Revisiting Borders and Boundaries: Gendered Politics and Experiences of Migrant Inclusion and Exclusion

3 – 4 November 2016
University of Neuchatel, Switzerland
This workshop addresses questions of inclusion and exclusion by bringing together two theoretical approaches, which are in general employed in different fields. One focuses on boundaries and boundary work. The other places borders and bordering practices at its center stage.

The idea of boundaries revolves around the creation, maintenance and contestation of institutionalized social differences. Conversely, the concept of borders captures the maintenance of territorial sovereignty and national inclusion and exclusion. We argue that boundaries produce both similarities and differences, which in turn affect the enforcement and management of borders. Additionally, we propose to apply a gender perspective to illuminate the links between borders and boundaries. As a marker of difference, gender is a key element of boundary work and politics of belonging. At the same time gender is fundamentally inscribed in the technologies of marking, enforcing and securing nation state borders by means of inclusive and exclusionary practices.

To integrate these different approaches the overarching question of the workshop asks:

How can we conceptualize dynamic processes of exclusion and inclusion through the prism of gendered boundary work and bordering practices?
Thursday, 3 November 2016
Workshop Venue: Avenue du 1er-Mars 26 (Main Building), Room D71

09:00 – 9:30
Welcome
Janine Dahinden and Christin Achermann, University of Neuchatel

09:30 – 10:30
Anna Amelina, Goethe Universität Frankfurt am Main
Regulation of Borders and Migration as a Regime of Intersection: European Perspectives
Discussant: Janine Dahinden

10:30 – 11:30
Anna Korteweg, University of Toronto
Regulating Territoriality and Embodiment through Boundary and Border Formations: Refugee Muslim Men and Gendered Violence in Germany and Canada
Discussant: Anna Amelina

11:30 – 12:00 Coffee Break

12:00 – 13:00
Carolin Fischer and Janine Dahinden, University of Neuchatel
[En]Countering Everyday Otherness: Gendered Responses to Boundaries among Second-Generation Migrants
Discussant: Anna Korteweg

13:00 – 14:30 Lunch

14:30 – 15:30
Oliver Bakewell, University of Oxford
Crossing the Luisabo: From a Gendered Boundary to an International Border between Zambia and Angola
Discussant: Sabine Strasser

15:30 – 16:30
Jana Häberlein, University of Neuchatel
Border Control and Gendered Performances
Discussant: Kathryn Cassidy

16:30 – 17:00 Coffee Break

17:00 – 18:00
Kathryn Cassidy, Northumbria University at Newcastle
“Where Can I Get Free?“: Everyday Bordering, Everyday Incarceration
Discussant: Jana Häberlein

18:00 – 18:15
Wrap-Up Day 1

Starting 18:15 Apéro and Dinner
Friday, 4 November 2016
Workshop Venue: Avenue du 1er-Mars 26 (Main Building), Room C56

09:00 – 10:00
Sabine Strasser, University of Bern
**Politeness of the Oppressed: Solidarity, Humanitarianism and Gender in Western Turkey (Aegean Area)**
Discussant: Heike Drotbohm

10:00 – 11:00
Heike Drotbohm, Johannes Gutenberg Universität Main
**Gendered Spaces of Differences: Institutionalized Protection and Struggles for Rights among Mobile Populations in Brazil**
Discussant: Oliver Bakewell

11:00 – 11:30 Coffee Break

11:30 – 12:30
Laura Rezzonico, University of Neuchatel
**Re)Producing Boundaries While Enforcing Borders: An Ethnography of Immigration Detention Facilities in Switzerland**
Discussant: Melanie Griffiths

12:30 – 14:00 Lunch

14:00 – 15:00
Melanie Griffiths, University of Bristol
**Negotiating Belonging, Masculinity, Love and Illegality: Processes of Exclusion and Claims for Inclusion by UK-Based Precarious Male Migrants with Citizen Families**
Discussant: Christin Achermann

15:00 – 16:00
Ioana Vrabiescu, National School of Political and Administrative Studies, Bucharest
**Care-Full Failure: How Social Aid for Poor Romanian Female Migrants in Spain Results in Further Marginalization and Displacement**
Discussant: Carolin Fischer

