

NIKOS PAPASTERGIADIS

MOBILITY AND THE NATION: SKINS, MACHINES AND COMPLEX SYSTEMS

Willy Brandt Series of Working Papers
in International Migration and Ethnic Relations
3/05



MALMÖ UNIVERSITY

**Willy Brandt Series of Working Papers
in International Migration and Ethnic Relations
3/05**

Published

2005

Editor

Maja Povrzanović Frykman
maja.frykman@imer.mah.se

Editor-in-Chief

Björn Fryklund

Published by

School of International Migration and Ethnic Relations
Malmö University
205 06 Malmö
Sweden

NIKOS PAPASTERGIADIS

MOBILITY AND THE NATION: SKINS, MACHINES AND COMPLEX SYSTEMS

This essay re-examines the public fears of invasion at the time of heightened anxiety over terrorist attacks and in light of the ongoing refugee crisis. It considers how discourses on the nation-state and mobility have been confined to an oppositional model. The twin pillars of micro-agency and macro-structuralism that have supported the prevailing sociological theories of migration present the nation-state as a bounded system. By identifying the fear of external agents and the ambivalence towards mobility, this essay traces a secret complicity between theories of migration and the preservation of the nation-state as a unified and exclusionary social system. The global flows and local affiliations of contemporary society are better grasped through complex systems theory, which transcends the oppositional logic of belonging and movement.

Keywords: mobility, nation state, body, machine, migration theory, complex systems

The oxymorons ‘political body’ and ‘social engine’ have legitimated the modes of governance throughout modernity. From antiquity to modernity, metaphors of the body and its parts have been used to classify the distribution of power within a specific order. The Roman Senate was popularly referred to as the head, while the subordinate plebeians were the limbs. This division between command and obedience, intellectual and manual, persisted throughout the medieval and modern structures of religious, military and economic organisation. Even the struggle between the Papal and Regal authority was fought in bodily metaphors. If Christ’s representative was the spiritual head, then the King was to be relocated into the midst of the chest, as the heart. In the modern period, the rise of new economic models tried to reconcile the tension between a seemingly endless chain

of mechanical production, and the need to replenish what Adam Smith called the 'toiling body'. Mark Seltzer (1992) has argued that in a number of disciplines, ranging from political-economy to literature, a new body-machine complex was constructed to represent the modern flows of power.¹ This new bio-mechanical model of power sought to reconcile the tension between the spirit of progress and the concern for social stability. However, these visions of modern power also preserved a general ambivalence towards mobility, and a particular fear of external agents.

When the former US attorney general John Ashcroft announced his response to the bombings on September 11th by warning terrorists that they would be arrested if they overstayed their visas 'even by one day', and when the current Australian minister for education Brendan Nelson, suggested that Muslims who did not share the Australian values should 'clear off', we can see very clearly how the 'war on terror' is conjoined with the 'war on migrants'. Both wars begin with racial profiling, which is nothing short of a reclassification of the human bodies that can count as being part of the civic body – refugees become 'illegals'; similarly, dissidents and insurgents are dropped into the legal blackhole of 'enemy combatant' (Meeropol 2005). Strangers and enemies, once branded as extremists, are in the same stroke banished or vanished. These new fictive identities of non-identity permit the authorities to detain and deport people, without recourse to legal procedures and with total impunity. Eating up or vomiting out the enemy is the primitive strategy for making them disappear. But before we unpick the false comfort in digestion and emission, it is worth taking one step back and asking, is there an 'outside' from which the enemy comes? I have argued that the detention of refugees and terrorists in the non-place of the camp is expressive of an enfolded spatial logic (Papastergiadis, forthcoming). The camp has become the constitutive outside: it is located beyond the realm of laws, values and civilisation, but also positioned in an adjacent location to the state, against which it becomes possible to re-draw the boundaries of 'our way of life'. At this point, I am not seeking to question the extent of stigmatic escalation, from discrimination to antagonism towards strangers and enemies, but rather to consider the way bio-mechanical models mobilise suspicion and fear in modern governance.

The public fears of invasion need to be re-examined. In this essay I will consider the ways in which the discourses on the nation-state and mobility have been confined to an oppositional discourse. This will proceed by noting the persistence of organic notions of political unity, and the survival of the foundational principles of mechanical equilibrium in the social sciences. Migration, as an ongoing process, has never fitted into this model of governance. The twin pillars of micro-agency and macro-structuralism that have supported the prevailing sociological theories of migration are embedded in the broader discourses on the nation-state as a bounded system. However, this discourse constructs mobility

as either a temporary disruption, or a force that can be regulated. By identifying the repetition of a general ambivalence towards mobility and a fear of external agents, I will trace a secret complicity between the theories of migration and the preservation of the nation state as a unified and exclusionary social system. In more general terms, I will argue that the commitment to the integrity of the nation state as a bounded system, and the understanding that power operates through as body-machine complex, inspires an enduring suspicion towards difference, and creates a propensity to conflate strangers with enemies. In conclusion, I will suggest that the global flows and local affiliations of contemporary society are better grasped through complex systems theory, and that this perspective would also twist attention out of an oppositional logic based on belonging and movement.

Bodies and their Parts: Nations and their Skins

Tolerance thresholds are critical for the wellbeing of bodies and engines. To puncture the skin and contaminate organs, or to flood carburettors and overheat pistons, would lead to bleeding, infection, choking and explosion. That much is true for bodies and engines. How far can such organic and mechanistic analogies be extended to explain the function of politics and society? In classical German political theory the conception of the political entity is based on an anthropomorphic organism. From Kant to Marx, they all drew on an image of the political body as if it had three key parts – a head that commands, arms that fight battles, and organs fulfil special functions (Cheah 2003). Most of the dispute within political theory has not revolved around the validity of this analogy, but has focused on the position of the head in relation to the rest of the body. The absolutist traditions equated the sovereign with the will of God, elevating the head slightly above the rest of the body; whereas the republicans defined the sovereign through a negotiated social contract, and so the head was submerged in the body. While the threat of invasion is intrinsic to maintaining the unity between head and body, the blindspot in this union is the nature of skin.

Even a cursory look at the key texts in the European and American social sciences reveals a reliance on a series of metaphors that equate society with an engine. Inputs and outputs, forces and levers, gears and cogs, fuels and lubricants have been the key terms for not only evoking social relations and tendencies, but also setting the parameters for the ‘normal’ function of society. Ford’s dream of a ceaseless conveyor belt that ensured the constant flow of steel from the mines, factory, showrooms and onto the streets, his belief that automatons work best when blind, and his classification of humanity as being made up of a few heads and many hands, is the most insistent version of the modernist romance with machines. The naming of an epoch as ‘Fordist’ demonstrates the absolute elevation of the machine, with which the rest of humanity had to negotiate and

ultimately compromise. Taylorism put Ford's metaphors to work. It was to managerialism what the engineer was to the engine: a method for coordinating flows. While the many hands could not see what the head directed to them to do, there was an underlying belief that the blindness of mechanical efficiency, or rather, the separation of mind from body, would deliver controlled progress. Mobility within the system was crucial and interruptions were catastrophic.

At the core of the mechanistic model of society is a general theory of equilibrium. Scientific theories on energy flows had a profound influence on the cultural and political frameworks of modernity (Rabinbach 1990). The first law of thermodynamics, which proposed the existence of a singular system of universal energy that was both finite and indestructible, was seized upon with particular zeal by both liberal reformists and utopian socialists. This belief that energy flows could be accelerated and converted to maximise production inspired new visions of progress. The human body, and society as a whole, were constantly compared to an engine. It was, and many ways still is popularly accepted that both the body and the social system were composed of parts that could be fuelled to move at different speeds, or modified to have greater flexibility, and that the overall stability would be ensured through the greater coordination of the structure and tightening of the boundary. The social parts were not just described as being part of a whole, but the idea of a whole both determined the limits and prescribed how the parts fit together. Taylorism, for instance, was the most popular 'scientific' method for dividing, analysing, linking and co-ordinating the labour process as if it were a series of simple mechanical components. Exorbitant bits and dissipative forces that threatened the internal equilibrium were either shaved off or sealed. Meanwhile the engine filtered inputs to eliminate impurities and was fortified against external shocks. Social engineering became the most respectable science in modernity.

