Original Article

MILLENNIUM
Journal of International Studies

Biopolitics Multiple: Migration, Extraction, Subtraction

Millennium: Journal of International Studies
2020, Vol. 48(2) 198–220

DOI: 10.1177/0305829819889139
journals.sagepub.com/home/mil
SAGE

Claudia Aradau
King's College London, UK

Martina Tazzioli
Goldsmiths, University of London, UK

Abstract
This article proposes 'biopolitics multiple' as an approach to the heterogeneity of biopolitical technologies deployed to govern migration today. Building on work that has started to develop analytical vocabularies to diagnose biopolitical technologies that work neither by fostering life nor by making people die in a necropolitical sense, it conceptualises 'extraction' and 'subtraction' as two such technologies that take 'hold' of migrants' lives today. Extraction, explored in the article through a focus on borderzones in Greece, captures the imbrication of biopolitics and value through the 'outside' creation of the economic conditions of data circulation. Subtraction, which is analysed in this article through a focus on Calais, captures the practices of (partial) non-governing by taking material and legal terrain away from migrants and reconfiguring convoluted geographies of (forced) hyper-mobility. This move allows us to understand the governmentality of migration beyond binary oppositions such as 'making live/letting die', biopolitics/necropolitics and inclusion/exclusion.

Keywords
biopolitics migration, extraction, subtraction, governmentality

Biopolítica múltiple: migración, extracción, sustracción

Resumen
Este artículo propone el concepto de «biopolítica múltiple» como un enfoque para abordar la heterogeneidad de las tecnologías biopolíticas que se implementan actualmente para controlar la migración. Se basa en trabajos que comenzaron a desarrollar vocabularios analíticos para detectar

Corresponding author:
Martina Tazzioli, Department of Politics & International Relations, Goldsmiths, University of London, 8, Lewisham Way, London SE14 6NW, UK.
Email: Martina.Tazzioli@gold.ac.uk

tecnologías biopolíticas que funcionan sin fomentar la vida ni contribuir a la muerte de las personas (en un sentido necropolítico) con el fin de conceptualizar los términos «extracción» y «sustracción» como dos de esas tecnologías que «se apoderan» de la vida de los migrantes en la actualidad. La extracción, que este artículo examina poniendo el foco en las zonas fronterizas de Grecia, refleja la imbricación entre biopolítica y valor mediante la creación «externa» de las condiciones económicas de la circulación de datos. La sustracción, que en este artículo se analiza poniendo el foco en Calais, refleja las prácticas de no gobernanza (parcial) que detrae el terreno material y legal de los migrantes, y reconfigura las intrincadas geografías de hipermovilidad (forzada). Esta estrategia nos permite comprender la gubernamentalidad de la migración que supera las oposiciones binarias, como «hacer posible vivir y dejar morir», biopolítica/necropolítica, e inclusión/exclusión.

Palabras clave
biopolítica, migración, extracción, sustracción, gubernamentalidad

Biopolitique multiple: migration, extraction, soustraction

Résumé
Cet article développe le concept de «biopolitique multiple» pour analyser l'hétérogénéité des technologies biopolitiques déployées pour gouverner les migrations aujourd'hui. S'appuyant sur d'autres travaux de recherche récents commençant à constituer un lexique analytique pour décrire les technologies biopolitiques qui ne fonctionnent ni en favorisant la vie ni en faisant mourir les gens (au sens nécropolitique), il vise à conceptualiser « l'extraction » et « la soustraction » comme étant deux des technologies qui affectent la vie des migrants dans la société contemporaine. L'extraction, étudiée dans cet article à travers l'exemple des zones frontalières en Grèce, s'articule autour de l'imbrication de la biopolitique et de la valeur, induite par la création des conditions économiques de la circulation des données. La soustraction, analysée ici à travers la situation à Calais, s'intéresse aux pratiques de non-gouvernmentalite (partielle) qui consistent à soustraire aux migrants le terrain légal et matériel et à reconfigurer des géographies complexes d'hypermobilité (forcée). Cette approche nous aide à comprendre la gouvernementalité des migrations au-delà des oppositions binaires telles que « faire vivre/laisser mourir », biopolitique/nécropolitique et inclusion/exclusion.

Mots-clés
biopolitique, migrations, extraction, soustraction, gouvernementalité

Introduction

'MasterCard Prepaid Debit Cards Provide Refugees with Mobility, Flexibility and Dignity'.[1]

'We are not there to harass and assault them, we are there to make them move . . .'[2]

1. Marisa Grimes, 'MasterCard Prepaid Debit Cards Provide Refugees with Mobility, Flexibility and Dignity', MasterCard. Available at: https://newsroom.mastercard.com/2016/06/20/mastercard-prepaid-debit-cards-provide-refugees-with-mobility-flexibility-and-dignity/. Last accessed September 20, 2018.
2. Quote from the police by Auberge des migrants, 'On est pas là pour les harceler et les agresser, on est là pour les faire bouger'. Available at: https://twitter.com/AubergeMigrants/status/1034836611048108033?s=09. Last accessed August 24, 2019.

From digital innovation to a wide array of repressive technologies, migration governmentality in Europe has been an intense site of transformation, particularly since what European states have defined as a 'refugee crisis'.[3] These two brief quotes are drawn from two different borderzones – one in Greece, where asylum seekers are given prepaid debit cards by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and the other in Calais in France, where migrants are constantly chased and moved by the police.

Borderzones have been productively analysed through the lens of biopolitics as key sites in the transnational government of mobile bodies and the management of populations.[4] The concept of biopolitics has been mobilised to explain the modalities of power emerging with modernity and constitutive of our present, which take 'life' as the object of power and transform the 'juridical subjects from whom we could collect good, and life too, moreover'.[5] While illuminating an array of different practices in borderzones, biopolitics has also been criticised for its 'thin' understanding of race, Eurocentrism, and downplaying of resistance, repression and violence. For critics of Foucault's concept, analyses that focus on biopolitics risk marginalising – even obscuring – the centrality of race to the hierarchisation of lives, and differential forms of subjection generated and sustained by racialised power mechanisms.[6] As we will discuss further below, International Relations (IR) scholars have addressed the limitations of biopolitics by supplementing the concept and associated practices with necropolitics, thanatopolitics or sovereignty to capture the multiple ways in which death continues to be juxtaposed to life in the governing of the present.

---

3. While there has been a lot of debate about the use of categories of 'migrant', 'refugee' and 'asylum seeker', we use 'migrant' as the overarching category where statuses are blurred in practice (as in the case of Calais). Where the legal status of a person is directly relevant to practices, as in the case of the prepaid cards in Greece, we tend to use the referent of 'refugee' as only those who apply for asylum and humanitarian protection can have access to the prepaid card. By not drawing fast distinctions in practice, we try to avoid the reification of categories and show not only how statuses are blurred in practice, but that a particular legal status can be withdrawn and reallocated. There is a wide literature reflecting on the categories of 'migrant' and 'refugee'. For recent reflection, see Heaven Crawley and Dimitris Skleparis, 'Refugees, Migrants, Neither, Both: Categorical Fetishism and the Politics of Bounding in Europe's "Migration Crisis"', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44, no. 1 (2018): 48–64.
4. For example William Walters, 'Mapping Schengenland: Denaturalizing the Border', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 20, no. 5 (2002): 561–80; Benjamin J. Muller, *Security, Risk and the Biometric State: Governing Borders and Bodies* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2009); Nick Vaughan-Williams, *EUrope's Border Crisis: Biopolitical Security and Beyond* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015); Martina Tazzioli, *The Making of Migration: The Biopolitics of Mobility at Europe's Borders* (London: SAGE Publications, 2019).
5. Michel Foucault, 'The Mesh of Power', *Viewpoint* (1976 [2012]). Available at: https://www.viewpointmag.com/2012/09/12/the-mesh-of-power/. Last Accessed October 17, 2017.
6. Achille Mbembe, 'Necropolitics', *Public Culture* 15, no. 1 (2003): 11–40; Patricia Ticineto Clough and Craig Willse, *Beyond Biopolitics: Essays on the Governance of Life and Death* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2011); Stefanie Fishel and Lauren Wilcox, 'Politics of the Living Dead: Race and Exceptionalism in the Apocalypse', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 45, no. 3 (2017): 335–55.

