5 Alien powers

Deportable labour and the spectacle of security[1]

Nicholas De Genova

Antiterrorism policies and the consequent securitization of migration must be recognized as ongoing 'irregularizing' practices that intervene in struggles over the politics of human mobility. It is instructive from the outset to establish that the practices of antiterrorism – its physics, so to speak – have only been legitimated and made possible with recourse to an elaborate scaffolding of distinctly metaphysical premises, propositions, and inferences about 'terror' and its Manichean changeling, counter-terror. For some time following the events of 11 September 2001 these doppelgangers were purported to be engaged in nothing less than total war (De Genova 2007; see Bigo, this volume). As a material and practical effect of what may therefore be called the metaphysics of antiterrorism, spectacles of increasingly militarized border policing have proliferated globally. Amidst the expanding purview of securitization in virtually all aspects of travel and transit, deportation has recently achieved an unprecedented prominence (e.g., Bloch and Schuster, 2005; Fekete, 2005; Hing, 2006; Kanstroom, 2007; Nyers, 2003; Peutz, 2006; Walters, 2002). The practice of deportation has emerged as a definite and increasingly pervasive convention of routine statecraft. Indeed, deportation seems to have become a virtually global regime (De Genova and Peutz, 2010). Consequently, migration must be theorized as a central figure in any attempt to comprehend and critically analyze the new, effectively global formations of state power along with a supranational sovereignty that may be detected in the unprecedented securitization of the planet.

The stakes of this chapter are primarily theoretical. Elaborating the linkages between 'illegal' (or 'irregular') migration and deportability through the analytic lens of the capital–labour relation, deportability is posited in this essay as a form of labour subordination. The securitization of migration, 'irregularization,' and deportability – and thus also the ascendancy of the ostensibly 'antiterrorist' security state – are thus examined for their affinities with a wider (global) politics of labour subordination. This chapter briefly examines the explicit and emphatic figuration of transnational human mobility in general, and migration in particular, which are discernable in the metaphysics of antiterrorism and the practices of what may be considered to be an incipient Global Security State. This argument is developed principally with reference to the practices of what I have designated as the Homeland Security State in the United States (De Genova, 2007). The dilemmas

posed for the global superintendence of 'security' by migration and mobility are conceived of here as problems of both power and knowledge. In exploring these dilemmas, with special emphasis placed on by their pronouncedly epistemic character, this chapter revisits some of the key theoretical insights and innovations of Guy Debord's conception of the society of the spectacle. This allows us to resituate the larger problems of antiterrorism and security-state formation within a critical analytical framework informed by considerations of the fetishism of state power and the significance of spectacle in the mediation of contemporary social relations. In this light, this chapter returns to the question of 'security' and 'terror' as two inextricable and mutually constituted formations of spectacle. Revisiting my previous formulation of the relation between migrant 'illegality' and deportability with the spectacle of border enforcement (De Genova, 2002, 2005), the essay posits the substantive linkages between securitization, labour, and racialization. In light of the unprecedented mobilizations in 2006 of migrants against an 'antiterrorist' immigration law proposed in the United States, this chapter concludes with some reflections upon the autonomy and subjectivity of racially subordinate and legally vulnerable migrant labour in confronting the spectacle of security.

Deportability, labour, 'security', and subordination

If all 'immigration' is more or less subject to deportation, it is specifically undocumented, 'irregular,' or 'illegal' migration that is conventionally depicted as quintessentially deportable. In countries such as the United States, this has been true since the early twentieth century, and is hardly a new revelation (Balderrama and Rodríguez, 1995; Calavita, 1984, 1992; Chavez, 1992; Cockcroft, 1986; Galarza, 1964; Gamio, 1930; García, 1980; Reisler, 1976; Samora, 1971; cf. De Genova, 2005; Ngai, 2004). How, then, might we apprehend the historical specificity of antiterrorism as a particular modality for the 'irregularization' of migrant mobility? How, moreover, might we assess the dramatic intersection of the specifically antiterrorist politics of state sovereignty, security, and border control (Bigo, 2002, 2006; De Genova, 2007; Walters, 2004) with the autonomous politics of migration as, in effect, a global social movement (Mezzadra, 2004, 2006; Mezzadra, in Bojadžijev and Saint-Saëns 2006; Mezzadra and Neilson, 2003; cf. De Genova, 2009; Karakayali and Rigo, 2010; Nyers, 2003; Papadopoulos, Stephenson, and Tsianos 2008; Papastergiadis, 2000, 2005)?

In the protracted aftermath of the events of 11 September 2001, the so-called 'Global War on Terror' was posited in extravagantly metaphysical terms as a struggle of 'civilization' itself against outright 'evil', variously figured as 'barbarism' and 'savagery'. This discourse almost instantaneously became the standard cant of the Bush administration and remained pervasive during the ensuing years across the spectrum of mass-mediated public discourse in the United States. Antiterrorism, in this respect, enunciated itself in a peculiar but revealingly double-voiced fashion. On the one hand, it exalted US nationalism in the exceedingly parochial terms of 'homeland security' (Walters, 2004). On the other, it adopted an emphatically globalist outlook and articulated itself in a language

remarkably reminiscent of previous colonial 'civilizing missions', which plainly signaled the rejuvenated ambitions of empire. Thus, the putative war against terrorism has been pivotal for the increasingly coercive reorganization of what, prior to 2001, was ubiquitously called 'globalization', under a reanimated US military hegemony that has aspired, however fecklessly, to reconsolidate a veritably imperial sovereignty. The global project of US empire has also capitalized upon the 'emergency' of terrorism to institute an indefinite 'state of exception'. In so doing, it unleashes an onslaught of new 'security' measures, only then to render these extraordinary interventions routine, banal, and effectively permanent (Agamben, 2003/2005). The consolidation and entrenchment of the Homeland Security State has defined a new historical moment in the 'domestic' US sociopolitical order (De Genova, 2007, 2009). The institutionalization of these new formations of state power and the normalization of the antiterrorist 'state of emergency' under the Obama administration, furthermore, alert us to the fact that none of these developments can be discounted as merely temporary and anomalous exigencies or aberrations of the Bush White House (De Genova, n.d.1). These convulsions of US power have made immediate and persistent demands on the security apparatuses of states throughout the world. Much more than merely a parochial exercise in US nationalist insularity, therefore, this new round of state formation has sought to streamline the proliferating governmentalities of what may be productively considered to be an incipient Global Security State. This essay cannot fully elucidate the global tendencies of antiterrorist security state formation. Rather, the identification of such a supranational and quasi-imperial project is posited here more simply as a broad conceptual framework and working hypothesis through which to pose more specific theoretical questions about the global securitization of transnational migration.

All undocumented or 'irregular' migrations are constituted as historically specific products of the intersections of particular migratory movements with the distinct political and legislative histories of particular states, along with their consequent legal economies of meaning and differentiation. Thus, there is no such thing as undocumented or 'irregular' migration (or migrant 'illegality') 'in general', and these analytic categories plainly do not constitute a generic, singular, universal, and thereby transhistorical and essentialized object of study or target for policy intervention or enforcement. It is nonetheless a broadly generalizable characteristic of many, if not most, undocumented migrations that they are eminently labour migrations (cf. Andrijasevic, 2010; Burawoy, 1976; Castells, 1975; Calavita, 1992, 2005; Cockcroft, 1986; De Genova, 2005; Harris, 1995; Heyman, 1998; Karakayali and Rigo, 2010; Kearney 1986; Portes, 1978; Sassen, 1999). Moreover, all 'illegal' or 'irregular' migrations, however constituted historically, must at least potentially be ultimately apprehensible to be 'regularizable' (or normalizable or routinizable). This is the case, however, only insofar as they may finally be (re)composed – as labour.[2] Undocumented migrations are therefore best understood as distinct transnational manifestations of a global social relation of labour and capital, which is mediated by the regulatory authority and coercive force of territorially delimited 'national' states.

The sheer subjectivity of labour always and inescapably presents itself to capital as a political problem of labour subordination. The need for subordination is occasioned in the first instance precisely by human labour's distinctly subjective vitality: the technical requirement that the will of the worker be purposefully subordinated to the objective of her labour for the entire duration of the work. As human beings we realize our purposes in the materials of nature consciously. As Marx explains, our work requires that we 'subordinate [our] will' to such tasks: 'a purposeful will is required for the entire duration of the work. This means close attention' (1867/1976: 284; cf. Chakrabarty, 1989: 65–115; Foucault, 1977: 135–228). Thus, what first arises as a rather prosaic and merely technical feature of an ontological condition of human creative capacities becomes an especially acute, indeed a defining, political problem in the context of estranged labour and its superintendence. In this respect, the question of deportability (mediated through state regimes of migrant 'legality' and 'illegality') must theoretically be posited in relation to the broader political dynamics of labour subordination (which present themselves immediately in the workplace as features of merely 'economic' relations). Indeed, it is their distinctive legal vulnerability, their putative 'illegality' above all else, which facilitates the subordination of undocumented or 'irregular' migrants as a highly exploitable workforce. But this is true because any confrontation with the scrutiny of legal authorities tends to be always already tempered by the discipline imposed by their ultimate susceptibility for deportation, their deportability. What makes deportability so decisive for migrant 'illegality' and the policing of state borders, ultimately, is that some are deported in order that most may remain (undeported), within the space of the nation-state. Those deportable migrants who are spared deportation remain, precisely, as workers, whose particular migrant status may thereby be rendered 'irregular' or 'illegal,' and thus precarious, and may be sustained indefinitely (De Genova 2002, 2005: 8).