If the political order is an integrated body and society a well-tuned engine, then anything from the outside that could not be consumed as food or fuel is registered as a threat. Everything that penetrates the skin will cause a rupture, alter the blood flow, and possibly even destabilise the function of vital organs. Extending these bio-mechanical metaphors to explain social relations and define the modes of belonging has perilous consequences. Migrants are invariably condemned to an external position, their entry into the system is coded along the spectrum with the useful stranger at one end, and the threatening enemy at the other. The discovery of the second law of thermodynamics, and its application in social and political thinking, created a set of beliefs that gave even more legitimacy to the inherent fear of difference and mobility. In contrast to the earlier law, there was now a claim that mobility depleted energy, and that the overall system tended towards entropy. The triumphalism of endless production was now matched by pessimistic sense of irreversible decline. This new perspective had particular

implications for attitudes towards movement: this was what made the system leak and weaken.

Contemporary views on migrants as transgressors, not just of borders, but also of laws and values, draw on deeply held attitudes towards people on the move as disruptive. People who leave are dismissed as the undesirable uppity ones or the miserable misfits, while those who seek to enter are regarded as the rejects from elsewhere that pose new risks and an unwanted burden. These views of migrants are not natural. They have emerged from the overlap between the scientific theories on movement as a form of disruption, and the anthropological mythology that universalises a specific form of social order, that Harald Kleinschmidt (2003) calls residentialism: where citizens live settled lives and governments preserve the integrity of borders. The British Tories counted on the potency of migration as a threat to social order when they sought to remind the polity in the 2005 election that: 'The first job of the government is to secure the nation's borders.' The projection of the migrant and the refugee along a stigmatic continuum that includes the terrorist unleashes bizarre monsters and blocks a genuine self-understanding. Despite the historical evidence that social order is formed through negotiated patterns of mobility, the figure of the migrant persists in a menacing space. He or she is not configured as a subject with which the self engages in dialogue for mutual identification, but the object whose regulation defines the strength of the skin and the function of every cell of modern power. This perspective barely conceals the fist of threat that shimmers beneath the veil of protection and reinforces the view that violence and fear are the foundations of the governance (Foucault 2003: 96).

Since September 11th, the political discourse of fear has been normalised through the metaphor of a porous skin and the attack on 'our way of life'. The boundary between inside and outside has been redrawn to reinforce the signs of loyalty and organise the zone of suspicion. Consider this typical example of reportage on security concerns, where the identity of the enemy slips swiftly between terrorists, migrants and citizens:

In the next few weeks cabinet will also consider a range of other changes designed to tighten counter-terrorism laws. They are likely to include tighter security checks on migrants and extending the period before permanent citizens can become citizens from two years to three, four or five years.²

The concern with territorial control is played out in paradoxical ways. On the one hand, there is an effort to externalise the threat. On the other, a concerted attempt to disconnect the enemy from any conventional sense of place. When Bush embraces the whole of the civilised world as allies in the 'war on terror', he is not only pointing out to his opponents that they have no home-base, but also warning dissidents inside America, or anywhere else, that they are already outside

the realm of civilised obligation. The cowboy alliances of ‘for’ and ‘against’ have made explicit the thresholds that the body politic will tolerate. The spectre of extermination and disappearance hovers over every citizen. Despite the creeping rise of an absolutist sovereign head from its submerged position in the republican body, the problem with modern power is not only in its elevated assumptions, but also the increasing disjunction between the rhetoric of control and the practices of everyday life. The authoritarian grip on political and social control has never been so fuzzy. By any measure the flows in contemporary life are well out of equilibrium and even world systems theorists acknowledge that it ‘is entering a period of chaos’ (Wallerstein 2003: 230). The critical task is not to be found in making conceptual adjustments to rebalance the signs of disequilibria, but as Hardt and Negri have argued, to invent a ‘new physiology’ of governance (Hardt and Negri 2004: 162).

Today people are more aware of the global dimensions of economic competition, political alignments and cultural dissemination. However, while moral panic over the threats of globalisation is cutting deeper into popular consciousness, this is not matched by any commensurate and sustainable form of global ‘moral connectedness’ (Szerszynski and Urry 2002: 471). Theories of spatial belonging drawn from diasporic perspectives, or new concepts of social solidarity that are defined through the multiplicity of bodily forces rather than a unified body, have yet to capture the public imagination.³

After September 11th the European newspapers ran with the headline: ‘We are all New Yorkers now!’ With further bombs in Bali, Casablanca, Cairo, Madrid and then London, this momentary flash of global empathy was soon bent into heightened concerns for national security. We know that we are living in a globalising world, but a global structure for mobilising an inclusive civic sentiment is absent. The circle of obligation tends to close most tightly around the residentialist nexus of family, community and nation – blood and soil.

Mapping Mobilities

Modern power cannot control global flows because in the first instance it has not addressed the complex patterns of mobility. The turbulence of global migration requires a new conceptual framework for understanding nations through the co-dependence on mobility and the porosity of their borders. The traditional theoretical frameworks assumed that migration was a uni-directional movement – whereby the migrant left from one bounded space, then entered through the front gate of another space, followed by a slow process of acquiring rights to settlement and citizenship. Since the 1970s there have been unprecedented trends in the volume and contradictory trajectories in global mobility. The complexity of the current flows of people can be identified by the changes in five factors that affect mobility.

1. Increased numbers of people on the move

Today there are more migrants and refugees than at any other point in history. Between the two world wars the numbers of migrants doubled. By 1965 there were 75 million migrants. In 2002 it was estimated that there were 175 million migrants worldwide out of which there are 16 million refugees. While the number of migrants continues to grow, it appears that refugee figures peaked in 1993 and have been steadily declining for the past decade. However, these figures do not include the vast numbers of undocumented migrants and increasing number of internally displaced people. The UNHCR estimates that there are between 20-25 million people who have been forced to leave their homes but have not found refuge in another country. The United States has the highest number of immigrants but in proportionate terms the heaviest weighting of migrants and refugees are landing in select parts of Africa, Pakistan and Iran, and in overall terms most migrants are living in the South (*United Nations International Migration Report 2002*).

2. Multiplicity of directions

'Go West' is not the iconic sign of contemporary migration. The classical perception of migration as a finite journey has been displaced by a more complex range of patterns, which includes seasonal, itinerant, recurrent and incessant movements. Migrants are not heading in any single direction (Zlotnik 1998: 429-68), nor is there a structural force that governs the majority of movements. Contemporary flows of migration are multiple and they differ from the earlier waves of migration which were characterised as being generated by the semi-structured push-pull dynamic of the colonisation of the New World by Europeans, or the recruitment of workers into the industrial centres of the North. Today there is no singular set of co-ordinates that is pulling the major flows. People are on the move in multiple directions. Labour migration is heading towards not only developed but also developing countries. For instance, while Asia has disproportionately low levels of international migration, it is experiencing some of the most complex patterns of movement. To map these movements would reveal turbulent patterns rather than linear trajectories. This also reflects the view that shuttling between two or more places plays a significant role in the contemporary condition of working and social life.

3. Diversification of migrants

The classical sociological image of the migrant as an uprooted, lonely and impoverished man is not representative of the diverse types of people that are now on the move. While the classical image of the migrant was dominated by the psycho-social type known as the 'marginal man', it also included a more ambivalent figure that Simmel and Schutz sketched out as the 'stranger'. The

image of the stranger opened a more positive form of identification as it suggested that migration was responsible for a broadening of cultural horizons and the introduction of critical perspectives. By contrast, the contemporary figure of the migrant is loaded with stigmatic associations of criminality, exploitation and desperation. In reality, men from all classes and status groups, and growing numbers of educated women, are on the move across the world. In the Philippines, the second largest 'exporter of labour in the world', not only do the number of women migrants vastly exceed the men, but their remittances have prevented the national economy from total collapse (Go 1998: 147). The feminisation of migration not only disrupts the stereotypes of alienation and marginality, but also disturbs traditional communal and family structures. The term 'transmigrant' has been added to refer to those people who cross borders on a recurring basis and are not subject to the restrictions that itinerant and seasonal migrants face.

