The diasporization of population in context of (in)security: the transnationalization of the security border:

Timothée Mottin

The study of diaspora has generally meant the study of transnational cultural practices and transnational politics, as if we can understand the complexity of the diasporic identity by only focalizing on its effects. In this presentation we try to reverse this perspective by firstly theorizing one of the specific contexts where population can and is appealed to in order to produce a diasporic identity. This context, namely the (in)security context, will be explored by using concepts from critical security studies that emphasise the impact of state security practice on the process of diasporization. In our view diaspora as a practice used by population whom are subject to an (in)security context can be seen as a specific strategy of governmentality. Indeed this category attributes particular desecuritizing functions to those identified as diasporic, thus involving them as actors in the transnationalization of the security border of the state in which they are living.

Key words
Diaspora, diasporization, Security imaginary, deterritorialization, (in)security, ban-opticon, transnationalization.

Our general aim is to problematize the "diasporization" of a population - the complex process by which a group identifies himself as a diaspora - in relation with the security policy of the state where the population is territorialized. As Lyons and Mandaville recently said "they are contexts where states, insurgents, and a range of other political interests see opportunities to use diasporas as a transnational strategy to advance their goals."[1] For us, one of these contexts is the one framed by the security practice of the state, what we call here: the context of (in)security. So this presentation, is dealing with a particular issue, not yet problematized in the field of diaspora studies: the signification of diasporic identity construction in a context of (in)security.

As Francesco Ragazzi said "an understanding of diasporization processes, requires a methodological displacement from the analysis of diaspora as an a priori category to the analysis of the social practices through which diasporas are constituted."[2] In this way the constitution of a diaspora has to be analyzed inside the specific spatial and historical context in which it appears. So as an ontological

statement "we begin with the recognition that diasporas are not free-floating, self-contained socio-political entities."[3] This requires problematizing the complex social power relations between the diaspora "homeland" and "hostlands" governments and localizing the particular space in which the diasporization takes place. Sınce diasporas are "made in localities" even if they act globally they think locally.[4]

In this way, we will employ some concepts derived from critical security studies. This presentation is structured as followed. Firstly, we will depict the broad context in which some of the new diasporization process occurs. By mixing the general frameworks of neoliberal governmentality and the security imaginary of states we want to show the complex relation between the categorization of population as an identification and also as a means of attributing a particular function to what is categorized.[5] Secondly, we will focus on the "diasporization process" of population in a context of (in)security. We will see that this identity (re)construction is a means to escape insecure policies and also a means for the state to securitize its internal and external borders. We call this phenomenon the transnationalization of the security practice of states.

Diaspora and the neoliberal governmentality

Drawings on the work of Foucault this research understands the "diasporization" process of population as a part of the new neoliberal governmentality strategies. Indeed, with globalization and the advent of a post-Westphalian world we can testify a "broader structural shifts in the ''art of government'' and in particular in the way the relations between authority, territory and populations are rationalized, organized, practiced and legitimized at the transnational and international levels."[6] Concretely, this change of governmentality primarily concerns populations, and actors of the civil society. In fact, "they are redefined from a passive object of governance to be acted upon and into an entity that is both an object and a subject of government."[7] In this way we see the construction of diasporic subjectivity as an expression of a change in governance through governing at a distance. But, while most of the authors of this field which is situated between diaspora studies and security studies focus on the impact of diaspora strategies of the state on "their" population abroad, we want to add another dimension by specifying the link between the (in)security context and the targeting of state security subject as a prelude to the diasporization process. This is in fact the management by the state of the population on its sovereign territory by controlling and containing their transnational subjectification and the conduct of conducts. Here we will focus on one of the most efficient state technologies of management: the "security mechanism".