If indeed it is migration that emerges as a central figure in any attempt to comprehend and critically analyze the incipient Global Security State, the real problem to be theorized is deportable labour. Conversely, labour subordination must be recognized to be one of the decisive, indeed constitutive – if nonetheless suppressed – conditions of possibility for the metaphysics of antiterrorism. Labour subordination and the securitization of migration operate in concert in the mass production of migrant 'illegality'. Much as citizenship may be considered a technology for the 'international management of populations' (Hindess, 2000) and deportation may be seen to operate as an 'international police of aliens' (Walters, 2002), antiterrorist securitization must become apprehensible as a modality for the global 'irregularization' of migrant labour.

Mobility as enemy?

The discourse of antiterrorism stages transnational mobility as a permanent menace. The United States's *National Strategy for Combating Terrorism* (White House, February 2003), for example, purports to be concerned with 'identifying and defusing threats before they reach our borders' (2003: 2). Notably, this is

posited as a response to 'a new global environment', chiefly distinguished by 'dramatic improvements in the ease of transnational communication, commerce, and travel' and 'unprecedented mobility and migration' (2003: 7). The same document endorses the ideal of '*a seamless web* of defense across the spectrum of engagement to protect our citizens and interests both at home and abroad', asserting the consequent necessity of 'providing our operating forces . . . foreign and domestic – with *a single integrated operating matrix*' (2003: 25; emphasis added). Thus, the invocation of the conventional distinction between 'foreign' and 'domestic' serves here only to underscore their material, practical, and discursive elision. The securitization project of US sovereign power is therefore embroiled in a struggle over the politics of mobility on a global scale.

It is indeed the mobility of 'terrorists' and their apparent capacity to evade detection that presents a central problem for the ascendant security state. While the antiterrorist state deploys the spectacular figure of 'terrorism' to conjure the threat of unpredictable and horrific chaos (the ultimate crime against social order), its more prosaic calculations and routine interventions are nevertheless overwhelmingly preoccupied with the rather more mundane mobility of migrants (see Bigo, Rygiel and Walters, this volume). In this regard, the 'unauthorized' and hence 'irregular' (free) transnational movement of labour migrants serves as their genuine target. Indeed, the Homeland Security State in the United States (as well as its analogues, elsewhere) has come to figure 'immigration' in general as an utterly decisive material site where the ostensible War on Terror may be practically and physically realized (De Genova, 2007, 2009; cf. Fernandes, 2007).

In the so-called 'war against terrorism', as with other historical precedents, the Enemy is oddly figured as both despicably subhuman and yet frightfully superhuman.[3] The phantasmatic figure of 'the terrorist' presents the perverse spectacle of strangely atavistic (Muslim) 'fundamentalist' predilections, which tend to be summarily disqualified from 'civilization' and, in effect, from humanity itself. However, these dubious 'traditionalisms' attributed to the figure of the Muslim jihadist are coupled with what appear to be distinctly deterritorialized forms of state-of-the-art networked communications and command systems. Indeed, they are coupled with rhizomatic or viral capacities for a seemingly fractal kind of spatial dispersion and an effectively global reach. In this respect, the metaphysics of antiterrorism is therefore strikingly innovative. It has fashioned its putative Enemy – terrorist 'evildoers' (in the cloying phrase of the former US president) – in terms of nefarious but spectral and ever elusive networks. Revealingly, such 'transnational actors' cannot be identified with any nation-state per se, and they operate largely in the interstices of the interstate geopolitical system (Johnson 2000: 9). Thus, the terrorist Enemy's alleged obscurantism is coupled with a menacing obscurity. This economy of identification and concealment thus serves in fact to produce the figure of the terrorist 'suspect' through the activation of a more mundane production of 'the Muslim' as a racialized category (cf. Ahmad, 2002, 2004; Bayoumi, 2008; Cainkar, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005; Chon and Arzt, 2005; Cole, 2003: 47–56; Daulatzai, 2007; De Genova, 2007; Maira, 2004, 2009; Puar, 2007; Puar and Rai, 2002; Saito, 2001; Volpp, 2002; cf. Human Rights

Watch, 2002), albeit one which is remarkably elastic and indeterminate (Amoore, 2007).

Indeed, the most fundamental work accomplished through the War on Terror's global racialization of 'Muslim' identity is the production of a racial condensation that is inimical to the white, Christian, 'European' identity of 'the West', while at the same time such a condensation is precisely ambiguous and inherently heterogeneous. The racial ambiguity and instability of the figure of the Muslim is productive, then, because it renders a vast cross-section of the planet's migrants (Muslim and non-Muslim alike) to be subject always to suspicion, commanding surveillance and further investigation in the incessant police work of uncovering 'the terrorists' (De Genova, n.d.1). The terrorist Enemy purportedly pursues its objectives only through opaque (if not unfathomable) conspiracies, which crucially depend upon hypermobile 'secret agents' and dormant 'sleeper cells'. These ostensible human time bombs are always merely waiting to be activated for their (presumably suicidal) missions of mass destruction (cf. Amoore, 2006; Baudrillard, 2001/2002; Nyers, 2006; Packer 2006). Questions of mobilization and immobilization and speed and deceleration become paramount as the global regime of capital accumulation is ostensibly shadowed by an enemy as flexible, opportunistic, and mobile as itself. And the regime of suspicion and unrelenting vigilance becomes fixated upon the unfathomable task of monitoring, documenting, and regulating an enigmatic global swirl of ambiguous identities, unstable identifications, unpredictable mobilities, and secret conspiracies. In a global milieu of unprecedented transnational mobility and mass migration, the putative challenges confronting the exercise of the 'state monopoly of the legitimate means of movement' (Torpey 2000) become epic in proportion and metaphysical in scope. For our critical purposes, moreover, they become truly inextricable from deeply epistemic conundrums.

Commodities, fetishism, and spectacle

Uncertainty, ambiguity, equivocation, dissimulation, intransigent secrecy, inconceivable enemies, falsehoods without reply, truths that cannot be verified, hypotheses that can never be demonstrated – these have truly become the hallmarks of our (global) political present. An audacious confrontation with this same constellation of epistemic enigmas distinguishes the rather unique imaginative force of the social critique of Guy Debord (1967, 1988). The legal and sociopolitical production of migrant 'illegality' and the 'irregularization' of human mobility – in the aftermath of antiterrorism so completely enshrouded by the conjoined spectacles of terror and security – commands a renewed consideration of the enduring explanatory power of Debord's austere theoretical formulation of *spectacle*.[4]

Significantly elaborating upon and extending Marx's imminent critique of the fetishism of the commodity under capitalism (1867/1976: 163–177), Debord identified the overwhelming and unprecedented hegemony of image and appearance as mediating all social relations. Indeed, he contends that 'the whole of life . . . presents itself as an immense accumulation of *spectacles*', ensuring that 'all that

once was directly lived has become mere representation' (1967/1995: 12; emphasis in original). For Debord, this ascendancy of spectacle tends to reduce all social life from its already estranged and atomized condition to the sheer passivity of utter spectatorship: 'a generalized autism' (1967/1995: 153).

Marx's critique of the commodity posited that, within the social relations of capitalism, labour confronts its own product – the objectification of its own vital energies, creative capacities, and productive powers – as 'an alien power' (1844/1965: 115). The value-relation among the products of labour transfigures every commodity into 'a social hieroglyphic' (1867/1976: 167), presenting the actual social relations among human beings as if they were social relations between things that are 'endowed with a life of their own.' As Marx states emphatically:

> . . . this fetishism . . . arises from the peculiar social character of the labour that produces them,' whereby 'the specific social characteristics of [the producers'] private labours' manifest themselves and appear to the producers only through the relations among the products established through their exchange, and thus, among the producers as well, but 'only . . . through their mediation.
>
> (1867/1976: 165)

The fetishism that imbues things with phantasmatic life as mysterious alien powers thus entails the constant mediation of an everyday life of objectification, estrangement, exploitation, humiliation, boredom, and disaffection.