4. Complex forms of agency and spatial affiliation

The motivation of migration can no longer be confined to an economic calculation of wage increases. The reasons for settling in a new country are also not always consistent with the assumption that it is driven by financial returns. The recent acknowledgement of social, cultural and political factors as being active in the *whole* of the migration process has a dramatic impact on the way we also understand spatial attachment. There are now transnational and diasporic cultural networks that have created complex links across the world. While some diasporic communities remain relatively fixed in their adopted homeland, they also channel their media services through new satellite networks. These triangulated media delivery systems that hop vast horizontal distances also twist the proximate forms of day-to-day intimacies. The contemporary patterns of cross-cultural interaction include both complex forms of hybridisation and jagged segmentations that do not easily fit into the categories of either an aggressive assimilationism, or even the emergent forms of multiculturalism. Diasporic networks are becoming more self-directive and bifurcate as they engage with dominant structures. Transformations in the methods of production and the dissemination of global commodities are also undermining traditional forms of spatial attachment. The media industries and dispersal of consumer commodities now also serve as strange attractors. In this context the North is consistently emitting contradictory signals: encouraging the illusion of freedom and mobility, promoting its own commodities and values, while also restricting human migration and devaluing other traditions. Despite these contradictory signs on global connectedness and exclusionary policies on immigration, complex migration networks are constantly emerging. While most forms of migration occur across relatively small distances, such as the route from Burma to Thailand, the changes in communication networks and the use of the airplane

for mass transportation have also transformed the relationships to space and place. As a consequence, members from closely knit rural communities in China can find passageways into receptive enclaves in New York. Information networks between friends and families now create a sense of adjacency between places that are separated by vast distances. Migrants often choose their destination according to personal knowledge and available transportation systems rather than by geographic proximities (Massey et al. 1998: 12).

5. Governance and transnational flows

Immigration and refugee policies have undergone dramatic changes since the 1970s. In 1976 the UN had calculated that only a small minority of countries had policies to lower immigration and this was matched by a slightly larger number of countries that were seeking to raise levels of immigration. By 2001 almost one quarter of all countries viewed immigration levels as too high, and almost half of all developed countries were introducing more restrictive policies. The effectiveness of these policies has been uneven. Dismantling of official migration recruiting agencies, deregulation in the market place and the increased restrictions on asylum policies have collectively spawned new informal and illegal networks for smuggling people across borders. In the absence of proximate and secure institutional spaces for the processing of asylum claims, legitimate refugees are increasingly reliant on traffickers to organise their escape, transition and entry into a safe country. The sanctions on airline carriers and employers, the adoption of the safe country of origin and safe third country principles, and the introduction of a new range of detention and deportation practices have not stemmed these flows. ‘Snakeheads’ in China, ‘coyotes’ in Mexico and the new Russian mafia are creating their own illegal trafficking networks of migrants and developing a trade in sex slaves which is now calculated as being as lucrative as the sale of drugs and arms. For instance, there are no uniform international laws against the trafficking and bondage of women within prostitution rings. As one pimp boasted, drugs and guns can only be sold once.⁴ These traffickers are well informed of legal loopholes and follow the most effective routes. They are highly mobile and operate through transnational networks. The gaps in international regulations allow certain movements to elude detection, and the chronic shortcomings in national agencies expose opportunities for corruption at checkpoints and the creation of secret passageways. The regulative void that sits between the national and the global is oxygen for human trafficking. The failure to coordinate migration policies on a transnational basis distributes insecurity to both the vulnerable residents and the desperate migrants. Despite the promotion of arguments by the United Nations High Commission for Refugees and International Organisation of Migration that migration is a global issue, there is still no regulative authority other than individual sovereign states.

These transnational institutions do not even have the power to enforce states to uphold laws and conventions to which they are already signatories. The capacity of an organisation like the UN to act is ultimately circumscribed by the nation state. This regulative void has only heightened the contradictions in the migration process: it further exposes refugees to criminal networks, and fans exaggerated fears on cross-border movements.

This brief outline of the features of global migration indicates a level of interconnection that is overlooked in mainstream political discourse. There are two lessons governments are reluctant to learn. First, that the history of imposing controls on migration is a catalogue of failures. Second, that migration is one of the driving forces and products of globalisation. There is now considerable historical evidence and economic data that demonstrate the dynamic role played by migrants.⁵ In the face of this empirical knowledge there is the repetition of the populist fears that migration is a threat to society. While there have been significant efforts at challenging the political manipulation of fear by anti-racist activists and migration experts, what seems to go by unnoticed is the linkage between these stigmatic claims against migrants and the inherent ambivalence towards mobility in the broader cultural frameworks for representing belonging.⁶

National Equilibrium and Global Chaos

The fear of migrants is not unique to modernity. However, the nineteenth century discourses on nationalism, which inherited a mixture of romantic and positivist ideas on belonging and social unity, were invariably hostile towards migrants and mobility. Modern nation states have not been very successful at developing strategies for accepting the positive force of migration. The promotion of nationalism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries was based on the need to extend or realign people's sense of belonging within new spatial and administrative boundaries. When the question of belonging was posed to peasants throughout the nineteenth century, the common response was not defined in national terms; they would point to their village and reply: 'I come from here and thereabouts'. Community was confined to the people they knew and the territory within which their lives were concentrated. The nation-state transformed and extended the relationship between space, community and knowledge. In Benedict Anderson's famous phrase, the nation-state was internalised as an 'imagined community' (Anderson 1983). In the building of a single state and a unified nation, local attachments had to be reconfigured and the diversity of identities had to be repressed. Nation building was a project that constructed a homogenous culture. All other cultural attachments were tolerated, at best, as transitional objects or legacies from an obsolete age. Either way, it was assumed that cultural differences would eventually disappear. Loyalty was meant

to be directed to a 'greater whole' and the integration of the different parts was compared to membership in a 'family'. However, the critical difference between nationalism and other forms of cultural belonging was not just the extension in the size of the community, but the means by which solidarity was established. An imagined community might evoke the object force of blood and soil, but more importantly it requires that people share symbolic attachments. They must come together under a common abstraction.

Metaphors of the body helped the borderlines of these administrative units feel 'homely' and 'familial'. National boundaries were represented as the outer skin. Seeing the nation through the metaphor of the body not only helped give shape to the otherwise abstract and vast 'imagined community', but it also established a specific way for the individual to express his or her sense of belonging and relate to the rest of the world. The nation as a 'body' offered a comfortable image that inspired attachment, naturalised the territorial possessiveness and provided the necessary narcissism to encourage these feelings as the supreme expressions of humanity. The bond between the self and the nation is, as Yael Tamir noted, often preceded by the magic pronoun 'my' (Tamir, 1993). Nations are made familiar not only through the personal attachment to the collective love for, say a local fish stew, or what Freud termed the 'narcissism of minor differences', but in the way these trivial habits are also used to mark out boundaries of membership. We can hear the declaration that my home begins with the signs of exclusion in the charming voice of a Swedish tourist recalling that delicate moment of return:

My husband and I love to go to Norway on vacation, but all the same, there is a special feeling coming back. Every time we cross the border we look at each other and sigh: Great to be back home again! We even long for the prohibition signs (Löfgren 2002: 259).

Coming back to your country, and your home, is meant to be like being back in your skin. A warm set of jumpers is woven by this discourse. The skin finds its protection, as we note, also in the display of exclusion. The skin serves as the limit point – where my identity begins – but it also carries the memory of trauma and separation. For while the skin of the body is always undergoing a process of replenishment, scars remain constant. In the national imaginary the skin as boundary is a fixed and fragile entity – it is scarred. The concern with boundaries is therefore twofold: to exclude foreign entrants and ensure integrity. The skin protects the illusion of precious uniqueness and defends the body from contamination and depletion. "The nation is thought to be a potentially self-contained sphere of human life, a unit which can contain everything which is needed to live in the modern world" (Levy 2000: 121). Within this discourse migrants are inevitably positioned as a threat because not only could they

puncture the skin, but they also disturb the unity of the body. Penetrating this skin is not seen as a minor infraction that self-repairs, but as a hostile violation with potential terminal consequences. Contemporary fears of the refugee are thus linked to this anxiety over controlling movements through the skin of the national body. This corporeal image of the nation not only exaggerates its fragility but also obscures its adaptive capacities.

Mechanistic metaphors have also framed the functions and ideals of social stability. The images ‘the engine of the economy’, and ‘the structures of society’, are based on the assumption that economic development tends towards the state of equilibrium and that social stability requires enclosure within a fixed system. The fear of internal entropy and fatigue is less visible in public debates than the dread of external agents that disrupt or drain the flows of the system. The image of the migrant is thus trapped by this predetermined suspicion that they will disturb social stability and impair economic performance. This bias is not confined to the most overt forms of racist labelling, but also evident in the assumption that there is a prescribed number of jobs in the economy, and a limit to the amount of support that can be offered by the state. Every job gained by an immigrant is supposedly notched against a loss to a native worker.