The "imaginary security" of state and the deterritorialized subjectification of the (in)security subject

Every individual with a diasporic identity is territorialized on a state and he is by so a subject of its sovereign power or in our case of its security practices. In brief, every citizen or immigrant is primarily a subject of the governementality of the state in which he is living in. While the concept of governementality is too broad to understand the multiple impacts on population we will use an important concept drawn from critical security studies: "the security imaginary of states". Popularized by Jutta Weldes this concept is helpful to explore the framework of signification from which immigrant, people with exilic or diasporic subjectivities, (re)construct their identity. Clearly, the "security imaginary" is "operating as a field of social power and works to produce social relations of power through the production of distinctive social identities."[8] This is the state's representation of the world enacted by the speeches of state officials and spread to all society which clarify "who and what "we" are, who and what "our enemies "are", in what ways we are threatened by them, and how we might best deals with those threats.""[9] As a representation, the production of danger and the construction of an existential threat are today primarily based on ethno-religious criteria. Indeed, the threats always come from an "Other" which is seen as the basis of political practices that are radically different from the political practice of the Self. The representation of the "Other" in the security imaginary is generally an intersectional mix of national, cultural, religious and racialized differences. For example, in the post 9/11 era, state officials in the U.S and the U.K (re)constructed the terrorist attack as a warfare practice enabled and stemmed from a particular religious identity: the Muslim faith.

If this construction of the imaginary security is officially concerning others states or population abroad its impact does not have borders. Indeed it (re)produces in a critical way the ongoing process of "othering" minorities associated their alterity with the security threat it represents for the nation. This renders the danger ubiquitous as it not only comes from a defined territory but from globalized and transnationalized identities that are living "inside us", at "home". Of course a rich example of this situation can be drawn from the experiences of people of Arabian or Iranian descent or of Muslim faith in Western countries after 9/11, but throughout history the myth of the fifth column has been employed for a wide range of identities. For us this "othering" of a national minority population in a context of (in)security is one of the basis in the construction of the sense of belonging to an extraterritorial communities. If the security imaginary produces the illusion of a homogenized global community, individuals who are targeted by this speech might see themselves as having a natural link with this foreign land. For example after 9/11, some young Britain Muslims situated their experiences of marginalization within a broader geopolitical context and by so becoming interested in the political dynamics of their country and land of "origin".

If we want to understand this othering process in a theoretical manner we can say that by framing some individuals as imperfect citizens the security imaginary has in a sense deterritorialized their identity, because deterritorialization describes the displacement and dislocation of identities, persons and meanings".[10] In this way, to be "othered" as an insecurity subject fixes your territorialized identification in the "subtext of home."[11] But this process of othering is not just discursive it will also be materially (re)produced by governmental technologies designed to securitize the target population. This phenomenon is well documented by the academic research on the state of exception. Perhaps one of the useful concepts for understanding the particular space in which insecurity subjects are localized is that developed by Dider Bigo which he coined the "ban-opticon dispositif". For him, this dispositif is "characterized by three criteria: practices of exceptionalism, acts of profiling and containing foreigners, and a normative imperative of mobility."[12] The "ban-opticon" can be seen as the state security mechanism directly deriving from the security imaginary: it will reinforce and fix the deterritorialized identities of "othered" populations in the name of their potential future behavior. By controlling, policing and with biometrics profiling, the "ban-opticon dispositif" reified the identity border separating those who are excluded from the national community and by doing so has a major role in the interpellation of this population.

In a general claim this othering process and the particular insecurity space framed by the "ban-opticon" can be perceived as a deterritorialized subjectification. This does not mean that the imaginary security creates the familial, cultural, or political ties of the population with the extraterritorial land. It means that this subjectification displaced the sense of belonging and home of subject from the territory where they live to the territory, and the imaginary on it, with which they are associated.