These supplementary concepts have been particularly productive for recent critical engagements with border and migration governmentality.[7] While attention to the multiplicity and multiplication of biopolitical technologies has also informed recent work on migration and borders, we argue that we need to further extend and nuance the vocabularies of biopolitics to understand the transformations of migration governmentality today. We develop 'biopolitics multiple' as a methodological device to attend to how biopolitical technologies are deployed in practice, how they are enacted differently from site to site, while still somehow 'hanging together'.[8] As our title suggests, echoing Annemarie Mol's *Body Multiple*, we propose to unsettle binary oppositions such as inclusion/exclusion, biopolitics/necropolitics, affirmative biopolitics/negative biopolitics, making live/letting die that have undergirded much work on biopolitical technologies of governing.[9] Focused on the life of asylum seekers, the two quotes we start with also indicate that something more is at stake in biopolitical technologies of governing than the politics of life and death. By developing an understanding of biopolitics beyond life/death, this article makes a contribution to the critical literature on migration and, at the same time, it takes migration as a terrain for rethinking contemporary biopolitical technologies more broadly.

In taking migration as a site of inquiry, we ask how we can account for modes of power and political technologies[10] that do not work through fostering life and do not make people die. Which 'hold' over migrant lives is at stake that does not fall under the biopolitical couplet of 'making live/letting die'?[11] How do we conceptualise technologies of power that do not just 'make a division between good and bad circulation'?[12] What are the effects of a discontinuous 'hold' over migrants' lives, made of some sites and moments in which migrants are highly controlled and others in which their movements are managed through (partial) non-governing, not-seeing and non-registration? We propose to conceptualise

7. See Vaughan-Williams, *EUrope's Border Crisis*; Luca Mavelli, 'Governing Populations through the Humanitarian Government of Refugees: Biopolitical Care and Racism in the European Refugee Crisis', *Review of International Studies* 43, no. 5 (2017): 809–32; Özgün E. Topak, 'The Biopolitical Border in Practice: Surveillance and Death at the Greece-Turkey Borderzones', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 32, no. 5 (2014): 815–33; Vicki Squire, 'Governing Migration through Death in Europe and the US: Identification, Burial and the Crisis of Modern Humanism', *European Journal of International Relations* 23, no. 3 (2017): 513–32.
8. Annemarie Mol, *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002).
9. Sandro Mezzadra and Brett Neilson, *Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2013); Judith Revel, 'Identity, Nature, Life: Three Biopolitical Deconstructions', *Theory, Culture & Society* 26, no. 6 (2009): 45–54.
10. Following Foucault's definition, we use 'political technologies' as a set of knowledges, practices and operations 'which determine the conduct of individuals and submit them to certain ends or domination'. Michel Foucault, 'The Political Technology of Individuals', in *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*, eds. Michel Foucault et al. (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988), 145–62,18.
11. Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality. Volume I* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978).
12. Michel Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2007), 34.

two modes of biopolitical governing as extraction and subtraction. The key argument of the article is that extractive and subtractive biopolitics allows us to attend to reconfigurations of power today and develop critical vocabularies to address analytical impasses not only around migration governmentality, but also biopolitics more broadly. For instance, as this article questions, how should we conceptualise border governmentality beyond strategies of killing and letting die? The conceptual apparatus of 'extraction' and 'subtraction' helps us highlight relations between biopolitics, circulation and mobility, thereby attending to intersections with political economic and racial formations.

While extraction is a familiar concept to literatures on neoliberalism and political economy, the concept has not been deployed in relation to biopolitics. Recently, Sandro Mezzadra and Brett Neilson have proposed to move beyond the literal meaning of extraction of natural resources to encompass much wider operations of capital which include, for instance, modes of value extraction from social cooperation.[13] Drawing on this initial expansion, we develop a conceptualisation of extractive biopolitics to investigate the modes of value extraction from migrants' mobility that are at stake through the intertwining of humanitarian interventions and digital economies. In this article, we propose to investigate extraction in relation to circulation of data as well as to the infrastructures that are constitutive of digital economies and data exchanges today.

Unlike extraction, subtraction is a concept that has rarely surfaced in the social sciences. We engage with the work of the architectural theorist Keller Easterling, who has articulated subtraction in relation to building removal, to similarly advance the concept and argue for its relevance as a biopolitical technology.[14] Through the lens of subtractive biopolitics, we interrogate how migrant subjectivities are shaped and targeted beyond the binary opposition between migrants' agency and victimhood that underpins migration scholarship. Political technologies for governing migration produce a whole range of modes of subjection that fall in-between those two oppositional figures of subjectivity. As this article illustrates, migrants are deprived of spaces of livability and infrastructures of support and they are entrapped in forced hyper-mobility. Such a forced hyper-mobility, we contend, might be seen as an effect of subtraction insofar as migrants are disrupted in their movements and pace of mobility.

To explore these technologies of extraction and subtraction, we start from two borderzones in Europe.[15] Our selection of official hotspots in Greece and informal hotspots in Calais in France is due to their situatedness as key sites of governmental invention and experimentation.[16] Moreover, far from being migration hotspots that emerge suddenly, these sites have a specific migration history, and Calais in particular has been a violent

13. Sandro Mezzadra and Brett Neilson, 'On the Multiple Frontiers of Extraction: Excavating Contemporary Capitalism', *Cultural Studies* 31, no. 2–3 (2017): 185–204.
14. Keller Easterling, *Subtraction* (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2014).
15. See Vicki Squire, ed., *The Contested Politics of Mobility: Borderzones and Irregularity* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2011).
16. We refer to migration as a site of experimentation throughout the article, to highlight that the political technologies implemented for governing and controlling migrants are partly used also in other fields. Many critical migration scholars have used the language of laboratories of experimentation where a series of policies, laws and technologies are tested. While there

borderzone for migrants since the mid-1990s. On a methodological level, it is important to avoid the trap of 'presentism'[17] that risks corroborating state narratives of a 'refugee crisis'. Our selection also requires a further methodological clarification: in interrogating the techniques and the specific 'hold' over migrants, we do not propose an overarching analytic that would subsume the heterogeneity of migration contexts. Indeed, there are important differences between the ways in which migrants are governed soon after landing, and how their presence and movements are managed at the internal frontiers of Europe, or in sites where the European Union (EU) has externalised its borders. Far from disregarding such heterogeneity, we contend that the unevenness of modes of government or 'biopolitics multiple' is what characterises the current European migration politics. Such unevenness inevitably generates uncertainty and disorientation for the migrants, making it hard to grasp how the EU border regime works. In introducing the notion of 'biopolitics multiple', we also need to ask which subjectivities these heterogenous political technologies shape and foster. We show that 'biopolitics multiple' has important political implications for migrant subjectivities, as these heterogeneous technologies which hang together without being coherent also produce ambiguity, uncertainty and disorientation.

Methodologically, we start from moments in which governing technologies become contested in these borderzones and follow how these contestations unravel in order to grasp the specificity of biopolitical technologies. Technologies gain limited public visibility as these become challenged by various non-state actors, migrant groups (through online and offline means), and even state actors. These contestations unravel through governmental inquiries, reports from nongovernmental organisations (NGOs), legal cases and online posts, which help us trace the contours and the messy deployment of these technologies.[18] Following these contestations means that we suspend assumptions about who 'counts' and trace a multiplicity of actors who contest biopolitical technologies and their deployment on the ground.

To develop the conceptualisation of 'biopolitics multiple', we proceed in three steps. First, we discuss how critical scholarship on migration and borders has engaged with literatures expanding and critiquing the concept of biopolitics more broadly. Second, we introduce the concept of extraction to diagnose technologies of extractive biopolitics in the governing of migration in Greece. Third, we introduce the concept of subtraction and analyse the technologies of subtractive biopolitics in another site of intense migration governmentality in Europe – Calais. We conclude by discussing the political

---

are important differences from the use of the 'laboratory thesis' in the Israel-Palestine context, Rhys Machold has raised a set of cautionary notes about the theoretical, empirical and normative use of the concept. Rhys Machold, 'Reconsidering the Laboratory Thesis: Palestine/Israel and the Geopolitics of Representation', *Political Geography* 65 (2018): 88–97.

