement. *Third World Q.* 24:1069–93
Palidda S. 2011. *Racial Criminalization of Migrants in the 21st Century*. Adelshot, UK: Ashgate
Pandolfo S. 2007. The burning. Finitude and the political-theological imagination of illegal migration. *Anthropol. Theory* 7(3):329–63
Peschanski D. 2002. *La France des Camps. L'Internement, 1938–1946*. Paris: Gallimard
Peteet J. 2005. *Landscape of Hope and Despair. Palestinian Refugee Camps*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press
Peutz. 2006. Embarking on an anthropology of removal. *Curr. Anthropol.* 47(2):217–41
Pian A. 2009. *Aux Nouvelles Frontières de l'Europe. L'Aventure Incertaine des Sénégalais au Maroc*. Paris: La Dispute
Pratt A. 2005. *Securing Borders: Detention and Deportation in Canada*. Vancouver: Univ. Br. Colombia Press
Richard C, Fischer N. 2008. A legal disgrace? The retention of deported migrants in contemporary France. *Soc. Sci. Inf.* 47(4):581–603
Rudolph C. 2006. *National security and immigration: Explaining policy development in the United States and Western Europe since 1945*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
Sasse G, Thielemann E. 2005. A research agenda for the study of migrants and minorities in Europe. *J. Common Market Stud.* 43(4):655–71

Sassen S. 1999. *Guests and Aliens*. New York: New Press
Sayad A. 2004. *The Suffering of the Immigrant*. Cambridge: Polity
Schmidt C. 1985. *Political Theology. Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
Schnapper D. 1991. *La France de l'Intégration. Sociologie de la Nation en 1990*. Paris: Gallimard
Schuster L. 2000. A comparison of asylum policy in seven European states. *J. Refugee Stud.* 13(1):118–32
Silverstein PA. 2005. Immigrant racialization and the new savage slot: race, migration and immigration in the New Europe. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 34:363–84
Siméant J. 2009. *La Grève de la Faim*. Paris: Presses Sci. Po
Simon J. 1998. Refugees in a carceral age: the rebirth of immigration prisons in the United States. *Public Cult.* 10(3):577–607
Spijkerboer T. 2007. The human costs of border control. *Eur. J. Migr. Law* 9:127–39
Spire A. 2008. *Accueillir ou Reconduire. Enquête sur les Guichets de l'Immigration*, Paris: Liber
Sweeney JA. 2009. Credibility, proof and refugee law. *Int. J. Refugee Law* 21(4):700–26
Ticktin M. 2006. Where ethics and politics meet: the violence of humanitarianism in France. *Am. Ethnologist* 33(1):33–49
Torpey J. 2000. *The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship, and the State*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
Valluy J. 2010. L'exportation de la xénophobie de gouvernement. De la politique européenne des frontiers à la repression dans les pays limitrophes. See Fassin 2010b, pp. 175–96
Vila P. 2000. *Crossing Borders, Reinforcing Borders: Social Categories, Metaphors, and Narrative Identities on the U.S.-Mexico Frontier*. Austin: Univ. Tex. Press
Waldinger R, Fitzgerald D. 2004. Transnationalism in question. *Am. J. Sociol.* 109(5):1177–95
Wallman S. 1978. The boundaries of 'race': processes of ethnicity in England. *Man* 13(2):200–17
Walters W. 2002. Deportation, expulsion, and the international police of aliens. *Citizenship Stud.* 6(3):265–92
Walters W. 2006. Border/control. *Eur. J. Soc. Theory* 9:187–203
Waters MC, Jiménez TR. 2005. Assessing immigrant assimilation: new empirical and theoretical challenges. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 31:105–25
Welch M. 2002. *Detained: Immigration Laws and the Expanding INS Jail Complex*. Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press
Willen S. 2010. Citizens, 'real' others, 'other' others. The biopolitics of otherness and the deportation of unauthorized migrant workers from Tel Aviv, Israel. In *The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement*, ed. N De Genova, N Peutz, pp. 262–94. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press
Wilson TM, Donnan H, eds. 1998. *Border Identities. Nation and State at International Frontiers*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
Wimmer A, Glick-Schiller N. 2002. Methodological nationalism and beyond: nation-state building, migration and the social sciences. *Glob. Netw.* 2(4):301–34