From the deterritorialized subjectification to the diasporic identity:

As we have seen with neoliberal governementality the "ban-opticon dispositif" is not just a passive position, it has some prospective functions. Certainly there is not a unique political direction embodied in the fact of being a subject of insecurity practices. Individuals have at least three "choices": Some can attempt to live as marginalized exiles and try to make political profit by instrumentalizing the representation spread by the security imaginary. This is the case for example for the mediatized Salafist group "Islam4uk". Some can whitewash their differences and testify their loyalty to a white conformism. Here comes the figure of the native informers. And thirdly, some can respond to the deterritorialized interpellation by moving from a subject position to an acting one. As Gayatri Spivak argues, individuals can temporarily "essentialize" themselves in the imposed categories and then use it to highlight shared experiences and interests and construct on this basis a possible emancipation.

This third solution is for us one of the most important parts of the diasporization process. Indeed, by recognizing their deterritorialized identities, individuals can then try to move collectively beyond their marginalized minority status by using the political strategies available. Certainly, the "diaspora option" is one of the most positively and most fashioned transnational identities in our times and it is not a surprise if marginalized population use it. As Berns McGrow said " 'diaspora' signify today to perceive oneself as linked to multiple places and to hold a complex identity that balances one's understanding of those places and the way one fits into each of them."[13]

But to say that the construction of a diasporic identity is directly linked to the deterritorialized subjectification of individuals is not our claim. There is no question that the process is highly political and politicized in relation to the security imaginary of the state where it appears. In fact, while categories are fixed by the "ban-opticon dispositif" it necessitates political entrepreneurs who will manage and conduct the aspiration of those who are categorized. Here appears the figure of the "diasporic entrepreneurs" as a focal point of the diaspora governmentality. Because the question of who is authorized to speak in the name of a diaspora with an "insecure identity" is directly related to the security imaginary of the state. Their empowerment in the "host society" and their capacity to negotiate is in this way a sign of their integration in the institutional structures of the state. As Fiona Adamson said "political entrepreneurs have taken the concept of diaspora and changed it from a *descriptive* to *prospective* – a category taken up by political entrepreneurs to organize internationally dispersed communities of 'immigrants' or 'ethnic minorities' in ways that allow for identifications, coalition-building and political action that can take place across national borders on global, as well as a national and a local stage."[14] They have a particular role in unifying and homogenizing groups behind a clear identity which can be used later as a social and transnational force.

The transationalization of the security border of the state:

The management of population in diaspora invokes the possibility for neoliberal governmentality to conduct the conducts of a large social space involving actors in common dynamics located in the homeland, in different hostlands and within diasporic institutions.[15] The case of diasporization of population in an (in)security context is far more specific because the field of power in which they can act is principally the one framed by the "hostland" governmentality. In this way individuals must engage themselves in a complex process of desecuritization of their "othered" identities without weakening their loyalty to state national interest. By doing so they are constantly under the control and the suspicion of the state security mechanism. But while this desecuritization is monitored by the diasporic entrepreneurs, it is in fact all the individuals tied with this diasporic subjectivity who will starts a "journey across geographical and psychics borders."[16] To understand this journey and its impact on the security

border of the state where it appears we will focus on two political prescriptive goals compelled in the diasporization process in (in)security contexts : the desecuritization of their identity, the moving of security issues back into normal politics.[17]

One of the first political strategies of desecuritization for population "othered" by the security imaginary is to prove their loyalty to the national identity and interest of the state where they are living. This desecuritization is the telling of a story of the "Others" in a way that is not recounting a security drama.[18] This phase can be called the "imperative patriotism" one and starts from the holding of national flags and finishes by the territorialisation of their identity by using "ethnic hyphenated identity". Cultural events, film festivals, anti-defamation leagues and "ethnic interest lobbies" are organized to testify the territoriality of their identity and most importantly: of their interest. As a border effect, this desecuritization strategy is the moving and the narrowing of the internal border identity fixed by the "ban-opticon dispositif". Here a differentiation will be draw by the diasporic entrepreneur between cultural identities and political ones and this will reinforce the exclusion and the surveillance of those considered as extremist or radicals in the group.