17. William Walters, 'Foucault and Frontiers: Notes on the Birth of the Humanitarian Border', in *Governmentality: Current Issues and Future Challenges*, ed. Ulrich Bröckling, Susanne Krasmann, Thomas Lemke (Abingdon: Routledge, 2010), 142.
18. While some of the observations contained in the article stem from fieldwork conducted in Greece (Lesvos and Athens) and in France (Calais), we have decided to draw on the vast array of documents produced and deployed as part of the public contestations of these technologies in 2017 and 2018.

implications of these biopolitical technologies and their heterogeneity for migrant subjectivity and contemporary biopolitics more broadly.

Beyond the Politics of Life and Death

Critical scholarship on migration governmentality has interrogated the specific politics of life and death underpinning the technologies which sort populations into lives worth saving and those left to die.[19] Following Foucault, the literature on migration governmentality has critically pointed to the divisions and exclusions which are fostered between 'host populations', whose life and wealth should be enhanced, and the racialised refugees who, from a state-based perspective, would threaten the wellbeing of the former.[20] These distinctions underpin the continuum of humanitarianism, migration management and biopolitical warfare as 'a form of hybrid warfare', which works 'through heterogeneous techniques [. . .] that act on migrants as singular individuals and, at the same time, as part of transnational populations on the move'.[21]

Recent literatures have not only attended to the inventiveness of biopolitical technologies, but they have also addressed the limitations of approaching biopolitical control through the binary of 'making live/letting die'. In highlighting the heterogeneity of practices of biopolitical control, critical literatures can be read as following three different paths in relation to the conceptualisation of biopolitics: supplementing, specifying or displacing the concept of biopolitics.

Firstly, for many authors, the heterogeneity of practices requires supplementing the concept of biopolitics. IR scholars, particularly in the field of border and migration studies, have largely adopted the first approach. They have productively built on the critiques of biopolitics, particularly arguments that biopolitics needs to be supplemented by either necropolitics, conceived by Achille Mbembe as the 'contemporary forms of subjugation of life to the power of death',[22] or thanatopolitics, defined by Giorgio Agamben as the moment when 'the decision on life becomes a decision on death'.[23] This supplementation exposes the co-constitution of life- and death-impulses in the contemporary government of life and the racialised constitution of the 'living dead', a term which denotes forms of existence characterised by social, political and physical death.[24] The biopolitical, thanatopolitical and necropolitical are particularly intensified in the government of migration, as death becomes a 'routine or

19. Vaughan-Williams, *EUrope's Border Crisis*; Squire, 'Governing Migration through Death in Europe and the US'; Adrian Little and Nick Vaughan-Williams, 'Stopping Boats, Saving Lives, Securing Subjects: Humanitarian Borders in Europe and Australia', *European Journal of International Relations* 23 no. 3 (2016): 533–56.
20. Mavelli, 'Governing Populations through the Humanitarian Government of Refugees', 811.
21. Glenda Garelli and Martina Tazzioli, 'The Biopolitical Warfare on Migrants: EU Naval Force and NATO Operations of Migration Government in the Mediterranean', *Critical Military Studies* 4 no. 2 (2018): 181–200., 4.
22. Mbembe, 'Necropolitics', 39.
23. Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer. Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 122.
24. Mbembe, 'Necropolitics', 39–40.

normalised dimension of contemporary bordering practices'.[25] What characterises these biopolitical spaces in which life is administered, monitored and surveyed is the drawing of boundaries, the hierarchisation of life, and the proliferation and intensification of violence. Other scholars have called for renewed attention to sovereignty in the light of biopolitical modes of government, arguing that such a theme remains in fact quite marginalised and overshadowed both in Foucault's work and in contemporary analyses on biopolitics.[26] Thus, borderzones are analysed as spaces where 'sovereign territorial surveillance, practices of death and exclusion, and suspension of rights are all central aspects of biopolitical control'.[27]

Nick Vaughan-Williams has pushed further the critical engagement with the notion of biopolitics, arguing for an analysis that moves beyond the opposition between affirmative biopolitics – which centres on the power of life rather than power over life, as discussed by authors like Toni Negri, and negative biopolitics or thanatopolitics, which builds on Giorgio Agamben's work to highlight the production of bare life as constitutive of sovereign power. For Vaughan-Williams, the opposition between a thanatopolitical and vital biopolitics which characterises the literature on migration cannot be sustained in practice, as 'the EU's humanitarian approach to border security *at once* encompasses *both* the discourse of control *and* that of migrant agency'.[28] Katharyne Mitchell and Matthew Sparke have also called for 'adapt[ing] Foucauldian arguments about "making live" and "rejecting into death" in modern biopolitics in order to come to terms with a wide range of intermediate experiences of "subcitizenship" between the poles of biopolitical enfranchisement and necropolitical rejection'.[29] The generality of biopolitics understood as the management of individuals and populations cannot account, in their view, for the multiplicity of experiences and technologies of biopolitical power.

Therefore, what is key to these moves of supplementing biopolitics is the analytical attention to heterogeneous practices, to how different rationalities and technologies of biopolitical governmentality co-exist and are entangled.[30] For instance, the

25. Squire, 'Governing Migration through Death in Europe and the US', 514.
26. François Debrix and Alexander D. Barder, *Beyond Biopolitics: Theory, Violence, and Horror in World Politics* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013); Banu Bargu, *Starve and Immolate: The Politics of Human Weapons* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2014). On borderzones, see for example Reece Jones et al., 'Interventions on the State of Sovereignty at the Border', *Political Geography* 59 (2017): 1–10.
27. Topak, 'The Biopolitical Border in Practice', 816.
28. Vaughan-Williams, *EUrope's Border Crisis*, 12, italics in original.
29. Katharyne Mitchell and Matthew Sparke, 'Hotspot Geopolitics versus Geosocial Solidarity: Contending Constructions of Safe Space for Migrants in Europe', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* Online First (2018). doi0263775818793647.
30. Thom Davies, Arshad Isakjee, and Surindar Dhesi, 'Violent Inaction: The Necropolitical Experience of Refugees in Europe', *Antipode* 49, no. 5 (2017): 1263–84; Michael McIntyre and Heidi J. Nast, 'Bio(necro)polis: Marx, Surplus Populations, and the Spatial Dialectics of Reproduction and "Race"1', *Antipode* 43 no. 5 (2011): 1465–88; Jill M. Williams, 'From Humanitarian Exceptionalism to Contingent Care: Care and Enforcement at the Humanitarian Border', *Political Geography* 47 (2015): 11–20.

refugee camp as a 'spatial political technology' is characterised by biopolitical modes of governance where forms of abandonment, colonial technologies for managing populations and humanitarian control coexist.[31] Recent works have also drawn attention to the specific biopolitical technologies that are at play in governing refugees at sea, speaking of a 'biopolitical warfare' that consists in military actors, such as the Navy, that are involved in both rescuing and containing migrants in the Mediterranean.[32] Others, such as Polly Pallister-Wilkins, have reflected on biopolitical modes of intervention which target the migrants in the recently established EU hotspots, showing how the humanitarian logic of 'care and control' is intertwined with forms of administrative violence.[33]

A second approach reads heterogeneity as an impetus to specify biopolitics and distinguish it from 'politics of life'. In our reading, specifying biopolitics entails tracing its boundaries both conceptually and in practice. Several scholars have taken issue with the generality of a concept that can become too encompassing and have argued in favour of distinctions that specify, rather than supplement biopolitics. Specifying biopolitics distinguishes it from other governmental technologies. For instance, while acknowledging that, historically, 'the border crossing has become for thousands of migrants [...] a matter of life and death', William Walters has noted that the functioning of the humanitarian border is not predicated upon the enhancement of life nor on pastoral power, but on the 'provision of bare necessities'.[34] Didier Fassin has also warned against the use of the term biopolitics to illustrate the rationale of humanitarianism as what is at stake is a 'politics of life' that targets and selects migrants individually, and not biopolitical mechanisms apt at governing populations for enhancing them.[35]

A third engagement with the limitations of biopolitics unpacks the heterogeneity of practices by attending to entanglements between biopolitics, neoliberal capitalism and racialisation. This means that biopolitics also becomes displaced to some extent, given its inability to capture a range of other practices of governmentality. The literature on biopolitics and (neoliberal) political economy has focused on migrant bodies and their commodification as labour. As Thomas Lemke has argued, 'the instrumentalization of life cannot be separated from its capitalization'.[36] As part of this strand of research, scholars writing on the 'migration industry' have relied on the centrality of labour and emphasised modes of value extraction through the commodification of migrant bodies, for instance by