This peculiar inversion in which human affairs appear as 'material [thing-like] relations between persons and social relations between things' (1867/1976: 166) is 'only valid', Marx clarifies, 'for this particular form of production, the production of commodities' (1867/1976: 167). Once this systematic distortion of human social relations has become historically established, the ensuing 'cooperation of wage-labourers . . . their unification into one single productive body, the establishment of a connection between their individual functions' and hence, 'the interconnection of their various labours' appears to them 'in the realm of ideas, as a plan drawn up by the capitalist ' (1867/1976: 449–450). The enhanced productive power of their own collaboration, therefore, 'confronts them . . . in practice, as his authority, as the powerful will of a being outside them, who subjects their activity to his purpose' (1867/1976: 449–450). In Marx's account, the social relations among human beings engaged in productive activity thus appear to be merely the consequence of the effective subordination of that activity, again, by an alien power (labour subordination). Their own activity is likewise 'an alien, coerced activity' (1844/1965:115) and 'the medium through which estrangement takes place is itself *practical*' (1867/1976: 116; emphasis in original). Furthermore, insofar as workers are contracted for their labour as individuals and 'enter into relations with the capitalist, but not with each other', they enter the labour process and are thereby 'incorporated into capital' and 'merely form a particular mode of existence of capital' (1867/1976: 451). In short, they become labour for capital (1867/1976: 991): 'The socially productive power of labour . . . appears as a

power which capital possesses by its nature' (1867/1976: 451). Thus, the workers' own power, the power of labour itself, appears only as an alien power; their subjectivity presents itself, likewise, as the conscious plan and machinations of an alien subject. In this manner, furthermore, the alien power of the commodity – the objective product of estranged labour, now objectified as something external and separate from the workers' own productive activity and creative power – comes to be refigured as the power of capital.

In his reformulation of the fetishism of commodities, Debord elaborates:

> The self-movement of the spectacle consists in this: it arrogates to itself everything that in human activity exists in a fluid state so as to possess it in a congealed form – as things that, being the *negative* expression of living value, have become exclusively abstract value.
>
> (1967/1995: 26)

'The spectacle is not a collection of images,' Debord clarifies, 'rather, it is a social relationship between people that is mediated by images'. It is a 'a concrete inversion of life' (1967/1995: 12), 'a weltanschauung that has been actualized, translated into the material realm – a world view transformed into an objective force' (1967/1995: 13). If, for Marx, the social relations between human beings engaged in productive labour are only manifest through their mediation in practice by the enigmatic social life of objects in the marketplace (through an endless succession of repetitive acts of exchange), for Debord the spectacle can be said to entail the multiplicity of those mediations. An endless succession of repetitive representations presents itself as a specious totality, a unified self-representation of the world of estrangement, prevailing over that world (1967/1995: 22). Thus, for Debord, the spectacle perfects the alienating isolation and separation of human energies and endeavors (1967/1995: 18) through a debilitating onslaught of images and abstractions to be passively contemplated (1967/1995: 22–23).

The spectacle is therefore 'a permanent opium war waged to make it impossible to distinguish between goods and commodities', or between genuine satisfaction and a regime of unrelenting consumption that is invariably disappointing and which merely enshrines deprivation (1967/1995: 30). It nonetheless 'exposes and manifests . . . the impoverishment, enslavement, and negation of real life' (1967/1995: 151). For Marx, 'with the *increasing value* of the world of things proceeds in direct proportion the *devaluation* of the world of men' and 'the worker becomes an ever cheaper commodity the more commodities he creates' (1844/1965: 107). This ensures that the 'realization of labour appears as *loss of realization* for the workers; objectification as *loss of the object* and *bondage to it*' (1844/1965: 108; emphases in original). Similarly for Debord, the abundance celebrated by the spectacle as an affluent society of conspicuous and interminable consumption confronts its producers only as an *abundance of dispossession*' (1967/1995: 23; emphasis in original). If, for Marx, the commodity assumes the appearance of an alien power to those who have produced it, then for Debord 'all time, all space, becomes *foreign* to them' in a thoroughly commodified universe

(1967/1995: 23; emphasis in original). Indeed, Debord claims that 'the spectacle corresponds to the historical moment at which the commodity completes its colonization of social life' (1967/1995: 29).

The spectacle and state power

In *The Society of the Spectacle* (1967) Debord insistently clarified that the spectacle was more than a mere apparatus comprised of the 'mass media' as means of communication, contending that these were 'only its most stultifying superficial manifestation'. Nonetheless, Debord (like Marx) argues that 'the social requirements of the age . . . can be met only through their mediation' and that 'the administration of society . . . now depends on the intervention of such 'instant' communication' (1967/1995: 19). In this respect, we may infer from Debord that state power itself has come to rely, both intensively and extensively, on the propagation of mass-mediated public discourse. This is fundamentally because all such instantaneously circulated mass mediation is 'essentially *one-way*' (1967/1995: 19; emphasis in original). Yet, if it is 'a visible negation of life' (1967/1995: 14) – indeed, a negation that 'manifests itself as an enormous positivity' (1967/1995: 15) which '*has invented a visual form for itself*' – then the spectacle is effectively the culmination of a capitalist social formation predicated upon estrangement and separation, and remains 'a product of real activity' (1967/1995: 14; emphasis in original). Thus, 'at the root of the spectacle lies that oldest of all social divisions of labour, the specialization of *power*' (1967/1995: 18; emphasis in original) and 'the social cleavage that the spectacle expresses is inseparable from the modern State, which . . . is the general form of all social division' (1967/1995: 20).

In his *Comments on the Society of the Spectacle* (1988), Debord retrospectively provides a concise summation of the society of the spectacle as he had originally depicted it in 1967. He describes it as follows: 'the autocratic reign of the market economy, which had acceded to an irresponsible sovereignty, and the totality of new techniques of government that accompanied this reign' (Thesis II; 1988/2005). In this subsequent reformulation, Debord further elaborates 'five principal features: incessant technological renewal; fusion of State and economy; generalized secrecy; forgeries without reply; a perpetual present' (Thesis V; 1988/2005). In order to adequately theorize the society of the spectacle, therefore, we are invited to comprehend its rampant fetishism as, in effect, a fusion of the fetishism of the commodity with the fetishism of the state.

The very existence of '*the*' (modern) 'State' (and likewise, of each and every particular state) derives from the effective hegemony and apparent universalization of relations of production that assume the general form of a voluntary contract between two ostensibly free, equal, and rightful owners of distinct commodities. As in the elementary act of commodity exchange, the two parties to this wage-labour contract are ostensibly engaged in a simple act of exchange, whereby one (i.e., the owner of the means of production) purchases the peculiar commodity being sold by the other (who owns nothing but her capacity to work, her labour-power) (Marx, 1867/1976: 270–280). In this defining feature of capitalist social

relations all coercion appears to be absent: 'the juridical relation, whose form is the contract' (Marx 1867/1976: 178) is itself a 'legal fiction' (Marx, 1867/1976: 719), while overtly political relations of domination and subordination in the labour process itself are ordinarily secured as 'the silent compulsion of economic relations', with 'direct extra-economic force' reserved only for 'exceptional cases' (Marx, 1867/1976: 899). The organized means of violence must thus be kept separate, systematically held in reserve as an apparently impersonal recourse for the maintenance of the Rule of Law. A specialized state power arises as an effect of precisely this separation and abstraction of 'the political' from 'the economic', ultimately allowing for an effectively global market to be fractured systemically into a political order of territorially delimited 'national' states (Holloway, 1994; following Pashukanis, 1929). In this regard, the state is an instrumental feature of capital. In usurping for itself the elemental and generative (productive) power of living labour, furthermore, the state manifests precisely the most concentrated and condensed expression of the 'political' dimension of the capital–labour relation itself. Whereas the sheer vitality of human life manifests itself diminutively as an infinite plenitude of particular instances of labour-power in the marketplace, it acquires a rarefied yet spurious unity – as 'power,' seemingly pure and simple – only when it is gathered and reified in the state (De Genova, 2010).

Like the commodity itself (in its mundane and ubiquitous heterogeneity), the state (in its sovereign and homogeneous singularity) assumes the form of an alien power. 'What on the side of the worker appeared in the form of unrest,' Marx demonstrates with regard to the commodity, 'now appears, on the side of the product, in the form of being, as a fixed, immobile characteristic' (1867/1976: 287). Likewise, state power institutes itself as 'an imaginary sovereignty . . . infused with an unreal universality' (1843/1978: 34), and may appear as 'power' in general (or in any case, as the final and decisive power) only by gathering together and objectifying the innumerable and diverse potentialities of living labour's restless subjectivity (cf. Bonefeld, 1995; Holloway, 1995). If the multiplicity of specific forms of concrete labour only achieve a semblance of universality as 'abstract labour' through their generalized commodification and the materialization of their value-form as money (Marx 1867/1976: 125–163), then the state acquires its own illusory universality only as a similarly alienated and fetishized reification of precisely the real universality of the abstraction of human labour. This rigidification of the state form occurs, that is, only once this diversity of labouring activities assumes the singular form of human labour in the abstract and comes to be subsumed within the effectively global regime of capital accumulation.