16:00 – 16:30 Coffee Break

16:30 – 17:30
Wrap-Up and Outlook

Starting 17:30 Apéro and Dinner
The aim of this presentation is to provide the original conceptualization of the interplay between boundaries and borders using the empirical research on migration to and within Europe. The presentation combines the gender-sensitive reading of the boundaries approach with a Foucauldian perspective to borders. First, the social differences (in respect to gender, ethnicity/race, class etc.) are approached as the sociocultural boundaries that (re)produce hierarchies on the basis of specific categorical distinctions. In other words, the talk applies an intersectional perspective from gender studies to the theories of boundaries and analyzes “gender” in the interplay with other “axes of difference”. Second, the presentation argues that the interplay between various types of “axes of difference” is to be best approached by the concept of a regime of intersection, which can be applied to various institutional settings. The regime of intersection is, therefore, understood as the nexus between (gendered, ethnicized/racialized, class-specific) knowledge and power that produces subjectification effects. Third, the talk highlights that the political regulation of borders and migration is the paradigmatic example for such a regime of intersection. On the one hand, border and migration regulations incorporate various classifications of mobile individuals including gendered, ethnicized, class-related (and other) categorizations. On the other hand, these classifications have explicit power effects (i.e. the Foucauldian reading), they open political-territorial borders for specific categories of mobile individuals and close them for others. In other words, the logics of border selectivity and the pathways of migrant inclusion and exclusion result from the interplay of the intersectional (i.e. gendered, ethnicized, class-specific) boundaries incorporated in the political regulation of borders and migration. These ideas will be illuminated using the example of current EU’s regulation of borders and migration.

Anna Amelina
Regulation of Borders and Migration as a Regime of Intersection: European Perspectives

Oliver Bakewell
Crossing the Luisabo: From a Gendered Boundary to an International Border between Zambia and Angola

This paper looks at how gendered boundary work interacts with changing bordering practices between Zambia and Angola. It draws on fieldwork conducted over a fifteen year period which follows how the changing relationship of villagers living on the Zambian side with nearby Angola over the period as the country as the country moved from war to peace. During the war, the border was largely unregulated and people's movement back and forth was governed by informal locally negotiated conventions. While these paid limited attention to notions of nationality, they embraced highly gendered boundary marking that differentiated the risks and opportunities of crossing the border stream (Luisabo) for women and men. With the end of the war, the control of the Angolan state now reaches right up to the borderline and the informal conventions have lost ground to the formal bordering practices of national government. The paper analyses how this change has affected the ways that men and women relate to the border and the impacts on their different mobility practices. To what extent have social boundaries between gender and nationality been reshaped by the new enforcement of the international border.
Over the last three decades, immigration legislation has shifted the policing of the UK's border away from the margins and into everyday life, as punitive measures seek to transform ordinary citizens into agents of the state, verifying the immigration status of others. Black, Asian, minority ethnic and refugee (BAMER) people in communities across the UK are disproportionately affected by this shift as they have come to embody supposed threats to the UK's geo-political and economic security. For BAMER women, such hostility intersects with existing gender-based discrimination (both in cultural and legal terms). For Gill et al (2014), political nation-states enact a form of spatial violence through their attempts to control the movement of people across their borders. This spatial violence is not separate from but connected to other forms of violence experienced by BAMER women, in what has been termed a complex of violence (Pain, 2015). Scholars have already begun to draw upon the emergent field of carceral geographies to explore elements of immigration policy, in particular migrant detention (Moran et al, 2013). In particular, political geographers have been interested in this state-sponsored ‘punitive turn’. In this paper, I seek to extend this analysis by asking critical questions about the spaces and agency of punishment and incarceration through exploring the experiences of Black, Asian, minority ethnic and refugee (BAMER) women in London and on Tyneside, who have been subject to firstly domestic abuse in the home and then secondly the ‘unfreedom’ of state control through vulnerable immigration status after they have left their violent partners.