31. Mark B. Salter, 'The Global Visa Regime and the Political Technologies of the International Self: Borders, Bodies, Biopolitics', *Alternatives* 31, no. 2 (2006): 167–89; Claudio Minca, 'Geographies of the Camp', *Political Geography* 49 (2015): 74-83; see also Alison Mountz, 'The Enforcement Archipelago: Detention, Haunting, and Asylum on Islands', *Political Geography* 30, no. 3 (2011): 118–28.
32. Garelli and Tazzioli, 'The Biopolitical Warfare on Migrants'.
33. Polly Pallister-Wilkins, 'Hotspots and the Geographies of Humanitarianism', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* Online First (2018). doi 0263775818754884.
34. Walters, 'Foucault and Frontiers', 138, 156.
35. Didier Fassin, 'Humanitarianism as a Politics of Life', *Public Culture* 19, no. 3 (2007): 499.
36. Thomas Lemke, 'Biopolitics and Beyond. On the Reception of a Vital Foucauldian Notion', Available at: http://www.biopolitica.org/docs/Biopolitics_and_beyond.pdf. Last accessed December 16, 2017.

private actors making profit from migrants' forced immobilisation in detention centres, or modes of capitalisation on reproductive labour.[37] Ultimately, '[i]t is the labour involved in managing, facilitating and controlling migration that makes this an industry'.[38] Recent studies have contributed to this debate from a slightly different angle, focusing on the 'logistification of migration regimes' and on the governmental fantasy of a 'just-in-time and to-the-point labor migration'.[39] For instance, Altenried et al., have described the EU Hotspot Approach[40] as 'the channeling of turbulent, unpredictable, and autonomous movements of mass migration through "spaces of exception and governmentalized routes"'.[41] What is key to this literature is the commodification of migrant labour, and therefore logistification attends to the structures of intermediation – discursive and material – through which migrant life is subsumed to a bio-economic rationality.

The analysis of entanglements between biopolitics and racialisation has remained the most debated field of critical analysis. The literature on biopolitics – as deployed in migration and border studies, but also in security studies – has been criticised for the 'flickering presence' of race, its erasure through Agambenian readings of biopolitics or 'whitewashing' race in Foucauldian security studies.[42] As Alexander Weheliye poignantly argues,

> Bare life and biopolitics discourse not only misconstrues how profoundly race and racism shape the modern idea of the human, it also overlooks or perfunctorily writes off theorizations of race, subjection, and humanity found in black and ethnic studies, allowing bare life and biopolitics discourse to imagine an indivisible biological substance anterior to racialization.[43]

37. Ruben Andersson, *Illegality, Inc: Clandestine Migration and the Business of Bordering Europe* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014); Thomas Gammeltoft-Hansen and Ninna Nyberg Sorensen, eds., *The Migration Industry and the Commercialization of International Migration* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013); Nancy Hiemstra and Deirdre Conlon, 'Beyond Privatization: Bureaucratization and the Spatialities of Immigration Detention Expansion', *Territory, Politics, Governance* 5, no. 3 (2017): 252–68.
38. Sophie Cranston, Joris Schapendonk, and Ernst Spaan, 'New Directions in Exploring the Migration Industries: Introduction to Special Issue', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44 no. 4 (2017): 1–15.
39. Moritz Altenried et al., 'Logistical Borderscapes: Politics and Mediation of Mobile Labor in Germany after the "Summer of Migration"', *South Atlantic Quarterly* 117, no. 2 (2018): 291–312; Sandro Mezzadra and Brett Neilson, 'Extraction, Logistics, Finance: Global Crisis and the Politics of Operations', *Radical Philosophy* 178, March/April (2013): 8–18.
40. European Commission, 'Hotspot Approach'. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/european_migration_network/glossary_search/hotspot-approach_en. Last accessed October 8, 2019.
41. Altenried et al., 'Logistical Borderscapes', 292.
42. Alison Howell and Melanie Richter-Montpetit, 'Racism in Foucauldian Security Studies: Biopolitics, Liberal War, and the Whitewashing of Colonial and Racial Violence', *International Political Sociology* 13, no. 1 (2018): 2–19; Leila Whitley, 'The Disappearance of Race: A Critique of the Use of Agamben in Border and Migration Scholarship', *Borderlands* 16, no. 1 (2017): 1–23; David Moffette and William Walters, 'Flickering Presence: Theorizing Race and Racism in the Governmentality of Borders and Migration', *Studies in Social Justice* 12, no. 1 (2018): 92.
43. Alexander G. Weheliye, *Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014), 4.

In starting from the Foucauldian framework of biopolitics, critical literatures on border and migration studies have often approached race and the production of racialised bodies as derivative of a 'biopolitical cut' and have thus paid less attention to the constitutive role of race. Thus, the language of 'modern biopolitical racism' versus 'traditional forms of racism' also appears in critical work on migration.[44] This risks restating 'an ontological differentiation between ethnic and biopolitical racism, leaving the door open for the naturalization of racial categories and the existence of a biological sphere that is not always already subject to ethnic racism'.[45] To avoid the foreclosure of race, it is important to attend to the mechanisms of racialisation through which some subjects are labelled, hierarchised and differentially governed as 'migrants'. That is, more than focusing on the racialised body as such, there is a need to investigate the political technologies through which new distinctions and hierarchies of life are produced. We foreground the mechanisms of racialisation that are constantly reconfigured or what can be called a move from an ontology of race towards the 'how' of racialisation.[46] Alongside analyses that have highlighted the racialised definition of 'humanity', which has historically produced hierarchies between human, less-than-human and sub-human subjects, racialising assemblages can help attend to the reconfigurations and displacements that emerging technologies enact.[47]

The recent criticisms of the erasure, downplaying or whitewashing of race in the IR literature have drawn attention to the concerns raised in the work of scholars such as Ann Laura Stoler, Alexander Weheliye, Fred Moten or Jasbir Puar about the treatment of race in Michel Foucault's, Giorgio Agamben's or Hannah Arendt's writings. Jasbir Puar, for example, has proposed to recalibrate an analytics of biopolitics to attend to the effects of debilitation and incapacitation that biopolitical control has for racialised bodies that are prepared for maiming, impairment or wearing out.[48] For her, biopolitics 'deployed through its neoliberal guises is a capacitation machine' and thus her project is to contribute to developing a critical lexicon and analytical toolbox.[49] Similarly, we propose expanding our critical vocabularies by attending to the technologies of 'biopolitics multiple'.

Building on the heterogeneity of practices and administrative measures mobilised by state authorities for regaining control over migration, first, we explore how the 'hold' on migrants as a population is enacted in practice. Starting with enactments allows us to approach biopolitics not as a homogenous binary logic, but as plural technologies, which

44. For example, Mavelli, 'Governing Populations through the Humanitarian Government of Refugees', 818.
45. Weheliye, *Habeas Viscus*, 59.
46. For a fundamental contribution on this, see Sylvia Wynter, 'Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, After Man, its Overrepresentation – An Argument', *CR: The New Centennial Review* 3, no. 3 (2003): 257–337.
47. Weheliye, *Habeas Viscus*. Ann Laura Stoler, *Duress: Imperial Durabilities in Our Times* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016).
48. Jasbir K. Puar, *The Right to Maim: Debility, Capacity, Disability* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017).
49. Puar, *The Right to Maim*.

are simultaneously dispersed and connected, while being entangled with technologies of capitalisation and racialisation. Second, we also propose to move beyond the binaries of life/death, biopolitics/necropolitics. Even when heterogenous practices are analysed to supplement Foucault's conceptualisation of biopolitics, these are overlaid with the modified formula of making live/making die. Rather than adding a third term or a replacement term for biopolitics, we argue that it is more productive to attend to 'biopolitics multiple' in order to analyse not only different technologies of biopolitical control and their entanglements as in the third approach we have outlined, but the effects of their inclusive disjunction.[50] The following two sections start from our own encounters with, and attempts to understand, conceptualise and critically engage with technologies of biopolitical control in two different borderzones in Europe.