The brazenness of the spectacle relies upon unrelenting mass mediation, publicity, and exuberant display to manifest itself as a specious unity: 'an enormous positivity, out of reach and beyond dispute' (Debord, 1967/1995: 15). Yet, as in Marx's classic account of the thinglike reification of relations between people, the spectacle remains inevitably accompanied by the invisibility of the real social relations of (alienated, exploited, and subjugated) life – hidden in plain sight, as it were. Thus, Debord's later reflections concentrate rather more pointedly on the 'generalized secrecy' that 'stands behind the spectacle, as the decisive

complement of all it displays and, in the last analysis, as its most important operation' (Thesis V; 1988/ 2005). These considerations would seem to be more appropriate at present than ever before. Barraged with an incessant flurry of images and discourses affirming the insidious menace of an inscrutable and ultrasecretive Enemy, we have been bludgeoned all the while into helpless spectatorship. We seem to be plagued with epistemic enigmas and crippling riddles about an elusive and devious global network of skilled technicians of terror. Against these spectacular ne'er-do-wells, we can only reaffirm our attachment and allegiance as citizen-subjects within the state's vigilant purview and uphold anew our faith in its promise of protection. In the face of a kind of hypermediatized spectacle of 'terror', we have thus been subjected to an utterly unprecedented and comparably spectacular onslaught of new formations of 'security'.

Spectacle of terror, spectacle of security

The spectacle of terror is inseparable from a spectacle of security. With regard to 'terrorism', Debord declares with stunning prescience:

> This perfect democracy fabricates its own inconceivable enemy, terrorism. It wants, actually, *to be judged by its enemies rather than by its results.* The history of terrorism is written by the State and it is thus instructive. The spectating populations must certainly never know everything about terrorism, but they must always know enough to convince them that, compared with terrorism, everything else seems rather acceptable, in any case more rational and democratic.
>
> (Thesis IX; 1988/2005 transl.; emphasis in original)[5]

The spectacle is 'the self-portrait of power' (1967/1995: 19), quintessentially characterized by an incessant monological tyranny and garrulous redundancy, 'a sort of eternity of non-importance that speaks loudly' (Thesis VI; 1988/2005; cf. 1967 [1995: 17, 19]). Nevertheless, such a spectacular self-portrait dissimulates state power. Against the threat of terrorism in particular, the security state can never seem to accumulate enough power: It seeks relentlessly to extend the reach of its surveillance and to enhance the efficiency, efficacy, and scope of its operations (see Nyers, this volume). The spectacle of security, conjured by all the ideological apparatuses and governmental techniques of the antiterrorist security state, produces, above all else, the state's most precious and necessary political resource. It advances what may likewise be its most politically valuable end – namely, heightened insecurity (cf. Bigo 2002, 2006; De Genova 2007; Huysmans 2006).

The antiterrorism regime needs to generate and intensify the fetish of a 'terrorist' menace as a 'fact' of the contemporary sociopolitical moment. Migrants – especially 'irregular' migrants – were immediately fashioned in the aftermath of the events of 11 September 2001 by the ascendant Homeland Security State as prime candidates for the role of 'suspects'. Thus, immigration law enforcement has been deployed selectively, 'preventively', indeed 'preemptively' in the

production of pretexts for surveillance and detention. Minor violations of what are often mere procedural technicalities of immigration law serve as pretexts for the indefinite detention of 'suspects' who remain 'under investigation' (Cole, 2003; Human Rights Watch, 2002; Lawyers' Committee for Human Rights, 2003; Volpp, 2002; cf. Fernandes, 2007). Selectively targeted indefinite and protracted detentions against an identifiable 'foreign' minority uphold and sustain racialized suspicion. Comprised almost entirely of Arab and other Muslim noncitizens initially, this confirms the minority's more general susceptibility for detention – their detainability. The detention dragnet thus collectively renders the detained 'suspects' to be de facto 'enemy aliens'. Whereas border enforcement conventionally provides a highly visible spectacle of what appears to be an 'illegal alien' 'invasion', the antiterrorist security state's tedious, unrelenting, and above all secretive enforcement of inconspicuous technicalities produces the rather more mysterious, indeed terrifying, spectacle of an invisible infiltration of 'sleepers'. This serves to justify increasingly invisible government. Subsequently, and increasingly, the spectre of terrorism within the space of the nation-state has likewise come to be identified with citizens – particularly native-born racial 'minorities' and especially 'second-generation' ('home-grown') sons of Muslim migrants or other nonwhite converts to Islam. With respect to both de facto 'enemy aliens' and their allegedly 'unassimilated' (and, by implication, inassimilable) enemy-citizen progeny, the antiterrorist security state fundamentally operates as an apparatus that produces the specter of 'guilt'. This dark cloud hovers presumptively over the mere detainability of these 'suspects'. Whereas detainability is contingent upon nothing more than susceptibility to suspicion, actual detention appears to confirm susceptibility to culpability. The enforcement spectacle generated by these selective detentions involves a staging of presumptive 'guilt' that, in effect, produces culprits. The distinctly secretive spectacle of these protracted detentions then sustains and enhances what I have called the 'terrorism' effect. Antiterrorism's requisite phantom menace of elusive 'evildoers' ultimately commands a material enemy. Detainability thus appears to substantiate the allegation of a palpable and imminent threat of terrorism in the 'homeland' (De Genova, 2007).

The securitization of everyday life that has ensued from the inauguration of the War on Terror may itself be spectacular state power's supreme achievement. For, the 'terrorist' menace is the state's pronouncedly evil changeling: its most perfect and ideal enemy, whose banal anonymity, unsettling mobility, and phantasmagorical ubiquity prefigure and summon forth the irradiation of the everyday by the security state as our saviour and redeemer. The ascendancy of the reanimated security state may even be an expression of the would-be superefficiency of the system of power. This appraisal would see state power precisely not as reeling from a symbolically mortal assault and careening toward an implosive collapse (Baudrillard, 2001/2002). Instead, it would detect the state to be engaged in a meticulous refortification of its foundations by seeking to assiduously secure and perpetuate what Debord's situationist cothinker Raoul Vaneigem calls 'the everyday eternity of life' (1991[1992/1994: 7]), with all its 'abundant and bitter consolations' (1991[1992/1994: 8]). After all, as Marx incisively notes: 'Security is the

supreme social concept of civil society; the concept of the police. . . . Security is . . . the *assurance* of its egotism' (1843/1978: 43; emphasis in original). The 'egotism' of the global capitalist sociopolitical order, of course, operates both as the unencumbered reign of private property and private aggrandizement, but also as the atomizing individuation that ubiquitously accompanies an alienated everyday life where privacy is haunted always by privation (cf. Lefebvre 1947/1991: 149, 1961/2002: 70–74). If the spectacle of security works to secure the regime of capital accumulation and the alienated everyday life that is everywhere its precondition as well as its systematic outcome, then ostensibly antiterrorist securitization may be critically situated in its proper relation to the more general securitization of labour, migration, and broader questions of mobility and the human freedom of movement.

The border spectacle and racial abjection

The persistent degradation, fanatical denunciation, and exquisitely refined rightlessness of deportable noncitizens (and of 'illegal' migrant labour in particular) supplies both the rationale for as well as the incessant and truly insatiable response to what I have elsewhere depicted as the Border Spectacle. By means of this spectacle of enforcement at the border, the spectre of migrant 'illegality' is rendered spectacularly visible. Through this same operation the law, which has in fact produced the 'illegality' of the migrants in question, is utterly naturalized and vanishes from view (De Genova 2002, 2005: 242–249). The spectacle of border enforcement thus conjures up the fetish of transgression. This image of violation transpires in an amorphous borderzone at the points of interception where migrant trajectories may be interrupted. Thus, migrant mobility is produced as an occasion for apprehension, literally and figuratively: it is an occasion for arrest and deportation, but also for fear and loathing. Thus, the Border Spectacle works its magic trick of displacing 'illegality' from its point of production (in the law) to the proverbial 'scene of the crime'. Yet, migrants' trajectories and human mobility generally prevail in spite of the accumulated pressures and violences of borderzones traversed en route (and this is so for the great majority of migrants). Hence, what is normal is the movement itself, the mobility of migrants, as well as the concomitant 'irregularization' of them. However, this requires the spectacle of law enforcement that transmutes every migration into a putative violation and transposes the borderzone as an ostensible crime scene. This borderzone finally encompasses the full extent of the space of the state as an unmitigated regulatory zone for migrants (see Inda, this volume).

In place of the social and political relation of migrant labour to the state, the spectacle of border enforcement yields up the thinglike fetish of migrant 'illegality' as a self-evident and *sui generis* fact that is generated by its own supposed act of violation. Indeed, if there were no border patrols or inspections, no border policing or passport controls whatsoever, there would still be migrant 'illegality'. We can only be made to believe in that 'illegality'. However, we can only be made to take it seriously once it appears as a thing-in-itself: reified, fetishized, as the

deliberate acts of a spectacular mass of sundry violators of the law. This systematically inverts our perception of what it truly is: a transnational social relation of labour and capital, an antagonistic relation of conflict in the process of being fixed as a relation of subordination. An ever increasingly militarized spectacle of apprehensions, detentions, and deportations lends migrant 'illegality' the commonsensical air of a 'natural' fact. This accompanies the banality of a continuous and routine importation of 'irregular' or undocumented migrant labour, while also augmenting and embellishing that mundane and diminutive human mobility with the mystique of an obnoxious and unpardonable transgression of the sacrosanct boundary of the state's space. Much in the manner that the antiterrorist spectacle of security dissimulates state power, the Border Spectacle is also a spectacle of the state's dutiful, diligent, more or less energetic, but ever beleaguered 'response' to the fetishized image of a 'crisis' of border 'invasion' or 'inundation'. Thus, the autonomy of migration and its politics of mobility precede and provoke the state's politics of control (see Mezzadra, this volume), while sustaining the spectacle of borderzones that may be depicted as deplorably 'out of control'. Indeed, even as it produces migrant 'illegality' as an obdurate and seemingly incorrigible 'problem', this spectacle demonstrates extravagantly that undocumented migrants in fact succeed to cross borders and insinuate themselves into the fabric of 'the nation' (see Rigo, this volume). Thus, the spectacle of border enforcement nonetheless appears to repeatedly verify that there is indeed a subordinate reserve army of deportable 'foreign' labour, always-already within the space of the nation-state, readily available for deployment as the inevitably overemployed working poor.