The zero-sum model on social stability or open migration can now be challenged on both a conceptual and an empirical level. In a number of wide-ranging surveys on economic development and immigration in post-war Australia, Europe and the United States, it has been found that immigrants provide a positive boost to economic expansion.⁷ These reports not only conclude that economies can absorb new entrants but that they are also radically transformed: migrants create the need for new jobs. This dynamism cannot be explained within a closed system mechanistic model.

The assumption that society is an ordered system that requires equilibrium to remain functional is inherently opposed to strangers and external forces. As a consequence migration has always appeared as a threat to modern society, and political models of citizenship have confined the distribution of rights to subjects who are settled within a given territory. Within this framework the migrant is always treated as an outsider. Zygmunt Bauman argues that migrants never forget the stigma, and that they are haunted by an ontological dilemma: doomed to disloyalty if they cut their ties to their original homeland, and treated with suspicion if they seek to fully join in to another ‘family’.

True, the modern faith allows anyone to become anybody, but one thing it does not permit is to become somebody *who has never been anybody else*. Even the most zealous and diligent of the voluntary assimilators carry with them into the ‘community of destination’ the brand of their alien origins, a stigma no oath of loyalty and no leaning over backwards in order to prove its sincerity would ever make non-existent. The sin of the wrong origins – the original sin – may

be recalled from oblivion at any stage and made into a charge against the most conscientious and devout ‘assimilators’. The test of admission is never final; it cannot be passed conclusively (Bauman 2001: 94-95).

While critics like Bauman complain that multiculturalism has undermined the basis for social solidarity, it is important to note that, even within his own reflections on assimilationism, he acknowledges that it too always fails to absorb the migrant. In this account of the interminable race to acceptance, there are always more hurdles for the migrant to leap over. This race is endless because origin and destiny will never meet. At the core of the migrant’s remoteness is “nothing less than the irreversibility of inner time” (Schuetz 1945: 370). The foreigner can never erase their foreignness. Their irreducible traces of difference, like the wearing of headscarves by schoolgirls, or the eating of kebabs in a defiant manner, are treated as a permanent cause for suspicion.⁸

Nationalist discourses have never delinked difference from a potential threat to security and unity. The ambivalence towards the stranger is not just in the inconsistent application of human rights – whereby citizens and migrants have unequal rights – but a consequence of defining civic rights and political identity according to the lineage of blood or the boundaries of the nation’s soil. The presence of the migrant takes the constitutive position of external threat. The bonds between state, people and place – a trinity that is crucial for the image of the nation – is tightened through the knotted defensiveness against the outsider.

One of the main obstacles in understanding the complexity of flows that shape contemporary forms of belonging is the prevalence of state-centric paradigms in the social sciences. As Harald Kleinschmidt observed, information ends where the state is (Kleinschmidt, forthcoming). Empirical studies of migration tend to be driven by the desire to identify the impact on the nation. This data rarely addresses the complex mobilities and historical patterns of transnational forms of spatial co-habitation. Borders are represented as discrete lines that separate entities, and yet, identities are never as clear-cut as this image suggests. Borders are usually ‘fuzzy’ at their edges and people find ways to not only connect with others, but they often live in frontier zones that do not correspond to national categories. These state-centric paradigms perpetuate the ideal of citizenship as a bounded subject and reproduce stigmatic values against those who are on the move.

Despite the repeated display of empirical evidence that migrants are overwhelmingly law-abiding and industrious members of society, there is the enduring suspicion that social bonds and political loyalties are dependent on specific blood-lines and fixed forms of territorial attachments. Note again this casual slur by an Australian Member of Parliament against her own new rural constituents: “Their main interest in citizenship is getting access to an Australian passport so they can leave and enter Australia conveniently”.⁹ The intensity of the suspicion towards refugees is linked to anxieties over the expanding

contradictions between globalisation and nation building. As the economic and political capacities of the nation state fail to keep pace with the pressures of global capital, its own capacity for organisation and regulation begin to diminish. As Bauman observes, the nation state has abandoned its trademark purpose: the distribution of resources, the execution of policies and the coordination of culture with patriotic duty (Bauman 2001: 96). However, this crisis also reveals that the failure of assimilation is not necessarily due to the intransigence of the foreigner, but is expressive of the fear that the system is heading towards entropy, and a loss of faith in the integrative power of the family metaphor.

From Chains and Transmission Belts to Nodes and Networks

In the social sciences two perspectives have dominated the discussions on international migration. The ‘two pillars’ of migration studies – macro-structural and micro-agency perspectives – are both reliant on a mechanistic model to explain the process of flow. Macro-social theorists have mapped the flows of migrants according to the fluctuations between supply and demand that establish equilibrium in the economy. It is argued that in times of economic expansion in the centre there is a need for additional sources of labour. Migrants come from the peripheries, but they enter on a differential status. They assume a position that Marx compared to the ‘reserve army’. When the economy contracts, then the supply of migrants is either constricted, or withdrawn from the labour market. This model relies on the integration of the spatial polarities of centre / periphery into a global system that allows migration to flow as a consequence of structural changes in the economy. The sources of migrants may be drawn from sites that are linked by historical patterns of migration, however, the actual flows are controlled by institutional regulations for entry and exit. The structural flows are depicted as if there was a system of pipelines and taps that connect the centre and the periphery. The power of the centre is measured by its capacity to control the flow.

This model is underscored by the assumption that contrary forces can balance out, and that, while power is concentrated by gathering the surplus energy from the periphery, equilibrium will be maintained by regulating flow. As a model, which emphasised the compensatory dynamic between push and pull factors, and stressed the function of chains and pipelines for conducting movement, it was perfectly suited to the industrial age. It classified human energy and trajectory according to the dominant paradigms of its time. The metaphors of migration reflected the language of mechanisation. However, these models, like the factories spread across the rustbelts of the North, now lay in ruins. In the post-industrial period, the idea of equilibrium has collapsed. A new system of attraction is in operation, one in which a complex array of forces are pushing migrants without any state admitting that it is pulling.

Liberal neo-classical economic commentators have favoured a micro-model that focuses the energy of migration flows on individual preferences. This perspective also draws on a general theory of flow. However, in the place of Marx's militaristic metaphors of conflict, there is a presumption that movement is a result of an individual decision to pursue economic opportunity, and that collectively the pattern of movement resembles a magnetic field. Migrants from densely populated areas with low incomes are meant to be attracted to sparse areas with high-income opportunities. This voluntarist model focuses on individual choices and is most vividly represented in the metaphor of 'chain migration'. It assumes that individuals not only have the capacity to determine whether conditions are favourable for themselves but also induce others to follow in their steps. The happy optimism and resigned naturalism of this perspective is best captured in the often-repeated mantra, that migration maintains equilibrium in the market place.¹⁰

Underpinning both the macro- and micro-model is a set of causal assumptions and linear trajectories. I have argued previously that the Marxist versions of the macro-model exaggerate the determining role of structural forces, and the forms of agency in the liberal micro-model are underestimated (Papastergiadis 2000: 30-37). In the macro-structural model there is no space for the agent to decide on his or her own migration. By contrast, the micro-agency model stresses that the imperious act of individual choice trumps the all-determining force of structure. While the models continue to focus on a primary determinant in the cause of migration, they continue to overlook the more complex processes of mobility and the constraints that are imposed on the available spaces in which people can move. This debate cannot be resolved by adding a new critical dimension to agency, or even acknowledging that structures are formed by the practices of everyday life, for it requires a deeper investigation into the contradiction between mobile agencies and structured forms of belonging. How are we to confront the ritual incantations of threat that repeatedly precede the migrant's own arrival, or the almost invisible conflation between stranger and enemy? The concepts of 'reserve army' and 'chain migration' rely on a boundary in economic production that barely exists today. In the age of outsourcing, who is 'outside' – and when flexibility saturates the work place, expendability is not confined to the margins. Last in is not necessarily first out. Equally, the motivation for leaving or staying are not confined to rational cost/benefit calculations. If economic needs were the only factors in motivating people to move, then it would be difficult to explain why the vast majority of the world's population never leave home. The 'cliff' of a 30% wage differential, that was, in the 1950s, the famous benchmark for explaining the point at which a migrant got motivated to move, is now more like a soft hill in comparison to the gaping precipices that separate income levels between the North and the South (Massey et al. 1998: 8).