Extractive Biopolitics

Since 2015, Greece has been a fertile terrain for governing migration, as well as a space where new assemblages of security and humanitarian practices have emerged. With the progressive closure of the Balkan route and the signature of the EU-Turkey Deal in March 2016, Greece has been transformed from a space of transit into a space of protracted migration containment.[51] To address some of the challenges of managing migration in Greece, the EU and the UNHCR have implemented a centralised debit card system (the Refugee Cash Assistance Programme) to provide monthly financial support to asylum seekers.[52] The programme, which became fully operational in 2017, is currently led by UNHCR in cooperation with Catholic Relief Services (CRS) and the International Federation of the Red Cross for the delivery of a single type of debit card across the whole Greek territory.

In summer 2018, around 100 migrants occupied the offices of CRS/UNHCR claiming access to the debit card. They had been waiting for months to receive the card or to actually have money loaded onto the card. The protests went on for months in 2018. In their statement on the protests, the UNHCR highlighted the biopolitical apparatus of governing through the card: 'Every applicant's eligibility is assessed on the basis of date of entry in Greece, legal status and location before assistance can be provided, and this

50. According to Brian Massumi, 'inclusive disjunction' refers to the co-presence of a number of terms whose proximity renders them as both/and rather than either/or. Brian Massumi, 'National Enterprise Emergency Steps toward an Ecology of Powers', *Theory, Culture & Society* 26, no. 6 (2009): 153–85.

51. Anja Karlsson Franck, 'The Lesvos Refugee Crisis as Disaster Capitalism', *Peace Review* 30, no. 2 (2018): 199–205; Martina Tazzioli, 'Containment through mobility: migrants' spatial disobediences and the reshaping of control through the hotspot system'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 44, no. 16 (2018): 2764–79.

52. UNHCR, 'Cash Card Assistance'. Available at: http://donors.unhcr.gr/echo/en/category/cash-card-assistance. Last accessed December 16, 2017. Greece is not the only country where asylum seekers receive pre-paid cards, although it is the first in Europe where an EU-funded programme had been implemented. Refugee Cash Assistance Programmes have proliferated in the Middle East Region in response to the Syrian refugee crisis, in particular in refugee camps in Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey.

process can cause delays'.[53] The card is a technology of differentiation and access to assistance. However, the statement did not mention how the debit card controls refugees by disqualifying 'unruly' mobility and conducts. For instance, those who leave the islands to go to the mainland lose their right to the prepaid card. The same happens to those who do not accept living in the accommodation provided by the Greek authorities (refugee camps, apartments or hotspots) and who move to squats or apartments without an official rental contract.

Financial support is also a temporary measure, which is intended to assist migrants in transit through Greece and through the process of applying for asylum.[54] As the UNCHR explains, 'This card will not function and will be permanently deactivated if used outside of Greece'.[55] Access to financial support is subjected to an individual pre-screening procedure that determines if the applicant matches the eligibility criteria for cash assistance. The eligibility criteria apply to refugees who arrived in the country after 1 January 2015, who are registered by the Greek authorities and have a valid asylum card or Police notice, and who reside in the country.[56] While prepaid cards are seen by the UNHCR as technology to enhance refugees' autonomy, paradoxically, refugees are obstructed from the possibility to choose where to live in order to get the card.[57]

Thus, the cash card needs to be understood as a technology of biopolitical control, as only those migrants with an asylum card and who accept to live in reception centres can receive a card and the monthly top-up. Monthly 'verification' of their right to the card, including location, family status and asylum application status, means that some migrants are continually excluded or included in the system. Hence, access to the cash card is entwined with the production of profiles and categories of risk, such as potential terrorists. Refugees are subjected to 'social sorting',[58] so that the ones who benefit from financial inclusion are the ones who are governable. Ungovernable or unruly refugees become 'punished' either through exclusion from the prepaid card or through delays in the allocation of cards.

If the prepaid cards are deployed to govern migration and discipline mobility in similar ways to checkpoints and travel documents,[59] we also need to supplement this

53. UNHCR, 'UNHCR Concerned after Protesters Occupy Athens Cash Assistance Centre'. Available at: www.unhcr.org/gr/en/10460-unhcr-concerned-after-protesters-occupy-athens-cash-assistance-centre.html. Last accessed August 15, 2018.
54. Daniela Gabor and Sally Brooks, 'The Digital Revolution in Financial Inclusion: International Development in the Fintech Era', *New Political Economy* 22, no. 4 (2017): 423–36.
55. UNHCR, 'Access to Cash Assistance'. Available at:http://help.unhcr.org/greece/living-in-greece/access-to-cash-assistance. Last accessed November 8, 2018.
56. UNHCR, 'The Greece Cash Assistance'. Available at: www.unhcr.org/5a14306a7.pdf. Last accessed February 25, 2018.
57. See Martina Tazzioli, 'Refugees' Subjectivities, Debit Cards and Data Circuits. Financial-humanitarianism in the Greek Migration Laboratory', *International Political Sociology* 13 no. 4 (2019): 392–408.
58. David Lyon, ed., *Surveillance as Social Sorting: Privacy, Risk, and Automated Discrimination* (London: Routledge, 2002).
59. Beste İşleyen, 'Transit Mobility Governance in Turkey', *Political Geography* 62 (2018): 23–32; Polly Pallister-Wilkins, 'How Walls Do Work: Security Barriers as Devices of Interruption and Data Capture', *Security Dialogue* 47, no. 2 (2016): 151–64.

biopolitical deployment of the cards with an understanding of extractive technologies that turn refugees' bodies and their movements into quantifiable digital data. The use of financial tools for governing refugees 'creates digital footprints'.[60] Refugees become datafied, made legible as digital data, in order to be made governable. The literature on migration has already explored the wide-ranging and diverse practices of the datafication of migration[61] as well as the peculiar functioning of digital technologies in refugee humanitarianism.[62] Whether through biometric control or through mining vast swathes of data to produce risk profiles, the literature on datafication has focused on the intensification of control and the transformation of sites of sovereign decision.[63]

Yet, there is something else at stake in the deployment and use of prepaid cards, which concerns the nexus between biopolitics and political economy. We propose understanding the datafication of refugees' movements and lives as a biopolitical technology of extraction rather than simply 'social sorting' and inclusion/exclusion. Notably, in *Critique of Black Reason*, Achille Mbembe has associated the production of blackness to the production of a 'body of extraction'.[64] To some extent, the body of the refugee can also be seen as a surface of extraction of data and potential value. Ruben Andersson has used the notion of 'predatory economies' to describe extractive mechanisms that are at stake in the field of migration governmentality and that are not narrowed to the capitalisation over migrant labour force.[65] He questions 'how migrants and their bodies were rendered "useful" beyond their labor power', for instance by capitalising on 'migrants' lived time' and vitality.[66]

Mezzadra and Neilson have offered a helpful extension and rethinking of extraction by moving beyond the widely used sense that has associated it either with a sector of capital or with processes of 're-primarization' of economies in Latin America.[67] They point to the 'prevalence and strategic role of extractive operations in contemporary capitalism', highlighting that these are at play 'not only when the operations of capital plunder the materiality

60. Gabor and Brooks, 'The Digital Revolution in Financial Inclusion', 7.
61. Louise Amoore, *The Politics of Possibility: Risk and Security beyond Probability* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014); Dennis Broeders and Huub Dijstelbloem, 'The Datafication of Mobility and Migration Management', in *Digitizing Identities: Doing Identity in a Networked World*, eds. Irma van der Ploeg and Jason Pridmore (New York: Routledge, 2015), 242–60.
62. Katja Lindskov Jacobsen, *The Politics of Humanitarian Technology: Good Intentions, Unintended Consequences and Insecurity* (London: Routledge, 2015); Katja Lindskov Jacobsen and Kristin Bergtora Sandvik, 'UNHCR and the Pursuit of International Protection: Accountability through Technology?', *Third World Quarterly* 30 no. 8 (2018): 1508–24.
63. Didier Bigo, 'The (In)securitization Practices of the Three Universes of EU Border Control: Military/Navy – Border Guards/Police – Database Analysts', *Security Dialogue* 45, no. 3 (2014): 209–25.
64. Achille Mbembe, *Critique of Black Reason* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2017), 18.
65. Ruben Andersson, 'Profits and Predation in the Human Bioeconomy', *Public Culture* 30, no. 3 (2018): 413–39, 435.
66. Andersson, 'Profits and Predation in the Human Bioeconomy', 424, 26.
67. Neo-extractivism has been rearticulated in debates about post-neoliberalism in Latin America e.g. Maristella Svampa, 'Commodities Consensus: Neoextractivism and Enclosure of the Commons in Latin America', *South Atlantic Quarterly* 114, no. 1 (2015): 65–82.

of the earth and biosphere, but also when they encounter and draw upon forms and practices of human cooperation and sociality that are external to them'.[68] Extraction is therefore relevant to capitalist processes more broadly, including to the domains of finance and logistics. It captures the relations of appropriation and expropriation that capital establishes with its 'outsides'.[69] The literature analysing accumulation, extraction and the commodification of migrant lives has focused on the production of value as economic profit. Nevertheless, what remains partially under-theorised is the relationship between extractive technologies, biopolitics and forms of value generated through data collection and circulation and that centre on refugees' mobility as such. We explore the mechanisms of extraction that capitalise on refugees' mobility by rendering them into data.