There is no way to adequately comprehend contemporary formations of transnational migration (and hence, also deportable labour) apart from their relation to an effectively global regime of capital accumulation. This is itself inseparable from the histories of nineteenth-century European and Euro-American colonialism and the twentieth-century eclipse of that colonial world order with the ascendancy of an ostensibly anticolonial US imperial formation. One of the key features which these apparently disparate configurations of protracted planetary inequalities of wealth and power share, nonetheless, is the persistence of a global sociopolitical order of white supremacy. Thus, every question of migration, migrant deportability, and migrant securitization more or less immediately presents the concomitant question of their racialization. The planetary project of an antiterrorist security state only exacerbates the already dire postcolonial vexations of race, national identity, and citizenship throughout 'the global North' and beyond. In this regard, it is crucial to consider Étienne Balibar's proposition that the management and policing of borders serves a '*world-configuring* function' (1993/2002: 79; emphasis in original; cf. Hindess 2000). Balibar describes this in terms of 'instruments of discrimination and triage', which globally differentiate individuals for capital in class terms as those who alternately circulate 'upwards' or 'downwards' while simultaneously establishing and maintaining 'a world *apartheid*'.[6] This, he argues, institutes a 'colour bar' that no longer now merely separates 'centre' from 'periphery', or North from South, but runs through *all* societies' (1993/2002: 82; emphases in original). Indeed, new dynamics of racialization and new formations

of racism emerge, including the antiterrorist politics of 'security' with its selective profiling, surveillance, and detentions. These dynamics are increasingly inextricable from the social production of migrants' 'differences', which, as often as not (or rather, more often than not) dissimulate their racisms and disarticulate 'race' and 'immigration' through a politics of nativism. This politics rests on the promotion of the priority of 'natives' on no other grounds than their being such (De Genova 2005: 56–94). In this manner, the promotion of the priorities of 'natives' may even masquerade as an avowedly 'anti-racist' politics of redress for 'native' (racial) 'minorities' – a nativism, so to speak, 'from the left' (De Genova 2005: 68–79; cf. Balibar 1991: 15).

In one important sense, 'foreign' (and, commonly, also racially subordinate) deportable labour presents a striking analogy to racially subjugated 'minority' citizens. In their analysis of the Watts rebellion of 1965, Debord and his Situationist comrades posited that impoverished African Americans served as 'a perfect spectacular prod', supplying the spectacle of a loathsome 'threat of . . . underprivilege [that] spurs on the rat race' (S.I. #10, December 1965 in Knabb, 1981: 157). In contrast to this sort of threat of permanent marginalization and the subordinate status enforced through protracted unemployment and underemployment, however, the spectacular prod of the figure of the 'illegal alien' is that of a predicament of unrelenting and unforgiving overemployment or superexploitation. What the two have in common, of course, is excessive misery. What they further have in common is the stigmata of racialized difference. This reassures the racial 'majority' (or the racially heterogeneous but still unequal polity of proper 'citizens') that their own misery is not so bad after all. Yet, it simultaneously unsettles the presumed certitude that such excesses of suffering could ever be reserved only for someone else, the 'others': a population condemned to an inferior social station – be it as an effect of their 'natural' (racial) inheritance, their 'alien' (juridical) status, or both.

Deportable (migrant) labour therefore conceals within it while simultaneously revealing and proclaiming the universal disposability of all labour. Labour under capitalism is the most commonplace and ubiquitous objectified, alienated, and fetishized form of life itself (in its active practical expression as open-ended creative capacity and productive power). In its extraordinary and exquisite (legally mandated) disposability, the 'irregular' and deportable labour of global capitalism's multifarious transnational migrant denizens thus signals the ultimate disposability of human life itself, on a planetary scale. The deportability of migrant denizens reinvokes the always already established fact of an at least potential relegation of the world's 'citizens' to their properly abject condition as 'bare life' (Agamben, 1995; cf. De Genova, 2010). This entails their abandonment to one or another status as de facto refugees, whether stateless (i.e., at the mercy of local formations of coercive violence as well as the global administrative regime of 'the world community') or stateful (i.e., fully exposed to and utterly unprotected from the recriminations of state power). If, for Debord, 'the spectacle corresponds to the historical moment at which the commodity completes its colonization of social life' (1967/1995: 29), the Border Spectacle's spectre of an invasive 'foreignness' enhances and intensifies the degree to which all labour and all of life is

rendered 'alien' and estranged. It is here, therefore, that the ostensibly 'rightful' and 'entitled' citizenry experiences its own condition of colonization. Moreover, the spectacle of terror has ensured that we are all now suspects, each of us (like 'the terrorists') a potential 'criminal going unnoticed' (Baudrillard 2001/2002b: 20). The spectacle of security which has ensued, pivoting so crucially around migrant 'illegality' and deportability, plainly signals a vastly more encompassing securitization of everyday life as a whole.

The ghost in the machine

The state and capital have worked assiduously to render deportable migrant labour a manageable and tractable object. These processes have undeniably undergone an extravagant acceleration and intensification under the sociopolitical conditions facilitated by the symbiotic spectacles of terror and security. Precisely against the ever more dismal horizon of rightlessness for noncitizens, however, an unprecedented upsurge of protest demonstrations took the United States by storm during the spring of 2006. This remarkable social movement – comprised overwhelmingly of working-class migrants of colour, especially the undocumented and their children – is inevitably apprehensible only in relation to the fierce struggle that has been perpetrated against migrants by the state in the elaboration of a peculiar 'War on Terror' that has, on a mass scale, made migrants its special targets. In the face of unprecedented securitization, the robust defiance and insubordination of migrant workers has audaciously verified and reasserted precisely the primacy of labour and of migrant working people as historical subjects in their own right (De Genova, 2009).

The mass protest mobilizations in defence of the 'rights' of 'immigrants' arose in response to the most expansively punitive immigration legislation in US history. The Border Protection, Antiterrorism and Illegal Immigration Control Act was passed on December 16, 2005 by the House of Representatives, but it remained under consideration by the Senate. In addition to numerous other draconian provisions, the proposed law would have criminalized an estimated 11 million undocumented migrants residing in the United States by summarily converting their 'unlawful presence' into a felony and rendering them subject to mandatory detention upon apprehension. Furthermore, it would have converted any and all immigration violations, however minor, technical, or unintentional, into felonies punishable with imprisonment. This means that 'legal' permanent residents would have been irreversibly rendered as 'illegal aliens' for any variety of innocuous incidental infractions.

It is instructive to note that the very title of the legislation that instigated so much controversy explicitly coupled 'Antiterrorism and Illegal Immigration'. The putative 'antiterrorist' motivations behind this flagrant legislative ambush targeting any residual vestiges of civil liberties or legal protections for noncitizens provoked a pronouncedly defensive retort from many of the migrants who mobilized against it. Perhaps predictably, the positive demands of the movement often included various formulations of 'legalization' for the undocumented, but the premier focus

of all the protests was to simply but audaciously denounce the new law. There was a significant evidence of slogans which tellingly revealed the more generally beleaguered sensibility that animated much of the struggle, including the agonistic and rather compromised proclamations 'We Are Not Criminals' and 'We Are Not Terrorists'. Worse still, and clearly symptomatic of the veritable hegemony of the metaphysics of antiterrorism for any plausibly 'legitimate' politics in the aftermath of 'homeland security' in the United States, it was not uncommon to see placards that in various renditions asserted 'The 9/11 Hijackers Did Not Speak Spanish'. In such gestures of complicity with the larger nationalist compulsions of US immigration discourse, the undocumented frequently sought to challenge their status as the iconic 'bad immigrant' by recapitulating its disabling normative logic: although 'illegal,' they were in fact hard-working, law-abiding, tax-paying 'good immigrants' (De Genova, 2005: 85–91). With recourse to the invidious racializing subtext signalled with reference to the Spanish language of Latinos, such divisive slogans implied that there were indeed other migrants who presumably represented a genuine menace: the figure of the terrorism suspect could now be upheld as the truly 'bad immigrant'.