In my work, I have approached boundaries as created not solely along ethnic lines but as intersectional constructs that delineate belonging through the symbolic or material activation of multiple differences, including but not limited to those associated with gender, sexuality, and religion. More recently, I have turned to work on borders, particularly the notion that given how technologies of surveillance have developed, we increasingly carry territorial borders on our bodies, though some bodies more than others. In this paper, I will address two moments in the Syrian refugee crises to bring the conceptual apparatus generated in scholarly work on boundaries and borders in conversation with each other: the events that took place in Cologne on New Year’s eve 2015, where refugee men were accused of sexually assaulting a large number of women and the decision by the Canadian government to place single Syrian men at the bottom of the admissible refugee list, after “complete” families, women, children, and LGBTQ refugees (except in cases of private sponsorship). Both cases suggest that refugee men embody a “wrong” masculinity, one that is shaped by violence and danger. In the Cologne case, women are the direct recipient of this violence and women come to symbolize a complex interaction between agency in their own calls for freedom from gendered violence and passivity as they are positioned as the embodiment of the national or European good soiled by those invading from the outside. In the Canadian case, the Liberal government made an election promise to open its territorial borders and increase the number of Syrian refugees let into Canada: where between 2013 and 2015, the Conservatives had let in just shy of 1,500 Syrian refugees, the Liberals would aim to let in 25,000 in the first few months of their reign. This was an explicit move to re-position Canada as a humanitarian, welcoming nation. However, the Paris attacks in November 2015 rekindled fears of Muslim terrorists and informed the newly installed Canadian government’s decision to close the border and (partially) exclude single men from the “open hearts and welcoming communities” that are the “Canadian way” (http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/refugees/welcome/). In my analysis of these two cases, I will show how in both Germany and Canada, fear of Muslim men activates symbolic and material boundaries that justify calls for increased control over men's bodies through territorial border enforcement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heike Drotbohm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gendered Spaces of Differences: Institutionalized Protection and Struggles for Rights among Mobile Populations in Brazil</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this talk I will reflect on the power of gender as an organizing category in institutionalized spaces of humanitarian protection and social activism. Drawing from fieldwork in São Paulo, Brazil, among migrants, refugees and other mobile populations I will trace the perception of social differences from multiple perspectives. As I intend to show, humanitarianism and political activism are organized along particular notions of gender, age, solidarity, vulnerability and deservingness, which prove to be highly inconsistent. While the contact and inclusion into these spaces of support can constitute a fundamental alleviation for some, it produces a reiteration and an aggravation of exclusion and confinement for others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caroline Fischer and Janine Dahinden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>[En]Countering Everyday Otherness: Gendered Responses to Boundaries among Second-Generation Migrants</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National immigration regimes are inextricably connected with the formation of modern nation states and (imagined) communities of citizens. Nation-state building involves boundary work as a result of which migrants have become paradigmatic ‘others’. Previous research has shown that gender plays an important role in migration governance and the making of migrant others. Gendered representations of migrants are mobilised by different actors to call for certain forms of immigration control and migrant integration. Boundaries between migrants and those perceived as native citizens often extend over generations and continue to affect persons and groups who are not migrants themselves. This study focuses on those categorised as others. Drawing on qualitative interview data among second-generation migrants in Zürich, it examines how people experience, interpret, appropriate and modify gendered boundaries in their everyday lives. Response strategies vary according to gender in addition to ethnic, religious and socio-economic backgrounds. The paper is a first step towards integrating different response strategies in a coherent theoretical framework, combining theories of structure and agency, boundary-work, constructions of the self and social positioning. It sets out to challenge widely-held beliefs about citizenship, belonging and participation in modern nation states.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Melanie Griffiths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negotiating Belonging, Masculinity, Love and Illegality: Processes of Exclusion and Claims for Inclusion by UK-Based Precarious Male Migrants with Citizen Families</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mixed nationality families have long existed at the contested boundaries of the nation state. In the UK, immigration authorities have historically sought to regulate such relationships through immigration and nationality policies that were explicitly sexist (and arguably racist). Although contemporary processes of exclusion are no longer as obviously discriminatory, we can still observe gender and other biases influencing those migrants and citizens affected. This paper considers the various means by which irregular male migrants in the UK have their family lives challenged and identities as husbands and fathers undermined as opportunistic, fictive or sacrificial. Drawing on qualitative research conducted as part of a three year ESRC-funded project based at the University of Bristol, the paper focuses on mixed-citizenship families consisting of precarious male migrants with British or EEA national partners or children. The men represent a wide range of nationalities and immigration experiences, but are nonetheless united in having an insecure immigration status and uncertain future in the UK, despite their close ties to citizen women and children. They also all occupy a contentious and politicised legal space in which the State’s attempts to define the boundaries of national belonging and protect ‘the public interest’ are said to require the men's forced exclusion. The paper considers how gender, along with ethnicity, class and other identity variables, are operationalised and/or silenced in the messy process of deporting male migrants intimately connected to citizens.
The management of borders is commonly described as having undergone a large-scale shift and “externalisation” since the emergence of the Schengen area. Border control posts have been abolished between EU member states and controls have discontinued some time ago. This externalisation only partly counts for Switzerland, however. The case of Switzerland differs significantly from that of other Schengen states in that it is not a member in the EU Customs Union checked every day at Swiss border posts – in order to collect duties and taxes, but equally to make sure that irregular migrants do not come to Switzerland or at least not without having been registered. The border and local bordering practices therefore are still quite active in the case of Switzerland. This paper draws on first empirical findings and discusses how the practices of migration control are carried out by the Swiss Border Guards, focussing specifically on their gendered dimension. It looks at the embodied state practices and implementation of border control and understands border control (and surveillance) as distinct gendered practices and performances. While border guarding is often perceived and described as masculinist practices (Prokkla/Ridanpää 2015) the question remains how masculinity and femininity are constructed within the Swiss Border Guard, and how this has shifted over time in the context of changing border control practices. Tackling these questions, this paper aims at shedding light on the relation between exclusion and inclusion practices in the context of migration control by the Swiss border guard on the one hand, and at reflecting upon gender as constituting bordering practices on the other hand.