While extraction has been used to render the operations of capital, we argue that the concept of extraction is particularly apt to reconnect analyses of biopolitics with political economy, while also supplementing the binaries of affirmative/negative biopolitics.[70] Contemporary biopolitical technologies also work through data extraction, which depends on infrastructures of circulation of the data collected from the refugees. Rather than filtering good and bad circulation, refugees' movements become a source of value by yielding data that is processed through digital infrastructures. Data extractive technologies do not entail more individualised surveillance. In Greece, once refugees are temporarily included in the prepaid card system, there is no particular individualised 'hold' on them. While refugees could potentially be tracked individually in real-time not only by the financial actors involved, but also by UNHCR and the NGOs that run reception centres and deliver the cards, UNHCR staff pointed out to us that data is not used for individual control or surveillance.[71] The debit card is not immediately understandable either as the extension of the 'migration industry' that exploits migrant labour or as financialisation through the inclusion of migrant populations within financial circuits of profit.[72] Such a focus on data extraction and on infrastructures of circulation draws attention to the multiplicity of political technologies through which migrants' lives are governed or what we call 'biopolitics multiple'.

Biopolitical technologies in the digital age increasingly rely on digital infrastructures that allow for the circulation and processing of data. These infrastructures are, however, difficult to set in place and to maintain. It is thus not surprising that humanitarian actors rely on financial institutions, which already have infrastructures of circulation, to deploy these in the government of refugee populations.[73] We see a dual movement between the

68. Mezzadra and Neilson, 'On the Multiple Frontiers of Extraction', 188.
69. Sandro Mezzadra and Brett Neilson, *The Politics of Operations: Excavating Contemporary Capitalism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2019).
70. Revel, 'Identity, Nature, Life: Three Biopolitical deconstructions'.
71. Research notes, 10 August 2018, Athens.
72. Financialisation is the 'process by which objects, practices, spaces and populations are converted into forms that are legible to financial institutions'. Rob Aitken, '"All Data is Credit Data": Constituting the Unbanked', *Competition & Change* 21, no. 4 (2017): 274–300.
73. UNHCR and Social Performance Task Force, 'Serving Refugee Populations: The Next Financial Inclusion Frontier'. Available at: https://sptf.info/images/Guidelines-for-FSPs-on-serving-refugee-populations-March2017.pdf. Last accessed October 30, 2017.

inside and outside of capital in the government of migration. It is not simply capital producing and transforming its 'outsides', but also humanitarianism incorporating its 'outsides', such as financial institutions, high-tech corporations and private actors.

Technologies of extraction are deployed to both supplement financial technologies of governing refugees' movements and to produce value. Value is not understood here in an economic sense as profit or commodification of migrant labour, but as generated through data. That is to say, data is not only about refugees' nationality, family situation, legal status and 'unruly' movements – this is the data collected during the registration and verification procedures for the debit card – but also the data about their transactions, purchases and mobility across the country. Value is connected to the potential and future uses of data to make refugees' populations knowable, as temporary consumers. Indeed, by transforming refugee populations into an object of knowledge and mapping their consumption trends, humanitarian actors produce data that has value for other actors who aim to render migrants legible. Data also becomes a source of value for humanitarian actors, while corporate actors render previously unavailable categories of population (partially) legible.

However, value also needs to be understood in relation to access to the infrastructures of digital circulation, which are produced and maintained by the financial partners in these projects. Through the datafication of refugees' movements and lives, humanitarian actors gain access to the infrastructures of circulation of digital economy, which are also infrastructures for the differential government of migration, by granting access to the cash assistance some of them and excluding others. This is not to say that the profit made from the commodification of migrants' bodies is not crucial in the 'migration industry'.[74] Nevertheless, our analysis of extraction shows that we need to move beyond the understanding of biopolitics as filtering 'good' and 'bad' circulation and 'social sorting', in order to grasp the modes of control that are at play. Data extraction renders refugee movements and conduct governable, while re-inscribing hierarchies and disparities between different categories of refugees. Overall, these extractive technologies do not replace other biopolitical technologies but are deployed alongside them. In the next section, we turn to yet another different technology deployed in the contemporary government of migration by moving to another site of experimentation – Calais.

Subtractive Biopolitics

The borderzone of Calais has long been a space of intensified biopolitical governmentality. Soon after the eviction of the Calais 'jungle' in October 2016, migrants had been encouraged to move to the newly established Centres of Hosting and Orientation (CAOs) located across France in order to submit their asylum claim.[75] Yet, for many of them, this temporary humanitarian solution was a 'spatial trap', as they risked being sent back to the first EU member state they entered where they had been fingerprinted

74. Gammeltoft-Hansen and Sorensen, *The Migration Industry*.

75. See, https://france3-regions.francetvinfo.fr/hauts-de-france/pas-calais/calais/an-apres-demantelement-42-migrants-jungle-ont-obtenu-asile-1352025.html. Last accessed November 25, 2019.

on the basis of the Dublin Regulation. In just a few weeks after the eviction of the Calais camp in 2016, hundreds of migrants returned to Calais from the CAOs, escaping what they saw as the trap of hosting centres. Since then, migrants in Calais have been subjected to arbitrary police arrests, even if they had acquired refugee status in another EU member state, and have been kept in detention for few days or weeks before being released again.

NGOs and organisations such as Human Rights Watch and La Cimade have reported that migrants are hindered from settling in Calais and from leaving any trace of their presence: tents and sleeping bags are destroyed by the police and migrants are attacked at night with pepper spray.[76] A Human Rights Watch report published in the summer of 2017 triggered media attention and a subsequent inquiry by the French Ministry of Interior. While much public attention was focused on the use of tear gas and violence by the riot police in Calais, the report also reveals the French government's accusations against humanitarian services that the latter 'create an implication of permanence (*un point de fixation*) and attract more migrants to the region'.[77] There have been constant attempts by the authorities to dismantle the material infrastructures put into place for supporting migrants by providing food and water, and allowing them to take showers. The Human Rights Watch report cites the account given by one of the migrants, a 15-year-old boy: '"They wake us up. Allez, allez," they say. But where can I go? After that, they come with spray'.[78]

While much of the attention has been on the destruction of material infrastructures and spectacular violence, another effect of these biopolitical practices is what we can call, following Puar, the debilitation of racialised migrant bodies.[79] This incapacitation of infrastructures and bodies needs to be supplemented by technologies of biopolitical control that keep bodies and infrastructures on the move. In fact, the whole governmental rationality of the Calais borderzone has been defined through the prevention of 'stabilisation'. Initially, this entailed refusals to provide showers, toilets and even allow NGOs to bring food to the migrants in Calais. What is interesting about the injunction to move (allez, allez), which one of the two opening quotes of this article encapsulates well – 'We are not there to harass and assault them, we are there to make them move' – is that it draws attention to biopolitical technologies that