Despite these nationalist contradictions and antiterrorist concessions, there was nevertheless a resounding and consistent manifestation of a more elementary defiance toward an escalating hostility against migrants in the grim and stifling atmosphere of the ascendant Homeland Security State. This spirit and sensibility were poignantly captured in a slogan (notably, in Spanish) that has been persistent and pervasive: '*Aquí Estamos, y No Nos Vamos*' [Here we are, and we're not leaving]. This same slogan was sometimes accompanied by a rejoinder: '*Y Si Nos Sacan, Nos Regresamos*' [. . . and if they throw us out, we'll come right back]. For the migrants engaged in this struggle, their 'unauthorized' presence and their autonomous mobility figured as definitive social and political 'objective' facts. Their exuberant affirmation – as sheer insubordinate subjectivity – almost seemed to signify an end in itself (De Genova, 2009, n.d.2).

It is also salient that the movement culminated in a national one-day general strike and boycott, consciously scheduled for May 1, International Workers' Day, and publicized as 'A Day without an Immigrant'. This was meant to dramatically underscore the prospective consequences of an unforeseen and frankly unfathomable withdrawal, or absence, of migrant labour. Thus, undocumented migrants, whom the legislative debate had sought to render its object, audaciously stepped forward on a genuinely massive scale as deportable labour to effectively reaffirm that migrant workers were truly subjects in this struggle. Indeed, they were the subjects in a double and inextricably contradictory sense: as labour-for-capital (and thus, the veritable source of value, upon which capital is constitutively dependent) and also as labour-against-capital (engaged in a mass act of insubordination and an expression of the irreconcilable antagonism that conjoins labour and capital in a mutually constitutive social relation) (Bonefeld, 1995; Holloway, 1995). If the 'irregular' status and 'unauthorized' work of these undocumented migrants had in fact been something utterly routine, mundane, and innocuous – in short, something perfectly 'regular' and normal – this was reflected in the previous

desire only to be left alone to get on with the thankless drudgery of everyday life as labour-for-capital. However, this same contradictory 'illegal' station – ensconced in the machinations of state power and sovereignty, but also strictly excluded from any proper place within its juridical order – now supplied the crucial condition of possibility for an audacious refiguring of the very notion of the political. Their political mobilization entailed the sort of 'emerging political practices and enduring political problematics' which Peter Nyers (2003: 1072) has insightfully examined as a kind of irruption of abject subjectivity, representing 'a troubling anomaly to the sovereign order' (2003: 1090).

Thus, migrant labour is plainly the irrepressible ghost in the machine of the antiterrorist security state. The resurgence of the conventional preoccupations with mundane 'illegal alien' workers in the current immigration debate in the United States exposes labour subordination as one of the constitutive (if suppressed) conditions of possibility for the metaphysics of antiterrorism. Undocumented migrants need not be branded as actual 'terrorists'. Indeed, given that they are absolutely desired and demanded for their labour, to do so would be counterproductive in the extreme. Rather, it is sufficient to mobilize the spectacle of terror and the concomitant metaphysics of antiterrorism to do the crucial work of continually and more exquisitely stripping these 'illegal' workers of even the most pathetic vestiges of legal personhood, such that their own quite labourious predicament of rightlessness may be further amplified and disciplined.

It is indeed in their very life, the vitality of their bodies and minds as living labour, as well as the sheer corporeal and practical fact of their indispensable presence within capital, that migrant workers have been rediscovering a power against capital and against the state. This power defies all the conceits, delusions, and duplicities of any spectacular regime of 'rights' and rightslessness. The commodity and capital itself – the objectified and alienated forms of the vitality and creative force of living labour – become manifest only as alien powers. Likewise, the spurious unity and universality of the state are manifested only as an alien power against the generative and productive power of labour. Nonetheless, the collective mobilization of 'aliens', in particular migrant noncitizens and especially the undocumented, reveals a decisive power that haunts and energizes the machinery of the antiterrorist state. The state's spectacle of security reveals that the spectacle of terror is itself but the alienated objectification of the elusive mobility and unsettling power of deportable migrant labour.

Conclusion

There have long been fairly elaborate techniques of government and rather expansive apparatuses of control aimed at policing borders and the mobility of migrants. The consequent spectacles of immigration law enforcement and border patrols, however, cannot be adequately comprehended apart from the legal production of migrant 'illegality' or 'irregularity' (De Genova, 2002, 2005). What deserves more considered scrutiny, however, is the extent to which these technologies of state power with regard to border control and the management of migration

have been implicated in the much more recent innovations associated with the so-called 'War on Terror' (see De Genova, 2007, 2009). This means that scholars of migration ought not to go on blithely treating the subject as if the War on Terror were somehow incidental and fundamentally extraneous to their inquiries. Furthermore, it requires that any who would seek to critically apprehend the current global sociopolitical conjuncture, and specifically the dramatic escalation in security state measures under the rubric of antiterrorism, must reckon with the salience of transnational migration as a defining feature of the contemporary world. As this chapter has sought to demonstrate, the massive deployment of security state techniques with respect to the autonomy of transnational migration, as well as the wider implications of antiterrorism for the large-scale 'irregularization' of migrant labour, needs to be understood as an active and unresolved social relation of antagonism and struggle.

The subjectivity of labour and the autonomy of migration are an irrepressible animating force that provokes the spectacle of terror and yet comes to be concealed by its smothering and stultifying displays. The ever more intensified abjection and persistent subjugation of deportable migrant labour, moreover, are a crucial objective of the resultant spectacle of security. As Debord reminds us, however, 'the spectacle, though it turns reality on its head, is itself a product of real activity'. Although the War on Terror's global regime of securitization indisputably confirms that 'the spectacle is real', the insurgencies of deportable migrant labour likewise assure us that 'reality erupts within the spectacle' (1967/1995: 14). The alien powers of the state and capital remain haunted by their constitutive dependency upon the productive powers and creative capacities of living labour, especially as these are manifested globally as the sheer subjective potentialities and subversive powers of their inimical and incorrigible 'aliens'.

Notes

1 A special note of appreciation is due to Vicki Squire, in her capacity as coordinator of this project, and for her insights and critical acumen as editor. I am also grateful for the intellectual engagement and provocative scholarship of all who participated in the original workshop for which this essay was first presented, especially Claudia Aradau for her instructive questions and comments as discussant and Didier Bigo, Michael Dillon, Engin Isin and William Walters.

2 Étienne Balibar, for instance, acknowledges this point when he stipulates that 'the category to which refugees belong' is that of 'potential workers' (1992/2002: 43).

3 Whereas the denigration, historically, of racialized enemies as subhuman is ubiquitous, and arguably a defining premise of 'race' as an epistemological category (Anderson, 2007; cf. Agamben, 2002/2004), the simultaneous depiction of them with effectively superhuman attributes or capabilities – as, for example, in various figures of monstrosity – is perhaps a less remarked but likewise persistent theme. For an analysis of the figuration of the Japanese Enemy during World War II as simultaneously subhuman and superhuman, for instance, see Dower (1986). Both themes are especially relevant to the logic of racial extermination, as Dower makes emphatic in his account of what he characterizes as the United States's 'race war' against the Japanese. Similarly, the denigration of Jews as 'lice' or other sorts vermin by European anti-Semitism, culminating in the Nazi Holocaust, readily transposed the subhuman figure of the parasite into the

superhuman figure of the vampire (Halberstam, 1995; Raffles, 2007). For an account of the figure of the Muslim terrorist in terms of simultaneously racialized, gendered, and sexualized monstrosity, see Puar and Rai (2002).

4 For recent engagements with Debord's conception of the society of the spectacle, see, e.g., Agamben (1996/2000), which is dedicated the memory of Debord and includes a chapter explicitly addressing the enduring salience of Debord's work; cf. Agamben (1995/1998: 6, 10–11), Hussey (2001), Retort (2004, 2005, 2008), Rogin (1993), and Weber (2002) for critical engagements with the formulation of spectacle in Retort (2005), see Balakrishnan (2005); Campbell (2008), Katz (2008), Mitchell (2008), Stallabrass (2006), and Tuathail/Toal (2008), for more general invocations of the significance of spectacle, see also the contributions to Garber, Matlock, and Walkowitz, eds. (1993), for a discussion of 'the banality of images' for a consolidation of global power through visuality, see Mirzoeff (2005:67–115).

5 Debord would indubitably have had as his principal frame of reference the state repression of 'terrorism' associated with the left-wing 'armed struggle' movements that emerged in Europe during the 1970s, as well as the various military formations associated with separatist movements demanding national self-determination in Europe, such as in Northern Ireland or the Basque country. Writing in the late 1980s, during the waning years of the Cold War, when anti-imperialist national liberation struggles throughout the so-called 'Third World' were routinely branded as 'terrorist', and in the aftermath of various sensational airline highjackings, however, Debord would already have recognized the increasing salience of the figure of 'international' terrorism. Thus, in retrospect, we may appreciate his insights with regard to the discourse of antiterrorism not merely as a commentary on the devolution of the social and political struggles of the 1960s, but also as a remarkably prescient anticipation of post-Cold War geopolitical realignments.