Theories of international migration have been too reliant on mechanical formulae of economic opportunity. These theories have failed to account for the fact that while many people share common levels of economic need, they tend to display patterns of migration that vary enormously. The people who become migrants are not necessarily the ones with the greatest economic incentives to move. When they head for new destinations they gather in some of the most crowded cities, and in times of an economic squeeze, they are not the first to leave. Migrants move because they are already in the spirit of modernity. They are not passive entities being pushed and pulled along the world's great imaginary pipelines. They may leave home with the intention of returning, but along the way experience alters their priorities. They often go back and forth, sometimes checking where to settle and where to work. In this criss-crossing, the causes and consequences of migration enfold. Migration studies, which divide the process into the determinant forces of movement and consequent mechanisms for incorporation, invariably overlook this complex feedback system. The classical theories of migration simply fail to explain why migrants concentrate in the already overcrowded and guarded metropolises of the north, or in the words of Hardt and Negri (2004: 134), how they manage to 'roll up-hill'.

These mechanistic and naturalistic models also obscure the way society develops through an ongoing process of differentiation, and projects upon the migrant the status of bearer of chaos and destruction. Populist politicians, by stressing the values of coherence and continuity, are constantly re-inscribing the image of difference as a threat. This emphasis on the homogenising tendency of society and the representation of the migrant as the bearer of difference implies that the migrant represents a risk to traditional modes of conviviality, and it also overlooks the internal propensities for creative adaptation in social settings where difference is the norm rather than the exception. A more careful analysis would need to go beyond the binary opposition between difference and continuity, and consider what is the necessary balance or productive mixture that ensures both vitality and security.

Castles and Miller, in their recently revised version of the influential and best selling *The Age of Migration* (2003), have also recognised the need for a looser and more dynamic model of global migration. While stressing that most migrants still follow the routes that were first established during the phases of colonialism and industrialisation, and accepting that individual motivation is a key force that is amplified by the micro-networks of diasporic communities, their perspective has now expanded to include the role of meso-structural agents. This additional focus on the legal advisers and human traffickers, the twin cogs in the 'migration industry', has helped shift the debate from the deadlocked opposition of structure versus agency. However, as a model of explanation, an underlying form of functionalism is still retained by their commitment to structural factors at

both ends of the spectrum, and the middle is left open as a vague space in which contradictory links and trajectories can spin and weave their own networks. This three-tiered model exposes rather than explains the paradoxes of global migration. For instance, if immigration levels are such a political problem in the North, then why do governments continue to formulate national policies that can only stimulate further migration?¹¹

Thomas Faist has also recognised the failure of the conventional macro- and micro-models to explain the dynamics of mobility and stability in the world. He rightly observes that not everyone who could gain an economic benefit from moving ever leaves home, and also ponders on the adjoining paradox, why so many of the world's migrants are drawn from such few places. The unevenness in the distribution of the volume in global migration is a genuine puzzle. Faist is not satisfied by minor conceptual adjustments, such as the incorporation of mechanistic terms like 'stress threshold' that can both address both the tension generated by sudden movement, and the need to allow for flexibility within the overall social equilibrium. Migration is, in his eyes, not just a relief mechanism but a powerful social force. To address these complexities he postulates a sophisticated version of meso-structural theory. In this stratum there is a network that links both broad structures and individual preferences, thereby facilitating the traffic between specific places. This relational approach "explains why *social capital* is mainly a *local asset*; but it can turn into a *transmission belt* when it *crystallizes in migrant networks*" (Faist 2000: 29; italics mine).

I am struck by the disjunctive combination of both materialist and territorial terms, as well as mechanistic and fluid metaphors, in Faist's explanation. It is not a mere semantic slippage but a reflection of the complexity of the terrain that migration must cover and the co-existence of diverse conceptual frameworks. The meso-level of analysis relies heavily on the old language of 'chain migration'. However, as Faist describes the formation of what he calls a 'transnational transmission belt', I suspect that there is a crunching and grafting of concepts as levers slip into nodes, and bases become networks. This mixing of metaphors is not necessarily a sign of confusion, but expressive of the complexity in the linkages and flows of global migration.

Social scientists have now conceded that there is no single model that can explain the complexity of global mobility. However, they are less willing to re-examine the mechanistic frameworks within which migration theories are embedded. The micro-, meso- and macro-models have all presupposed that migration patterns are driven by the laws of equilibrium. The explanations of exchange and movement may vary by giving particular stress to either individual choice or economic structures, yet they invariably rely on the transpersonal system of the 'self regulating' market. The invisible hand of the market always ensures that gains and losses balance out. Such myths defy history and confound

politics. No system works so neatly. Although migration theorists have tended to expose the machinations for exploiting and discriminating against migrants, they have also tended to validate the migration process on a cost/benefit balance sheet. These affirmative approaches have done little to consider the available spaces for mobility, or even complicities between national identity and differential human entitlements. From the Malthusian ideas on migration and overcrowding, to the logic of economic accountability, there is a persistent linkage to a discourse that never defines the moment of absolute acceptance, and always handles difference with the slippery glove that can cover both the stranger and the enemy.

Complex Systems

Complex systems theory could offer a third perspective on the turbulent mobilities that shape contemporary life. James Rosenau, the most astute observer of the turbulence in local and global scenes, argues that the contemporary patterns of social change resemble the dynamic flows in complex systems (Rosenau 1997: 55-78).

Rosenau does not seek to explain mobility as a consequence of individual choices, or even as the result of individual actions and structural forces. Change is more complex. It occurs in and through the interaction between a range of vectors that he has identified as the reflexive patterns in decision-making, the shifting forms of knowledge, the cascading effects of new technologies, and the dialectic of both an integrative and fragmenting tension between national and global structures. This interactive model of social complexity also offers a new perspective on mobility and migration.

According to complexity theory, difference is not a problem that is in need of resolution. This starting point signals a departure from the dualism between matter and motion, and the oppositional logic that dominated the mechanistic models of social transformation. Throughout modernity sociologists, even powerful critics of positivism like Sorokin – who also warned against the adoption of organic metaphors to explain the processes of social change – were deeply committed to mechanical frameworks that defined the strength and vitality of a social system in relation to its capacity to consume and convert difference according to its own inner principles of unity and coherence. Any evidence of unreconciled syncretism or residual hybridity was interpreted as a sign that the social system was fragmenting. Difference was the social sign of decline (Sorokin 1992: 242-250). Complexity theory gives us a new way of thinking about difference, as it re-opens the scientific conundrum on what makes matter move. It proposes that it is neither the presence of an external force, nor the unification of matter and motion, but rather the productive tension between them that elicits their distinctive identity and unpredictable trajectories. In this model difference does not threaten identity and mobility does not exhaust energy.

If we were to re-think social and cultural transformation through this interactive model, then it would open new possibilities of thinking about the constitutive relationship between difference and identity, as well as allow us to consider the idea that movement is a matter of belonging, and vice versa.

Complexity theory is not another scientific model that can be transposed to explain the totality of social relations. It is not a new meta-theory that will unite macro and micro approaches into a singular perspective. But it will focus on the paradoxical dynamic that both drives change and sustains continuity. As John Urry argues, complexity only offers a set of metaphors and concepts that are useful for social analysis (Urry 2003: 120). Rosenau is also cautious about his application of complexity theory. He argues that despite significant theoretical insights, there is still a sense that the vocabulary and techniques for representing social change are lagging behind the dynamism that has exploded from the major events of our time.

These theoretical gaps are also visible in the gaping holes and profound uncertainties that appear in public life. Confronting these problems is a matter of political urgency. It is necessary to not only challenge the appeal of a vociferous rhetoric that stigmatises strangers, but also grasp the significance of contemporary flows. Rosenau warns that complexity theory cannot predict the trajectory of change. However, he argues that it produces a more optimistic view towards mobility and difference, as it is tuned to find creative links between order and disorder (Rosenau 2003: 212).

Complexity refers to an operational modality that is neither totally ordered nor tumbling from one random encounter to the next. It suggests that there is a process of relational interaction that exists between and within the 'closed' space of structure and the 'open' spaces of chance. Flows occur and shapes emerge through a network of circulation and modification. The effect of these flows is a rhythmic process of clustering and dispersal. Within these formations and trajectories there is what Rosenau calls a 'complex adaptive system' (Rosenau 2003: 212). Complexity can be identified in the interaction between semi-autonomous agents as they break out of existing entities and link up in different formations. In this dynamic process of fragmentation and integration there is both an interruption of the old structures and a new system of feedback. In these new relations the looping feedback is partially open and modification becomes multi-directional. Both the individual entities are transformed and their surroundings are re-shaped by this process of dispersal and gathering. The potential for fragmentation and integration is sensitive to specific contexts and can be decisively influenced by small acts. Rosenau stresses that complexity theory is at its most useful when it directs attention to the manner in which clusters can be formed and a new momentum is generated out of the inter-related and collective responses.