76. Human Rights Watch, '"Like Living in Hell". Police Abuses Against Child and Adult Migrants in Calais', Human Rights Watch. Available at: www.hrw.org/report/2017/07/26/living-hell/police-abuses-against-child-and-adult-migrants-calais. Last accessed November 21, 2017; Passeurs d'hospitalités, 'Calais: nouvelles saisines contre les violences'. Available at: https://passeursdhospitalites.wordpress.com/2017/04/15/calais-nouvelles-saisines-contre-les-violences. Last accessed December 14, 2017; Maryline Baumard, 'A Calais, un retour des migrants sous haute tension', *Le Monde* 2017, Available at https://www.lemonde.fr/societe/article/2017/06/03/les-pouvoirs-publics-face-a-un-nouvel-afflux-de-migrants-a-calais_5138214_3224.html. Last accessed December 6, 2019.
77. Human Rights Watch, '"Like Living in Hell"', 13.
78. Ibid., 16.
79. Puar, *The Right to Maim*. Other scholars have used the language of the politics of exhaustion. Leonie Ansems de Vries and Marta Welander, 'Refugees, Displacement, and the European "Politics of Exhaustion"', Open Democracy. Available at: www.opendemocracy.net/mediterranean-journeys-in-hope/leonie-ansems-de-vries-marta-welander/refugees-displacement-and-europ. Last accessed November 20, 2017.

do not aim to stop, confine, identify or detain migrants. Rather, the police practices of rendering tents, blankets and sleeping bags unusable are indicative of a technology of continually making migrants move. This entails hindering and undermining migrants' life spaces *(lieux de vie)* and the very material possibility to stay in a given place.[80]

Thus, as NGOs and even government reports show, when migrants' sleeping bags are sprayed by the police in Calais, this is not an attempt to hunt down migrants, identify or register them. Rather, it is simply to move them from visible areas – for instance from the city centre of Calais – and to move them without driving them to a specific place. While we focus here on migrants in Calais, such a technology that consists in making migrants move is enacted by state authorities in many European cities, for example, in the Italian town of Ventimiglia, located at the French-Italian border.

More than debilitation or maiming, there appears to be a mode of biopolitical governing through non-governing, a politics of making move 'without any perspective of installation' and with no exact destination.[81] How can we account for modes of government through non-registration and the apparent withdrawal of the will to govern? Critical geographers have spoken of 'a continuum of violent inaction' to designate the effects of destitution and suffering generated on migrants as a result of state's active withdrawal.[82] Through such an expression they highlight forms of violence that are not spectacular and do not let live or make die, or at least not in a direct way. Our account of subtraction partially engages with such a perspective, while at the same time drawing attention to the ambiguities of the apparent state's withdrawal. Indeed, in Calais, a series of active interventions were required. As we illustrate later, what is at stake is not only a partial not-doing, but also pro-active engagement that is actualised through a multiplication of local decrees, national laws, police operations and resources to dismantle migrants' shelters, road blockages, as well as legal and infrastructural obstructions against locals who act in solidarity with the migrants.[83]

We propose to understand these technologies of biopolitical control as subtractive. In her work on architecture, Keller Easterling associates subtraction with 'building removal', which is not simply negative but develops 'active forms' of spatial reorganisation.[84] For Easterling, subtraction 'is not simply absence, but a moment in a set of exchanges and advances, aggressions and attritions that are part of most active organizations. They are capable of orchestrating the ebbs and flows – the appearance and disappearances – of buildings'.[85] While Easterling proposes subtraction as active rather than negative form, her use remains too closely wedded to destruction. For us, subtraction is important exactly because it is neither destruction nor production. Subtraction is thus not

80. Tribunal Administratif de Lille, 'Requête de référé liberté (L. 521-2 CJA)'. Available at: www.gisti.org/IMG/pdf/jur_requete_ta_lille_2017-03-13.pdf. Last accessed December 14, 2017.
81. Chowra Makaremi and Carolina Kobelinsky, *Enfermés dehors. Enquêtes sur le confinement des étrangers* (Paris, Éditions Du Croquant, 2009), 18.
82. Davies, Isakjee and Dhesi, 'Violent Inaction', 19.
83. Amnesty International, 'Targeting Solidarity: Criminalization and Harrassment of People Defending Refugee and Migrant Rights in Northern France'. Available at: www.amnesty.org/download/Documents/EUR2103562019ENGLISH.PDF. Last accessed: October 14, 2019.
84. Easterling, *Subtraction*, 2–3.
85. Ibid., 3.

equivalent to destruction and our aim is not to reintroduce a vocabulary of 'negative biopolitics' or 'necropolitics'. Mathematically, subtraction has addition as its opposed term. Etymologically, the verb 'subtract' is derived from the Latin *subtrahere*, 'to draw or drag from under'.[86] Subtractive technologies orchestrate the ebbs and flows of migrant lives. We propose to analyse subtraction as 'taking away terrain' from migrants. We understand terrain here in the sense proposed by Stuart Elden, as 'a relation of power, with a heritage in geology and the military, the control of which allows the establishment and maintenance of order'.[87]

Subtraction allows us to understand biopolitical government beyond demolition, eviction, confinement and stopping in the Calais borderzone. These subtractive technologies neither take life nor make live, even as they make living much more difficult. If their effects are debilitating, they do not operate through maiming. They also do not extract profit from the encounters with migrants. What is most surprising and disturbing about these technologies is that, in 'taking terrain away from migrants', they operate on mobility. Subtractive biopolitics leads migrants to undertake convoluted hyper-mobilities. That is, migrants are forced to reroute their trajectories and to do the same route multiple times. Taking terrain away from migrants goes beyond merely destructive operations; it is productive in an embodied and infrastructural sense – not allowing migrants to stay, destroying their collective spaces of life – and in a legal and political one – through the implementation of local decrees as well as by hampering access to the legal channels of asylum. Forced hyper-mobility is a means through which subtractive mechanisms are enacted and, simultaneously, one of the main effects it generates – as long as migrants are indirectly or violently hampered from staying.

While migrants are increasingly restricted in their tempos and autonomy of movement, this is not exactly a sort of being stranded, nor confined. It is also not simply a question of deceleration.[88] Rather, experiences of being stranded are combined with the disruption of migrants' movements and stay. This can take place through measures of forced mobility or mobility without an end point or goal; but it can also consist in temporal suspension – protracted moments of legal limbo or of indefinite wait. Subtractive technologies trouble the migrants' presence in space and hinder their mobility, not by (fully) blocking them but, on the contrary, by forcing them to undertake convoluted movements. These subtractive operations do not need to destroy infrastructures or maim bodies. Infrastructures themselves are rendered mobile, as in the case of mobile water or shower provision in Calais. To have access to food, water or even legal processes, migrants are made hyper-mobile.[89] For instance, between 2017 and 2018, migrants

86. Oxford English Dictionary, *'subtract, v.'*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
87. Stuart Elden, 'Land, Terrain, Territory', *Progress in Human Geography* 34, no. 6 (2010): 799–817, 804.
88. Vassilis Tsianos and Serhat Karakayali, 'Transnational Migration and the Emergence of the European Border Regime: an Ethnographic Analysis', *European Journal of Social Theory* 13, no. 3 (2010): 373–87.
89. Maire de la Ville de Calais, 'Arrêté portant interdiction des occupations abusives, prolongées et répétées de la zone industrielle des Dunes', Gisti. Available at:www.gisti.org/IMG/pdf/arrete_2017-03-02_calais-maire.pdf. Last accessed October 14, 2019.

stranded in Calais were forced to take food from volunteers at specific time slots in punctual sites and then to stay away from there for the rest of the day.[90]

Taking terrain away from migrants also entails that migrants are not only hampered in their mobility; more than that, their movements are accelerated, but in 'cramped spaces'.[91] On the one hand, these subtractive technologies concern the very possibility to move on, as well as to remain in a given place without being 'illegalised'. On the other, the erratic geographies that migrants are forced to undertake in order to reach a certain place, as well as the multiple 'bounces' migrants are subjected to at the internal borders of Europe show that mobility is used as a technology of biopolitical control that subtracts the autonomy of movement. Taking terrain away from migrants does not necessarily involve geographic fixation, although migrants are forced, directly or indirectly, to undertake certain legal and geographic paths, and not take others. The forced hyper-mobility that migrants experience in their so-called 'secondary movements'[92] in Europe is a subtractive operation that leaves asylum law in place, but subtracts access to it by obstructing migrants from applying and by preventively illegalising them.[93] It does not explicitly deny nor destroy access to asylum claims. However, claiming asylum requires a mode of localisation, and the establishment of a relation through registration, reporting, and data. Hence, hampering access to the asylum system or making it hard constitute modes of subtraction that end up in debilitating migrants.