6 For related invocations of global 'apartheid' see Nevins (2008), Richmond (1994), and Sharma (2006).

Bibliography

Agamben, Giorgio 1995/1998 *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

—— 1996/2000 *Means without End: Notes on Politics*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

—— 2002/2004 *The Open: Man and Animal*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

—— 2003/2005 *State of Exception*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ahmad, Muneer I. 2002 'Homeland Insecurities: Racial Violence the Day after September 11.' *Social Text* 72 20(3): 101–115.

—— 2004 'A Rage Shared by Law: Post-September 11 Racial Violence as Crimes of Passion.' *California Law Review* 92(5): 1259–1330.

Amoore, Louise 2006 'Biometric Borders: Governing Mobilities in the War on Terror.' *Political Geography* 25(3): 336–351.

—— 2007 'Vigilant Visualities: The Watchful Politics of the War on Terror.' *Security Dialogue* 38(2): 141–156.

Anderson, Kay 2007 *Race and the Crisis of Humanism*. New York: Routledge.

Andrijasevic, Rutvica 2010 'From Exception to Excess: Detention and Deportations across the Mediterranean Space.' pp. 147–165 in N. De Genova and N. Peutz, eds. *The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Balakrishnan, Gopal 2005 'States of War.' *New Left Review* 36: 5–32.

Balderrama, Francisco E. and Raymond Rodríguez 1995 *Decade of Betrayal: Mexican Repatriation in the 1930s*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.

Balibar, Étienne 1991 '*Es Gibt Keinen Staat in Europa*: Racism and Politics in Europe Today.' *New Left Review* 186: 5–19.

—— 1992/2002 'Is There Such a Thing as European Racism?' pp. 40–55 in Étienne Balibar, ed. *Politics and the Other Scene*. New York: Verso, 2002.

—— 1993/2002 'What Is a Border?' pp. 75–86 in Étienne Balibar, ed. *Politics and the Other Scene*. New York: Verso, 2002.

Baudrillard, Jean 2001/2002 *The Spirit of Terrorism, and Requiem for the Twin Towers*. Translated by Chris Turner. New York: Verso.

Bayoumi, Moustafa 2008 *How Doe It Feel To Be a Problem? Being Young and Arab in America*. New York: Penguin.

Bigo, Didier 2002 'Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease.' *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 27: 63–92.

—— 2006 'Globalized (in)Security: The Field and the Ban-opticon.' pp. 5–49 in Didier Bigo and Anastassia Tsoukala, eds., *Illiberal Practices of Liberal Regimes: The (In)Security Games*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Bloch, Alice and Liza Schuster 2005 'At the Extremes of Exclusion: Deportation, Detention, and Dispersal.' *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(3): 491–512.

Bojadžijev, Manuela and Saint-Saëns, Isabelle 2006 'Borders, Citizenship, War, Class: A Discussion with Étienne Balibar and Sandro Mezzadra.' *New Formations* 58: 10–30.

Bonefeld, Werner 1995 'Capital as Subject and the Existence of Labour.' pp. 182–212 in *Emancipating Marx: Open Marxism 3*, Werner Bonefeld, Richard Gunn, John Holloway, and Kosmas Psychopedis eds. East Haven, CN: Pluto Press.

Burawoy, Michael 1976 'The Functions and Reproduction of Migrant Labor: Comparative Material from Southern Africa and the United States.' *American Journal of Sociology* 81(5): 1050–1087.

Cainkar, Louise 2002 'No Longer Invisible: Arab and Muslim Exclusion After September 11.' *Middle East Report* 224. Available at: <www.merip.org/mer/mer224/224_cainkar.html>

—— 2003 'Special Registration: A Fervor for Muslims.' *Journal of Islamic Law and Culture* 7(2): 73–101.

—— 2004 'The Impact of the September 11 Attacks and Their Aftermath on Arab and Muslim Communities in the United States.' *GSC Quarterly* 13. Available at: <www.ssrc.org/programs/gsc/publications/quarterly13/cainkar.pdf>.

—— 2005 'Space and Place in the Metropolis: Arabs and Muslims Seeking Safety.' *City & Society* 17(2): 181–209.

Calavita, Kitty 1984 *U.S. Immigration Law and the Control of Labor: 1820–1924*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

—— 1992 *Inside the State: The Bracero Program, Immigration, and the I.N.S*. New York: Routledge.

—— 2005 *Immigrants at the Margins: Law, Race, and Exclusion in Southern Europe*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Campbell, David 2008 'Beyond Image and Reality: Critique and Resistance in the Age of Spectacle.' *Public Culture* 20(3): 539–49.

Castells, Manuel 1975 'Immigrant Workers and Class Struggles in Advanced Capitalism: The Western European Experience.' *Politics and Society* 5(1): 33–66.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh 1989 *Rethinking Working-Class History: Bengal, 1890–1940*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Chavez, Leo R. 1992 *Shadowed Lives: Undocumented Immigrants in American Society*. Ft. Worth, TX: Harcourt, Brace, and Jovanovich.

Chon, Margaret and Donna E. Arzt 2005 'Walking while Muslim.' *Law and Contemporary Problems* 68(2): 215–54.

Cockcroft, James D. 1986 *Outlaws in the Promized Land: Mexican Immigrant Workers and America's Future*. New York: Grove Press.

Cole, David 2003 *Enemy Aliens: Double Standards and Constitutional Freedoms in the War on Terrorism*. New York: The New Press.

Daulatzai, Sohail 2007 'Protect Ya Neck: Muslims and the Carceral Imagination in the Age of Guantánamo.' *Souls* 9(2): 132–147.

Debord, Guy 1967/1995 *The Society of the Spectacle*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. New York: Zone Books.

—— 1988/2005 *Comments on the Society of the Spectacle*. Translated by NOT BORED! Available at: <www.notbored.org/commentaires.html>.

De Genova, Nicholas 2002 'Migrant "Illegality" and Deportability in Everyday Life.' *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31: 419–447.

—— 2005 *Working the Boundaries: Race, Space, and 'Illegality' in Mexican Chicago*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

—— 2007 'The Production of Culprits: From Deportability to Detainability in the Aftermath of "Homeland Security".' *Citizenship Studies* 11(5): 421–48.

—— 2009 'Conflicts of Mobility, and the Mobility of Conflict: Rightslessness, Presence, Subjectivity, Freedom.' *Subjectivity* 29(1): 445–66.

—— 2010 'The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement.' Theoretical Overview, pp. 33–65 in N. De Genova and N. Peutz, eds. *The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

—— n.d.1 'Antiterrorism, Race, and the New Frontier: American Exceptionalism, Imperial Multiculturalism, and the Global Security State.' Under review in *Identities*.

—— n.d.2 'The Queer Politics of Migration: Reflections on "Illegality" and Incorrigibility.' Forthcoming in *Studies in Social Justice*.

De Genova, Nicholas and Nathalie Peutz, eds. 2010 *The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Dower, John W. 1986 *War Without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War*. New York: Pantheon Books/Random House.

Fekete, Liz 2005 *The Deportation Machine: Europe, Asylum, and Human Rights*. Special Issue of the *European Race Bulletin*, No. 51. London: Institute of Race Relations.

Fernandes, Deepa 2007 *Targeted: Homeland Security and the Business of Immigration*. New York: Seven Stories Press.

Foucault, Michel 1977 *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Random House.

Galarza, Ernesto 1964 *Merchants of Labor: The Mexican Bracero Story*. Santa Barbara, CA: McNally and Loftin.

Gamio, Manuel 1930[1971] *Mexican Immigration to the United States: A Study of Human Migration and Adjustment*. New York: Dover.

Garber, Marjorie B., Jann Matlock, and Rebecca L. Walkowitz, eds. 1993 *Media Spectacles*. New York: Routledge.

García, Juan Ramón 1980 *Operation Wetback: The Mass Deportation of Mexican Undocumented Workers in 1954*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.

Halberstam, Judith 1995 *Skin Shows: Gothic Horror and the Technology of Monsters*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Harris, Nigel 1995 *The New Untouchables: Immigration and the New World Worker*. New York: I. B. Tauris.

Heyman, Josiah McC. 1998 'State Effects on Labor: The INS and Undocumented Immigrants at the Mexico-United States Border.' *Critique of Anthropology* 18(2): 157–180.

Hindess, Barry 2000 'Citizenship in the International Management of Populations.' *American Behavioral Scientist* 43(9): 1486–1497.

Hing, Bill Ong 2006 *Deporting Our Souls: Values, Morality, and Immigration Policy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Holloway, John 1994 'Global Capital and the National State.' *Capital and Class* 52: 23–49.

—— 1995 'From Scream of Refusal to Scream of Power: The Centrality of Work.' pp. 155–81 in *Emancipating Marx: Open Marxism 3*, ed. Werner Bonefeld, Richard Gunn, John Holloway, and Kosmas Psychopedis. East Haven, CN: Pluto Press.

Human Rights Watch 2002 *Presumption of Guilt: Human Rights Abuses of Post-September 11 Detainees*. Available at: <www.hrw.org/reports/2002/us911>.