The second desecuritization strategy directly concerns the breeding grounds of their "othering": the security imaginary. For the diasporic entrepreneur the goals are twofold. They have to change the representations by the state officials who are part of the construction of the imaginary security and as a corollary change "materially" the facts they used for this construction. In this way they have to engage theirs groups in transnational action and involve them in the politics of their "homeland" and in the foreign policy of their "hostland". In the case of the Iranian in the United States a lot of "diasporicinstution" as the National Iranian American Council (NIAC) or the Iranian Alliance Across Borders was launched following 9/11 with the aims of changing U.S foreign policy towards Iran and by doing so creating the possibility of change in Iran. In this way the representation of the "green movement" in Iran after the 2009 election was particularly useful for the desecuritization of the Iranian-American identity. This desecuritization is thus a moving of the external security border in the transnational space.

Conclusion:

In this paper we posit that the diasporization process should be seen as an effect of neoliberal governmentality. Furthermore we argue that in a context of (in)security the population seen as representing a threat are today interpellated for playing a proactive role in the security practices of the state. As we have shown, this phenomenon is permitted by the prospective functions attributed to diaspora as a practice and the way the deterritorialized subject uses this category to improve their integration in the place in which they live.

Viewing this process in a more generalised manner we then conclude that in fact these two entities, the state security practice and the diasporic practice, do not

really exist except through each other. The symbiotic relationship between these two terms, symbolized by the political activities of the diasporic entrepreneurs, enabled us to understand how diaspora are today a part of the reproductive functioning of neoliberal governmentality by transnationalizing the security border of the state.

Let us finish with a quote from Deleuze and Guattari that can contribute to the construction of a new understanding of the diaspora in the international system: "How could movement of deterritorialization and process of reterritorialization not be relative, always connected, caught up in one another ? The orchid deterritorializes by forming an image, a tracing of a wasp; but the wasp reterritorializes on that image. The wasp in nevertheless deterritorialized, becoming a piece in the orchid's reproductive apparatus. But it territorilizes the orchid by transporting is pollen. Wasp and orchid, as heterogeneous elements, form a rhizome."[19] (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987:11).

Notes

[1] Terrence Lyons and Peter Mandaville, 'Think Locally, Act Globally: Toward a Transnational Comparative Politics', *International Political Sociology* 4 (2010): 126.

[2] Francesco Ragazzi, 'When Governments Say « Diaspora »: Transnational practices of citizenship, nationalism and sovereignty in Croatia and former Yugoslavia', (PhD Diss., Institut d'Etude Politique de Paris, 2010).

[3] Latha Varadarajan, 'Back to the Future: Historical Materialism, Diaspora Politics, and the Limits of Novelty', *International Political Sociology* 6 (2012): 97.

[4] Lyons and Mandaville, 'Think Locally, Act Globally: Toward a Transnational Comparative Politics'.

[5] John R. Searle, *The construction of social reality* (London: Allen Lane 1995), 42.

[6] Francesco Ragazzi, 'Governing Diasporas', *International Political Sociology* 3 (2009): 383.

[7] Ole J. Sending and Iver B. Neumann, 'Governance to Governmentality: Analyzing NGOs, States, and Power', International Studies Quarterly 50 (2006): 652

[8] Himadeep Muppidi, 'Postcoloniality and the Production of International Insecurity : The Persistent Puzzle of U.S-Indian Relations', in *Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities, and the Production of Danger*, ed. Jutta Weldes et al. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 124.

[9] Jutta Weldes, Mark Laffey, Hugh Gusterson and Raymond Duvall, 'Introduction: Construction insecurity',in *Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities, and the Production of Danger*, ed. Jutta Weldes et al, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 15.

[10] Avtar Brah, *Cartographies of Diaspora : Contesting identities* (New York : Routledge 1996), 203

[11] Ibid., 191.