This perspective remains open to the non-linear processes of change. It can also lead to a more radical understanding of the role of mobility in social organisation. Bruno Latour goes so far as to argue that society has no fixed structure and all social agents lack any fixed essence. Rather than seeing the social system as a bounded unit, he describes it as a process in which everything is connected and moving in an endless state of circulation (quoted in Urry 2003: 123). This perspective has radical implications for the way we understand global migration. It goes beyond the mechanistic and functionalist foundations of migration system theory, because it does not simply search for new causal factors, or add more links between macro-structures and micro-networks, but proposes the view that mobility creates its own momentum, pathways and boundaries. There are no pre-existing structures, only shapes that are made by the constant process of flow. Routes taken by migrants are not to be confused with the paths that are the trace lines of mobility. Within this relational system there are also pockets of consolidation and concentration. However, even in these domains, where power may exert greater levels of influence, there is still a looping network of feedback and destabilisation that does not necessarily lead to destruction, but inspires reflexive adjustments and modifications. If we were to re-imagine society as a complex system, then the status and function of mobility would be completely different.

Complexity and the Unending Journey of Migration

What do migrants find in movement? The answers are often baffling and unexpected. ‘In dreams,’ as the poet Antigone Kefala noted, ‘begins the journey’ (Kefala 1973: 5). Migrants mostly seek security but also share the modern ambition of progress. They take refuge in foreign countries to protect their children from persecution but also expose them to new cultural values and norms. By leaving home they create new connections with the rest of the world. In a fundamental sense they can never return to the place they have left. All attempts to recreate the original home will expose some new gaps and tensions. Even a brief glance at the interior of a migrant home reveals a disjunctive assemblage of cultural signs. In the BBC sit-com ‘The Kumars’, while inspecting the wardrobes in the bedroom of a new purpose built home for Indian immigrants in Britain, the daughter points out: “Look Mama, it is has in-built suitcases, to make us feel at home”. On the walls of my mother’s house there is a tapestry of a shepherdess tending her flock. She stitched it as a decoration for a pillow cover when she was a young woman living in a Greek village. This icon now competes for space, on what my brother and I call the ‘hall of fame’, with other large framed photographs of more recent cross-cultural weddings in a metropolis on the other side of the world. As different elements are juxtaposed together the contents on the walls of the home begin to resemble a collage. The walls of the home are both a container for holding and a screen for projecting the contradictory images of contemporary life.

Diasporic communities have been often described as enclosed ghettos where symbols and rituals are supposedly frozen in time. This spatially bounded perspective on minorities is a symptom of a larger blindspot. When different cultures combine in complex systems, the processes that dominate can vary from polarisation, whereby different entities retreat from each other; to active colonisation, which involves the consumption of differences; to a subtle hybridisation, where new identities emerge from the oscillation between differences. Complexity theory stresses that within any given cultural field each of these three processes can be at play, both simultaneously and successively. For instance, in an affirmative meditation on Argentine/Mexican anthropologist Nestor Garcia Canclini's conceptualisation of hybridisation, Chan Kwok Bun stressed the peculiar balance between surrender and poise in the act of mingling. "One culture 'slips into' another culture, half forgetting and remembering itself, and half changing the other. One is allowing oneself to be inhabited by the other, while still recognising oneself and the other as different" (Kwok Bun 2003: 139).

Obviously the potential for exchange is not so dialogical in the polarising and colonising processes. Here power either eats up or chases away differences. However, complexity theory is particularly adept at pointing towards both the subtle liquidities and fortified resistances in the hybridising process of identity formation. Complexity does not presume that there are no limits to hybridity. On the contrary, it recognises that each part, with its distinctive sources, will seek to impose its own boundaries. Or in John Urry's formulation, "It is the dialectics of mobility/mooring that produces social complexity" (Urry 2003: 126). To track the complex patterning in cultural hybridity, it is necessary to adopt a methodology that is open to multiple frames of reference.

Complexity is not confined to affirmative modes of cultural exchange but also in play at the most violent end of the spectrum of migration: the trafficking of humans. There is now a growing body of empirical evidence that demonstrates how the human traffickers are bypassing the traditional mechanisms of border control and overriding the latest forms of surveillance (Salt 2000). New flexible and transnational smuggling units have developed an organisational capacity to either morph with their environment, or segment into discrete entities. They have literally found ways to penetrate a system without detection, or at least, are capable of coordinating their activities without leaving a trail that would link all the elements together. Human traffickers draw on local knowledge for recruiting migrants, develop detailed knowledge of available pathways, acquire rapid response rates with transportation facilities and are extremely adaptive to shifting bureaucratic needs. If one aspect of their operation is threatened it can be dissolved. Discrete parts can also split so that the overall system eludes comprehensive scrutiny. The degree to which we can describe human trafficking as part of the machinations of 'organised crime' may say more about our

populist thirst for conspiracy theories, than they reflect the levels of control and coordination that are exerted by competing entities as they struggle for dominance in specific networks.

This complex structure challenges the conventional models for explaining flows, but also creates new levels of dependency that disrupt the moral frameworks for judging people who rely on traffickers. Social scientists, who have investigated the motivations and options for refugees, admit that there is a 'conceptual morass' when it comes to determining their legal status (Skeldon 2000: 8).¹² Do refugees invalidate their status if, in the course of searching for asylum, they employ human traffickers? At what point does the force of circumstance become sufficient for a person to be distinguished as either a political refugee or an economic migrant? In what sense is choice relevant if the circumstances are comparable to historical forms of slavery? When the former Australian Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, Phillip Ruddock, repeatedly stressed the economic outcomes of migration he was pandering to the tawdry image of the 'pushy' migrant. This personalising strategy has had the effect of blurring the more complex factors of political risks and cultural constraints, and the reliance on collective decisions in the migration process.¹³

Complex system theory can help break the reductive code of blame by demonstrating that cause and effect do not follow a linear path, but operate within a multi-dimensional field. The combination of different entities can produce oblique, delayed and unintentional reactions that in turn trigger further tangential responses. The emergent order bears a superficial resemblance to the flight pattern of objects thrust by the swirling forces of turbulence. Opposing forces collide, each entity slightly or significantly displacing the trajectory of the other. Every interaction with other forces is not necessarily proportionate but it is to some degree interconnected. In such a system, flow does not operate under the laws of magnetic attraction and mechanistic equilibrium. When elements are drawn together there are not necessarily compensatory counter reactions. Gains and losses are not determined on a zero sum basis. Rather, the system creates clusters out of interactions that share common trajectories, or it fragments as energies within a given entity clash and dissipate. The involvement of migrants in both cultural hybridity and human trafficking could be explained more effectively by reference to complexity theory. This is not to demonstrate their extraordinarily demonic and wily ways, but an index of the creativity and hidden order in what might otherwise appear as a random sequence of events.

Complexity theory gives little comfort to politicians who prefer simple solutions and assume that it is possible to maintain tight limits on governance. It questions the capacity to which any system can be controlled. To grasp the implications of global change we need more than 'tough talk' by our politicians, and civic pleas for 'softer' policies: there must also be a wider awareness of the turbulent patterns of mobility.

The politicisation of migration issues that spread across the ‘civilised world’ since the 1990s is symptomatic of a heightened sensitivity over the nation’s porous skin. Gaining control at the border became a ‘race to the bottom’ of the state’s authority. This battle was fought with renewed vigour, in spite of the fact that there is only one famous example of a wall securing the promises made by the state. Although the weaker side of the Berlin Wall faced the enemy, it was completely successful in protecting the GDR from the invasion of Western imperialism. The official records prove this. Every year the border officials dutifully noted the number of fascist invaders from the West as nil. The wall was working, from one side. However, in the corresponding column of exits to the West there was an ever-increasing number. Even with the multiplication in the number of walls, the deepening of trenches, the inducements granted to maintain the vigilance of the guards, and the constant strategic adaptations in surveillance methods, the ‘anti-fascist protection wall’ continued to work brilliantly from the outside, but it still leaked from the inside.