In Spain, the national and local authorities have been boasting in recent years about their progressive programs for the integration of poor migrants from Romania, mostly from a Roma ethnic background. In contrast to the recurrent evictions of Roma, and their occasional forced deportation to Romania, as it occurs in France and Germany, the Spanish authorities claim to work towards the integration of Roma into local societies and to elevate their exclusion from state provisions. Many of the state efforts to work with Roma on their integration are specifically directed at women. Roma women, in their roles as mothers, wives, daughters and the center of the household, are identified and taken to be the subject of state interventions and social programs. This move to focus on women as the main subject in state policies aimed at integration holds a great promise, poten- tially, not only for advancing the integration of entire families but also for empowering women. Based on a qualitative research among poor Romanian families in Spain, mostly ethnic Roma but not exclusively, this paper argues that many of the Spanish programs for integration adversely result in the further discrimination and exclusion of poor families. This is often done by first identifying vulnerable women as the subject of the caring state; a move that ushers the gaze of the state into the households of poor migrant families. By identifying, inspecting and evaluating women as responsible subjects for compliance with state and civil-society aid programs, it is often concluded that women are indeed failing to live up to the normative standard of ‘good mothers’, ‘decent wives’, ‘diligent workers’, ‘role models for children’, etc. As a result, state sanctions are often inflicted on ‘failing’ women, and their families, in different forms, for example: cutting of social benefits, eviction from poor households with no alternative housing solution, taking children into custody and foster families, forced removal to Romania, etc. We thus argue that a ‘caring move’ by the left-hand of the state (and civil society) often goes hand-in-hand with a ‘repressive move’ by the right-hand of the state. It is, in fact, often the case that the ‘caring move’ mostly results in ‘evidencing’ the prevailing racist stereotypes about poor migrants, thus vindicating the more repressive state policies of exclusion and discrimination against poor migrants.
Immigration detention centres are important sites of border enforcement, where noncitizens who are not allowed to stay in a certain country are confined in order to be excluded from its national territory. At the same time, they are closed spaces where actors with different logics, ethics, and understandings of immigration control come into contact: detention officers, detainees, NGO representatives, immigration authorities, and so on. As such, immigration detention centres are also sites of constant boundary making based on nationality, ethnicity, gender, race, social class, and professional ethos. Immigration detention is also a gendered field of state practice, with women being detained much less than men, at least in Switzerland. The wider use of detention for men reflects and reinforces the image of male asylum seekers and irregular migrants as a threat, while women are often depicted as victims and vulnerable subjects. At the same time, this image of female migrants as in need of protection (re)produces an idea of women as passive subjects, while men are conceptualised as active agents, “but potentially criminal and threatening” (Griffiths 2014). In Switzerland, immigration detention mainly takes place in prisons, confining noncitizens for immigration-related goals and prisoners accused or convicted of a crime in the same institution. By blurring the distinction between migrants and criminals, this spatial practice has the obvious effect of criminalizing migrants even more than specific removal centres do. This process of criminalization and exclusion, related to a masculine image of irregular migrants, contributes to the social, artificial construction of the boundary between “true” refugees and the “bogus” asylum seekers/economic migrant. Based on an ongoing ethnographic research in Switzerland, this paper will address the processes of boundary making at work in immigration detention spaces and practices, and will particularly focus on the relation between prison staff and detainees, where the boundary between citizens and noncitizens is reified (Griffiths 2013; Mountz et al. 2013).

Since the “colonial crisis” (Hage 2016) has finally hit Europe in 2015 key EU representatives have portrayed Turkey as a relevant partner and safe third country. Yet, an ongoing war in the Southeast, suicide bombings in Istanbul, Ankara and other major cities, and constant human rights violations by the government fuel EU orientalism and reshape Turkey-EU relations. While EU institutions and the Turkish government negotiate the readmission agreement and visa liberation between Turkey and the EU, different NGO’s, solidarity groups and humanitarian organisations in the EU and in Turkey fiercely criticise this deal meant to rescue the EU and to “Sultanize” the Turkish government. Furthermore, humanitarian reasoning has been depicted recently as a widespread and well-intended contribution to global inequality in recent anthropological debates. In this paper I will show how humanitarian volunteering and political solidarity unveil the crises in Turkey and develop different responses during this “siege”. I will focus on gender in humanitarianism under siege from so different perspectives as solidarity groups, charities, and institutions (all called dernek in Turkey) to exemplify my argument and to reconsider one of the key elements of orientalism.