Hussey, Andrew 2001 'Spectacle, Simulation, and Spectre: Debord, Baudrillard, and the Ghost of Marx.' *Parallax* 7(3): 63–72.

Huysmans, Jef 2006 *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, Migration, and Asylum in the EU*. New York: Routledge.

Johnson, Chalmers 2000 *Blowback: The Costs and Consequences of American Empire*. New York: Henry Holt.

Kanstroom, Daniel 2007 *Deportation Nation: Outsiders in American History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Karakayali, Serhat and Enrica Rigo 2010 'Mapping the European Space of Circulation.' pp. 123–144 in N. De Genova and N. Peutz, eds. *The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Katz, Cindi 2008 'The Death Wish of Modernity and the Politics of Mimesis.' *Public Culture* 20(3): 551–560.

Kearney, Michael 1986 'From the Invisible Hand to Visible Feet: Anthropological Studies of Migration and Development.' *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15: 331–361.

Knabb, Ken 1981 *Situationist International Anthology*. Berkeley, CA: Bureau of Public Secrets.

Lawyers Committee for Human Rights 2003 'Imbalance of Powers: How Changes to U.S. Law & Policy Since 9/11 Erode Human Rights and Civil Liberties, September 2002 – March 2003.' Washington, DC: Lawyers Committee for Human Rights. Available at: <www.humanrightsfirst.org/us_law/loss/imbalance/powers.pdf>

Lefebvre, Henri 1947/1991 *The Critique of Everyday Life, Volume One: Introduction*. Translated by John Moore. New York: Verso.

—— 1961/2002 *The Critique of Everyday Life, Volume Two: Foundations for a Sociology of the Everyday*. Translated by John Moore. New York: Verso.

Maira, Sunaina 2004 'Youth Culture, Citizenship and Globalization: South Asian Youth in the United States after September 11th.' *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa, and the Middle East* 24(1): 219–231.

—— 2009 *Missing: Youth, Citizenship, and Empire after 9/11*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Marx, Karl 1843/1978 'On the Jewish Question.' pp. 26–52 in Robert C. Tucker, ed. *The Marx-Engles Reader*, Second Edition. New York: W.W. Norton.

—— 1844/1965 *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. New York: International Publishers.

—— 1867/1976 *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, Volume One. Translated by Ben Fowkes. New York: Penguin Books.

Mezzadra, Sandro 2004 'The Right to Escape.' *Ephemera* 4(3): 267–275; available at: <www.ephemeraweb.org/journal/4-3/4-3mezzadra.pdf >.

—— 2006 'Citizen and Subject: A Postcolonial Constitution for the European Union?' *Situations* 1(2): 31–42.

Mezzadra, Sandro and Brett Neilson 2003 'Né qui, né altrove—Migration, Detention, Desertion: A Dialogue.' *borderlands e-journal* 2(1); available at: <www.borderlandsejournal.adelaide.edu.au/vol2no1_2003/mezzadra_neilson.html>.

Mirzoeff, Nicholas 2005 *Watching Babylon: The War in Iraq and Global Visual Culture*. New York: Routledge.

Mitchell, W. J. T. 2008 'The Spectacle Today: A Response to RETORT.' *Public Culture* 20(3): 573–581.

Nevins, Joseph 2008 *Dying to Live: A Story of U.S. Immigration in an Age of Global Apartheid*. San Francisco, CA: Open Media/ City Lights Books.

Ngai, Mae M. 2004 *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Nyers, Peter 2003 'Abject Cosmopolitanism: The Politics of Protection in the Anti-Deportation Movement.' *Third World Quarterly* 24(6): 1069–1093. Reprinted in N. De Genova and N. Peutz, eds. *The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press (2010), pp. 413–441.

—— 2006 'The Accidental Citizen: Acts of Sovereignty and (Un)Making Citizenship.' *Economy and Society* 35(1): 22–41.

Packer, Jeremy 2006 'Becoming Bombs: Mobilizing Mobility in the War on Terror.' *Cultural Studies* 20(4–5): 378–399.

Papadopoulos, Dimitris; Niamh Stephenson, and Vassilis Tsianos 2008 *Escape Routes: Control and Subversion in the 21st Century*. London: Pluto Press.

Papastergiadis, Nikos 2000 *The Turbulence of Migration: Globalization, Deterritorialization and Hybridity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

—— 2005 'Mobility and the Nation: Skins, Machines, and Complex Systems.' Willy Brandt Series of Working Papers. School of International Migration and Ethnic Relations, Malmö University, Sweden.

Pashukanis, Evgeny B. 1929/1989 *Law and Marxism: A General Theory Towards a Critique of the Fundamental Juridical Concepts*. Worcester, UK: Pluto Publishing.

Peutz, Nathalie 2006 'Embarking on an Anthropology of Removal.' *Current Anthropology* 47(2): 217–241. Reprinted as '"Criminal Alien" Deportees in Somaliland: An Ethnography of Removal,' in N. De Genova and N. Peutz, eds. *The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press (2010), pp. 371–410.

Portes, Alejandro 1978 'Toward a Structural Analysis of Illegal (Undocumented) Immigration.' *International Migration Review* 12 (4): 469–484.

Puar, Jasbir K. 2007 *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Puar, Jasbir K. and Amit S. Rai 2002 'Monster, Terrorist, Fag: The War on Terrorism and the Production of Docile Patriots.' *Social Text* 72 20(3):117–148.

Raffles, Hugh 2007 'Jews, Lice, and History.' *Public Culture* 19(3): 521–566.

Reisler, Mark 1976 *By the Sweat of Their Brow: Mexican Immigrant Labor in the United States, 1900–1940*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.

Retort (Iain Boal, T. J. Clark, Joseph Matthews, and Michael Watts) 2004 'Afflicted Powers: The State, Spectacle, and September 11.' *New Left Review* 27: 5–21.

—— 2005 *Afflicted Powers: Capital and Spectacle in a New Age of War*. New York: Verso.

—— 2008 'The Totality for Grownups.' *Public Culture* 20(3): 583–593

Richmond, Anthony 1994 *Global Apartheid: Refugees, Racism, and the New World Order*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Rogin, Michael 1993 '"Make My Day!" Spectacle as Amnesia in Imperial Politics.' pp. 499–534 in Amy Kaplan and Donald Pease, eds. *Cultures of United States Imperialism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Saito, Natsu Taylor 2001 'Symbolism Under Siege: Japanese American Redress and the 'Racing' of Arab Americans as "Terrorists".' *Asian Law Journal* 8(1): 1–29.

Samora, Julian 1971 *Los Mojados: The Wetback Story*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Sassen, Saskia 1999 *Guests and Aliens*. New York: The New Press.

Sharma, Nandita 2006 *Home Economics: Nationalism and the Making of 'Migrant Workers' in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Stallabrass, Peter 2006 'Spectacle and Terror.' *New Left Review* 37: 87–106.

Torpey, John 2000 *The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship, and the State*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tuathail, Gearóid Ó (Gerard Toal) 2008 'Pleasures of the Polemic.' *Public Culture* 20(3): 561–571.

Vaneigem, Raoul 1967/1994 *The Revolution of Everyday Life*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. London: Rebel Press/Left Bank Books.

—— 1991/1994 'The Everyday Eternity of Life.' Preface to the first French paperback edition. pp. 7–15 in *The Revolution of Everyday Life*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. London: Rebel Press/Left Bank Books.

Volpp, Leti 2002 'The Citizen and the Terrorist.' *UCLA Law Review* 49: 1575–1598.

Walters, William 2002 'Deportation, Expulsion and the International Police of Aliens.' *Citizenship Studies* 6 (3): 265–292. Reprinted in N. De Genova and N. Peutz, eds. *The Deportation Regime: Sovereignty, Space, and the Freedom of Movement*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press (2010), pp. 69–100.

—— 2004 'Secure Borders, Safe Haven, Domopolitics.' *Citizenship Studies* 8(3): 237–260.

Weber, Samuel 2002 'War, Terrorism, and Spectacle: On Towers and Caves.' *South Atlantic Quarterly* 101(3): 449–458.

White House 2003 *National Strategy for Combating Terrorism* (February 2003). Available at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/02/counter_terrorism/counter_terrorism_strategy.pdf

The Contested Politics of Mobility

Borderzones and irregularity

Edited by Vicki Squire

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2011 by Routledge
2 Park Square Milton Park Abingdon Oxon OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
270 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business.

© 2011 Vicki Squire, selection and editorial matter; individual contributors, their contribution.

The right of Vicki Squire to be identified as editor of this work has been asserted by her in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patent Act 1988.

Typeset in Times New Roman by Swales & Willis Ltd, Exeter, Devon
Printed and bound in Great Britain by CPI Antony Rowe, Chippenham, Wiltshire

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
The contested politics of mobility: borderzones and irregularity /
edited by Vicki Squire.
p. cm.—(Routledge advances in international relations and global politics, 87)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
1. Emigration and immigration—Political aspects. I. Squire, Vicki, 1974–
JV6255.C66 2010
325—dc22
2010018638

ISBN: 978–0–415–58461–6 (hbk)
ISBN: 978–0–203–83982–9 (ebk)