[12] Didier Bigo, 'Globalized (In)Security: The field and the Ban-Opticon', in *Terror, Insecurity and Liberty. Illeberal practices of liberal regimes after 9/11*, ed. Didier Bigo and Anastassia Tsoukala (Oxon and New York: Routledge, 2008), 6.

[13] Rima Berns-McGrow, ' Redefining « diaspora »: The Challenge of Connection and Inclusion', *International Journal* 63 (2008): 8.

[14] Fiona Adamson, 'Constructing the Diaspora : Diaspora Identity Politics and Transnational Social Movements', (Paper prepared for presentation at the 49th Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, San Francisco, CA, March 26-29,2008): 18.

[15] Ragazzi, 'When Governments Say « Diaspora » : Transnational practices of citizenship, nationalism and sovereignty in Croatia and former Yugoslavia'.

[16] Brah, *Cartographies of Diaspora : Contesting identities,* 204.

[17] Ole Wæver, `Securitization and Desecuritization', in *On Security*, ed. Ronnie D. Lipschutz (*N*ew York*:* Columbia University Press, 1995).

[18] Paul Roe, 'Securitization and Minority Rights: Conditions of Desecuritization', *Security Dialogue* 35 (2004): 286.

[19] Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987): 11.

Bibliography

Adamson, Fiona. 'Constructing the Diaspora : Diaspora Identity Politics and Transnational Social Movements'. Paper prepared for presentation at the 49th Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, San Francisco, CA, March 26-29, 2008.

Berns-McGrow, Rima. ' Redefining « diaspora »: The Challenge of Connection and Inclusion'. *International Journal* 63 (2008): 3-20.

Bigo, Didier. 'Globalized (In)Security: The field and the Ban-Opticon'. In *Terror, Insecurity and Liberty. Illeberal practices of liberal regimes after 9/11*, edited by Didier Bigo and Anastassia Tsoukala, 10-48. Oxon and New York: Routledge, 2008.

Brah, Avtar. *Cartographies of Diaspora : Contesting identities*. New York: Routledge, 1996.

Deleuze Gilles and Guattari Felix. *A Thousand Plateaus*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

Lyons, Terrence and Mandaville Peter. 'Think Locally, Act Globally: Toward a Transnational Comparative Politics'. *International Political Sociology* 4 (2010): 124-141.

Muppidi, Himadeep. 'Postcoloniality and the Production of International Insecurity : The Persistent Puzzle of U.S-Indian Relations'. In *Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities, and the Production of Danger*, edited by Jutta Weldes et al, 119-

146. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

Ragazzi, Francesco. 'Governing Diasporas'. *International Political Sociology* 3 (2009): 378-397.

Ragazzi, Francesco. 'When Governments Say « Diaspora » : Transnational practices of citizenship, nationalism and sovereignty in Croatia and former Yugoslavia'. PhD Diss., Institut d'Etude Politique de Paris, 2010.

Roe, Paul. 'Securitization and Minority Rights: Conditions of Desecuritization', *Security Dialogue* 35 (2004): 279-294.

Searle John R.. *The construction of social reality.* London: Allen Lane, 1995.

Sending Ole J. and Neumann Iver B.. 'Governance to Governmentality: Analyzing NGOs, States, and Power**'.** International Studies Quarterly 50 (2006): 651-672.

Varadarajan, Latha. 'Back to the Future : Historical Materialism, Diaspora Politics, and the Limits of Novelty'. *International Political Sociology* 6 (2012): 95-99.

Wæver, Ole. `Securitization and Desecuritization'. In *On Security*, edited by Ronnie *D.* Lipschutz, 46-86. New York*:* Columbia University Press*, 1995.*

Weldes, Jutta, Laffey, Mark, Gusterson; Hugh and Duvall, Raymond. 'Introduction: Construction insecurity'. In *Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities, and the Production of Danger*, edited by Jutta Weldes et al, 1-33. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.