Invasion is no longer a numbers game. Threat is now experienced through the symbolic reverberation of terrorist acts of violence, and the politicisation of border control.¹⁴ The arrival of refugees has become an explosive global political issue since the 1990s, because these small transgressions exposed the deeper contradiction between sovereignty and security. The repetition of the phrase “We will decide who comes to this country, and the circumstances under which they come” by the Australian Prime Minister John Howard may have inspired a new level of fist thumping self-righteous violence against a tiny fraction of the world’s refugees, but in the long term, it will appear as another futile denial of the fact that, in a globalising world, the body politic “is no longer an enclosed nucleus of identity” (Grosz 1994: 103)¹⁵, and the social engine is a complex transnational ‘network’. The hysterical excesses of this anxiety over political sovereignty and social control found its apogee in the installation of thousands of government signs on remote rocks along Australia’s coastline. Each sign carried a map of Australia with a big eye in the centre and asked passersby to report suspicious activity.¹⁶ When I noticed one on the far north coast of Queensland I was at first confused, thinking to myself – is this another Big Brother advertisement? Slowly I realised that there is no escape: even the pensive fishermen should remain on ‘high alert’ while waiting for the bite of that elusive barramundi. Fishing with fear: this is the ultimate expression of a nation that feels circumscribed by migration and is thus denied its own destiny with identity.

NOTES

1. See Jacques Le Goff, "Head or Heart? The political use of body metaphors in the middle ages", and Catherine Gallagher, 'The Bio-Economics of Our Mutual Friend', both in Feher 1989.
2. Brendan Nicholson, "Push to ban 'glorification' of terrorism", *The Age*, 30 August 2005, p 1.
3. Among the many contributions to the debates on diaspora see Morley and Kuan-Hsing 1996. On flesh, see Butler 1990.
4. See Pope 1997: 38. A recent report on international trafficking estimated that between 800,000 to 900,000 people are forcibly moved across borders every year ("Global Trends" 2003: 34).
5. Douglas Massey and J. Edward Taylor argue that in the USA there is a historical correlation between growth in trade and immigration, and also a correlation between the recent restrictions on immigration and the decline of rates of trade between the USA and the rest of the world (see Massey and Taylor 2004: 377). In the most recent British calculation it has been estimated that migrants earn about 15% more than their native born counterparts, and while they contribute more to the government's revenue they are also less reliant on welfare and state support (Dhananjayan Sriskandarajak et al. 2005).
6. As a brief introduction to the range of popular, polemical and historical accounts of the way fear has been manipulated in contemporary politics, see Lapham 2005; Roy 2004; Mamdani 2004.
7. John Murphy outlines the ways in which Australian public sentiment and political rhetoric on the suitable levels of migration have been at odds with economic models that account for the stimulant provided by migration. The supposedly negative effect of migration was not that it took jobs away but that it overstimulated the economy in times of inflation (Murphy 2000: 159). For a historical survey of the impact of immigration on trade in the United States, see Massey and Taylor 2004: 377; for Europe, see Christian Dustmann and Albrecht Glitz, "Immigration, Jobs and Wages: Theory, Evidence and Opinion", quoted in S. Daneshku, "Migrants promote growth, wide study concludes", *Financial Times*, 13 May 2005, p 3.
8. The wearing of headscarves produced a hysterical response in the French state. See Terray 2004: 121. It has also surfaced as a sign of moral contestation in Australia. The supposed fear and intimidation generated by the wearing of headscarves was satirised by the Australian cartoonist Michael Leunig when he extended the populist 'concern' with the brandishing of other foreign signs, like a kebab; see *The Age*, 30 August 2005, p 14.

9. Philip Hudson, "MP urges tougher English test for migrants who want to be Australians", *The Sunday Age*, 18 September 2005, p 9.
10. For the classical defense of this position see Borjas 1989 and for a critique see Chiswick 2000.
11. On the contradiction between utilising militarised border surveillance, expanded deportation powers, restrictive quotas, punitive employment laws and diminished welfare rights as the means for gaining control over migration levels, see Bean and Spener 2004. For a more general analysis of the broader contradictions between the goal of a free market ideology and restricted human movement, see Martin 2004.
12. In relation to the absence of legitimate 'third' spaces for receiving and identifying refugees, see Warner 1999: 255.
13. Oded Stark has argued that, predominantly, the decision for migration is not made by individual actors on the basis of maximising economic gain, but rather embedded in collective network and aimed at minimising social and political risks. This perspective would require a more subtle appreciation of the links between political refugee and economic migrant; see Stark 1991.
14. See Tomas Hammar on the shift from the depoliticised strategies for both recruiting and then halting labour migration in Western Europe during the 1970s, to the intense politicisation of border control in relation to the asylum seeker in the 1990s (Hammar 2001: 15-38).
15. Elizabeth Grosz is speaking directly to the problematic identity of the body, and in place of a stable universal referent she proposes the idea of "flesh that is composed of the 'leaves' of the body interspersed with the 'leaves' of the world" (Grosz 1994: 103). This idea of the flesh is utilised by Hardt and Negri to characterise the 'multitude' of social-political affiliations that now exist in the interactions between the local and the global (Hardt and Negri 2004: 199 – 200).
16. On the website of the Australian Department for Immigration is another instance of the attempt to insert the practice of surveillance into the vernacular code for fighting bullies. The link for reporting suspicious behaviour is headed by the phrase that children use as a threat when they are unable to fight their own battles: 'dob in' (www.immi.gov.au/illegals/dob-in-line.htm).

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Benedict (1983) *Imagined Community*. London: Verso.
- Australian Department of Immigration website: www.immi.gov.au/illegals/dob-in-line.htm
- Bauman, Zygmunt (2001) *Community*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bean, Frank and David Spener (2004) "Controlling International Migration through Enforcement: The Case of the United States", in D. Massey and J. E. Taylor (eds), *International Migration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Borjas, George (1989) "Economic Theory and International Migration", *International Migration Review* 23(3).
- Butler, Judith (1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Castles, Stephen and Mark Miller (2003) *The Age of Migration*. New York: Palgrave.
- Cheah, Pheng (2003) *Spectral Nationalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Chiswick, Barry (2000) "Are Immigrants Favourably Self Selected? An Economic Analysis", in C. Brettell and J. Hollifield (eds), *Migration Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Faist, Thomas (2000) *The Volume and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Spaces*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Feher, Michael (ed) (1989) *Zone 5: Fragments for a History of the Human Body*, Part III. New York: Urzone.
- Foucault, Michel (2003) *Society Must Be Defended*, ed. by M. Bertani and A. Fontana, transl. by David Macey. London: Penguin Books.
- Gallagher, Catherine (1989) "The Bio-Economics of Our Mutual Friend", in M. Feher (ed), *Zone 5: Fragments for a History of the Human Body*, Part III. New York: Urzone.
- "Global Trends" (2003) *Migration News* 10(3).
- Go, S. (1998) "The Philippines: a look into the migration scenario in the nineties", in *Migration and Regional Economic Integration in Asia*, ed. by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. Paris: OECD.
- Grosz, Elizabeth (1994) *Volatile Bodies*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Hammar, Tomas (2001) "Politics of Immigration Control and Politicisation of International Migration", in M. Saddique (ed), *International Migration into the Twenty First Century*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Press.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri (2004) *Multitude*. London: Penguin Books.
- Hudson, Philip, 'MP urges tougher English test for migrants who want to be Australians', *The Sunday Age*, 18 September 2005.
- Kefala, Antigone (1973) *The Alien*. St. Lucia: Makar.

- Kleinschmidt, Harald (2003) *People on the Move*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Kleinschmidt, Harald (forthcoming) *Migration, Regional Integration and Human Security*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Kwok Bun, Chan (2003) "Imagining/Desiring Cosmopolitanism", *Global Change, Peace and Security* 15(2).
- Lapham, Lewis (2005) *Gag Rule: On Suppression of Dissent and the Stifling of Democracy*. New York: Penguin.
- Le Goff, Jacques (1989) "Head or Heart? The political use of body metaphors in the middle ages", in M. Feher (ed), *Zone 5: Fragments for a History of the Human Body*, Part III. New York: Urzone.
- Leunig, Michael, *The Age*, 30 August 2005.
- Levy, Jacob (2000) *The Multiculturalism of Fear*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Löfgren, Orvar (2002) "The Nationalization of Anxiety", in U. Hedetoft and M. Hjort (eds), *The Postnational Self*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mamdani, Mahmood (2004) *Good Muslims, Bad Muslims*. New York: Pantheon.
- Martin, Philip (2004) "Mexican Migration to the United States: The Effect of NAFTA", in D. Massey and J. E. Taylor (eds), *International Migration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Massey, Douglas and J. Edward Taylor (2004) *International Migration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Massey, Douglas S., Joaquin Arango, Graeme Hugo, Ali Kouaouci, Adela Pellegrino, and J. Edward Taylor (1998) *Worlds in Motion: Understanding International Migration at the End of the Millennium*. Oxford: Clarendon University Press.
- Meeropol, Rachel (ed) (2005) *America's Disappeared*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Morley, David and Kuan-Hsing Chen (eds) (1996) *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Murphy, John (2000) *Imagining the Fifties*. Sydney: UNSW Press.
- Papastergiadis, Nikos (2000) *The Turbulence of Migration*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Papastergiadis, Nikos (forthcoming) 'The Invasion Complex', *Human Geography* (special issue on 'Giorgio Agamben and the spatiality of the camp', ed. by R. Ek).
- Pope, Victor (1997) "Trafficking in Women", *US News and World Report*, 7 April.
- Rabinbach, Anson (1990) *The Human Motor*. New York: Basic Books.
- Rosenau, James (1997) *Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenau, James (2003) *Distant Proximities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Roy, Arundhati (2004) *Public Power in the Age of Empire*. New York: Seven Stories Press.

- Salt, John (ed) (2000) *Perspectives on Trafficking of Migrants*. Geneva: International Organisation for Migration.
- Schuetz, Alfred (1945) "The Homecomer", *American Journal of Sociology* 50.
- Seltzer, Mark (1992) *Bodies and Machines*. New York: Routledge.
- Skeldon, Ronald (2000) "Trafficking: A Perspective from Asia", in J. Salt (ed), *Perspectives on Trafficking of Migrants*. Geneva: International Organisation for Migration.
- Sorokin, Pitirim (1992) *The Crisis of Our Age*. Oxford: One World.
- Sriskandarajak, Dhananjayan, Lawrence Cooley and Howard Reed (2005) "Paying their way: the fiscal contribution of immigrants", <http://www.ippr.org> (viewed 17 October 2005).
- Stark, Oded (1991) *The Migration of Labor*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.
- Szerszynski, Bronislaw and John Urry (2002) "Cultures of Cosmopolitanism", *The Sociological Review* 50(4).
- Tamir, Yael (1993) *Liberal Nationalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Terray, Emmanuel (2004) "Headscarf Hysteria", *New Left Review* 26.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (2003) *The Decline of American Power*. New York: The New Press.
- Warner, Daniel (1999) "The refugee state and state protection", in F. Nicholson and P. Twomey (eds), *Refugee Rights and Realities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- United Nations International Migration Report 2002* (2002) New York: Population Division, U.N. Department of Economic and Social Affairs.
- Urry, John (2003) *Global Complexity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Zlotnik, Hania (1998) "International Migration 1965–96: An Overview", *Population and Development Review* 24.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Nikos Papastergiadis is currently Associate Professor and Reader of the Australian Centre, University of Melbourne. He has contributed to many academic and public panels on contemporary art and the impact of migration. His research and writing has focused on cultural theory and artistic practice in relation to place, migration and globalisation. His recent work has focused on the transformation of urban environment in post industrial cities.

Dr Nikos Papastergiadis was educated at the University of Melbourne and completed his dissertation under the supervision of Professor Anthony Giddens at the University of Cambridge. Formerly, he was Head of the Centre for Ideas at the Victorian College of the Arts, lecturer and Simon Fellow at the University of Manchester, Visiting lecturer at the Glasgow School of Art, advisor to the Moscow School of Social Science, and Honorary Research Fellow in the Department of Fine Arts & Cinema Studies, University of Melbourne. He lectured widely in the United Kingdom and Australia. He also acted as a keynote speaker and guest lecturer in France, Germany, Greece, Russia, Sweden, New Zealand, Taiwan, USA and Canada.

He is the author of over 100 essays in various edited books, academic journals and art magazines, some of which have been translated into Japanese, Korean, French, German, Spanish, Catalan, Finnish and Dutch.

Dr Papastergiadis was special guest editor of *Arena*, *Chronico*, *Third Text*, *Art and Design*, *Annotations*, and *Photofile*. He is editor of *Art & Cultural Difference* (Academy Books, 1995), *Mixed Belongings* (INIVA Publications, 1996), *What John Berger Saw* (2000), and *Complex Entanglements: Art, Globalization and Cultural Difference* (Rivers Oram Press, 2003), and co-editor of *Random Access* (Rivers Oram Press, 1995), *Ambient Fears* (Rivers Oram Press, 1996).

His single-author books include *Modernity as Exile* (Manchester University Press, 1993), *Dialogues in the Diaspora* (Rivers Oram Press, 1998), and *The Turbulence of Migration* (Polity Press, 2000).

Nikos Papastergiadis was Guest Professor in memory of Willy Brandt at IMER in spring semester 2005.

The Guest Professorship in memory of Willy Brandt is a gift to Malmö University financed by the City of Malmö, and sponsored by MKB Fastighets AB. It was established to strengthen and develop research in the field of international migration and ethnic relations, and to create close links to international research in this field.

Willy Brandt Series of Working Papers in International Migration and Ethnic Relations

- 1/01 Rainer Bauböck. 2001.
Public Culture in Societies of
Immigration.
- 2/01 Rainer Bauböck. 2001.
Multinational Federalism:
Territorial or Cultural Autonomy?
- 3/01 Thomas Faist. 2001.
Dual Citizenship as
Overlapping Membership.
- 4/01 John Rex. 2003.
The Basic Elements of a Systematic
Theory of Ethnic Relations.
- 1/02 Jock Collins. 2003.
Ethnic Entrepreneurship in
Australia.
- 2/02 Jock Collins. 2003.
Immigration and Immigrant
Settlement in Australia:
Political Responses, Discourses
and New Challenges.
- 3/02 Ellie Vasta. 2003.
Australia's Post-war
Immigration – Institutional
and Social Science Research.
- 4/02 Ellie Vasta. 2004.
Communities and Social Capital.
- 1/03 Grete Brochmann. 2004.
The Current Traps of European
Immigration Policies.
- 2/03 Grete Brochmann. 2004.
Welfare State, Integration and
Legitimacy of the Majority:
The Case of Norway.
- 3/03 Thomas Faist. 2004.
Multiple Citizenship in a
Globalising World: The
Politics of Dual Citizenship in
Comparative Perspective.
- 4/03 Thomas Faist. 2004.
The Migration-Security Nexus:
International Migration and
Security before and after 9/11.
- 1/04 Katherine Fennelly. 2004.
Listening to the Experts:
Provider Recommendations
on the Health Needs of
Immigrants and Refugees.
- 2/04 Don J. DeVoretz. 2004.
Immigrant Issues and Cities:
Lesson from Malmö and
Toronto.
- 3/04 Don J. DeVoretz & Sergiy
Pivnenko. 2004.
The Economics of Canadian
Citizenship.
- 4/04 Katherine Fennelly. 2005.
Correlates of Prejudice: Data
from Midwestern Communities
in the United States.
- 1/05 Marco Martiniello. 2005.
Political Participation,
Mobilisation and Representation
of Immigrants and Their Offspring
in Europe.
- 2/05 Nikos Papastergiadis. 2005.
The Invasion Complex:
Deep Historical Fears and
Wide Open Anxieties.
- 3/05 Nikos Papastergiadis. 2005.
Mobility and the Nation:
Skins, Machines and Complex
Systems.

The Willy Brandt Series of Working Papers in International Migration and Ethnic Relations is published by the School of International Migration and Ethnic Relations (IMER), established in 1997 as a multi- and transdisciplinary academic education and research field at Malmö University.

The Working Paper Series is a forum for research in, and debate about, issues of migration, ethnicity and related topics. It is associated with IMER's guest professorship in memory of Willy Brandt. Thus, the Series makes available original manuscripts by IMER's visiting Willy Brandt professors.

The guest professorship in memory of Willy Brandt is a gift to Malmö University financed by the City of Malmö, and sponsored by MKB Fastighets AB. The Willy Brandt professorship was established to strengthen and develop research in the field of international migration and ethnic relations, and to create close links to international research in this field.

The Willy Brandt Series of Working Papers in International Migration and Ethnic Relations is available in print and online.

MALMÖ UNIVERSITY

SE-205 06 Malmö

Sweden

tel: +46 40-665 70 00

www.mah.se