To subtract is not only to take away the material infrastructures of existence, but also to use the law in a political-strategic way to take away terrain from migrants. Using the law as a subtractive technology means that certain actions are not forbidden or repressed but their conditions of possibility are rendered mobile and changeable. Subtraction relies on what appear to be 'innocuous details – an invisible build-up of neglect or a silent form of attrition,'[94] which nonetheless come to disrupt migrants' movements. Subtractive technologies mobilise small and apparently insignificant details that don't amount to open antagonism, destruction or death.

The judicial hearings conducted by the Court of Lille about the conditions of migrants in Calais can help shed light on how subtractive biopolitics mobilises the nuances of the law and builds on minimal differences. In fact, both NGOs and the French authorities refer to humanitarian measures, such as providing shelters, food and showers to migrants, not in an unconditional way (in support or against) but, rather by introducing spatio-temporal

90. Tribunal administratif de Lille, 2017 #4620.

91. William Walters and Barbara Lüthi, 'The Politics of Cramped Space: Dilemmas of Action, Containment and Mobility', *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 29, no. 4 (2016): 359–66.

92. 'Secondary movements' is an expression employed in EU documents to designate migrants' erratic routes across Europe that result from the spatial restrictions imposed by the Dublin Regulation, rejected asylum applications and push back operations. In our view, such an expression is highly problematic as it strengthens a representation of migrant journeys as linear routes – as movements from a point A to a point B.

93. For instance, by giving decrees of expulsion before they could lodge the asylum application.

94. Keller Easterling, *Extrastatecraft: The Power of Infrastructure Space* (London: Verso, 2014), Loc 2490.

delimitations. For instance, NGOs deployed in Calais demanded that migrants could access 'an emergency shelter within 48 hours' and open food distribution points for 'three hours every time' during the day, such as 'between 11:30am and 14:30pm' and 'between 6pm and 9pm'.[95] The Lille Administrative Court called for the implementation of showers and water points in the Calais area: the Municipality of Calais has been requested to decide, together with local organisations, 'the number and the exact location of water points and latrines' as well as access to showers.[96] In the end, the Prefecture and the Municipality let locals and NGOs bring food to migrants only in a specific site in the industrial area of the city, two hours per day in the beginning (from 6pm to 8pm) and then extended also to lunchtime (12 to 2pm). Until September 2017, the Municipality of Calais refused to install showers in the area, despite the Court judgement, as the showers were deemed to constitute a pull factor and points of stabilisation (*'points de fixation'*) for migrants to come to Calais.[97]

These spatio-temporal delimitations force migrants to become hyper-mobile between different sites and render the conditions of access to food, water and infrastructures mobile themselves. The NGOs change, the sites change, the times change. Food can be accessed in one site, medical care in another and at a different time, lunch elsewhere than dinner and so on. This subtractive 'hold' on migrants' lives is enacted not only by taking material and existential terrain away from migrants through police interventions; they also take place through legal, semi-legal and administrative restrictions in the access to basic needs. In Calais, 'police practices do not simply speak to an undoing of the very conditions of liveability, but of the destruction of conditions of collectivity'.[98] This also clearly emerges from the decrees of the Calais Municipality, which highlight the risks associated with migrant 'grouping' in some areas of the city.[99] Therefore, a gaze on the multiple fences, the police checks and the x-ray controls at the port of Calais enforced to prevent migrants from going to the UK and thus block their movements only partially captures the ways in which migrants' presence and movements are governed. Taking showers, sleeping and eating appear to be strictly conditioned upon detailed – but changeable – spatio-temporal restrictions. Subtraction is not only about taking away, but also about reorganising the terrains of liveability and collectivity.

Such a focus on legal texts that trace boundaries of humanitarian intervention sheds light on the peculiarity of the role of the law in governing migration through practices of subtraction. Local decrees and court sentences that address migrants' presence in Calais build and introduce minimal differences to establish the conditions and the extent to

95. Tribunal Administratif de Lille, 'M. X et les autres. Ordonnance du 26 juin 2017'. Available at: https://bloglandotavocatsnet.files.wordpress.com/2017/06/1705379.pdf Last accessed December 14, 2017.
96. Tribunal Administratif de Lille, 'M. X et les autres'.
97. Natasha Bouchart, 'Lettre au collectif des associations'. Available at:www.gisti.org/IMG/pdf/lettre_2017-03-09_calais-maire.pdf. Last accessed December 14, 2017.
98. Claudia Aradau, 'Performative Politics and International Relations', *New Perspectives* 25, no. 2 (2017): 2–8, 6.
99. Département du Pas-de-Calais, 'Arrêté du 2 mars 2017 de la maire de Calais portant interdiction des occupations abusives, prolongées et répétées de la zone industrielle des Dunes'. Available at: www.gisti.org/IMG/pdf/arrete_2017-03-02_calais-maire.pdf. Last accessed December 16, 2017.

which migrants can be the object of solidarity activities as well as of states' 'humanitarian' interventions. In this context, the strategic use of law hinges neither on the norm as 'the criterion of partition of the individuals'[100] nor on the exception. The introduction of minimal differences in municipal decrees and state documents does not in fact respond to the rationale of the exception, predicated upon neat boundaries between what is allowed and what is forbidden. Rather, it consists in deploying apparently innocuous legal details that subtract from the applicability of law itself. Subtractive technologies establish and fix differences, generate asymmetrical relationships and dispose bodies in space so that migrants are trapped in 'a lesser form of being'[101] through hyper-mobility. Indeed, forced hyper-mobility contributes, we suggest, to debilitate and harm those who are racialised as migrants.

Conclusion: 'Biopolitics Multiple'

This article has explored biopolitical technologies in the government of migration, which cannot be grasped through the making live/letting die couplet. We have proposed understanding the pluralisation, dispersal and proliferation of biopolitical technologies of migration control as 'biopolitics multiple'. Through this coinage, we have drawn attention to biopolitical technologies that are characterised by heterogeneity, but also that at the same time 'hold together' through a sort of inclusive disjunction: in fact, migrants' lives and mobilities are contained and obstructed precisely through such heterogeneity that often translates into a substantial opacity and disorientation for migrants and even NGOs. However, our conceptualisation of 'biopolitics multiple' is not limited to the field of migration. The analytical focus on migration and on two specific borderzones have enabled us to rethink biopolitical modes of governing in relation to infrastructures of mobility and circulation. Therefore, this article has made a twofold theoretical contribution to the critical literature on migration and analyses of biopolitics more broadly. Conceptualising extraction and subtraction as technologies of government has allowed us to analyse the biopolitical governing of migration beyond 'making live and letting die' or the filtering of good and bad circulation. However, focusing on extraction and subtraction does not mean ignoring power's grasp over life and death; rather, engaging with biopolitics multiple through the angle of extraction and subtraction helps to account for the peculiar and heterogeneous 'hold' over migrants' lives.

Firstly, focusing on the implementation of prepaid cards for refugees in Greece, we have explored the extraction of data and its circulation in digital infrastructures that connect humanitarian organisations and financial institutions. While a growing scholarship has explored the processes of commodification of the body and the modes of differential inclusion connected to extractive processes, we have drawn attention to extraction in relation to data circulation and refugees' mobility. New modes of cash assistance and debit card use in governing migration can be read as extractive technologies that datafy refugees' movements and enable access to the material infrastructures of digital

100. Michel Foucault, 'L'extension sociale de la norme', in *Dits et Ecrits*, ed. Michel Foucault (Paris: Gallimard, 2001), 74–9, 75.

101. Mbembe, *Critique of Black Reason*, 17.

economy. Secondly, through an account of migrant governmentality in Calais, we have highlighted different technologies of government that do not work either through 'making live' or 'letting die'. We have called these technologies subtractive, as they withdraw or 'take away' material, legal and existential terrain from migrants, while entrapping them in convoluted geographies of erratic movements.

In neither of these cases can we use the national territory-population nexus to grasp the peculiarities of biopolitics multiple. The focus on Calais has shown that migrants are governed not through constant monitoring, but through subtractive mechanisms that make their presence invisible to the citizens, while at the same time hampering the formation of collective subjects that could build spaces of life. The case of Calais has also foregrounded how migrants are spatially disciplined by being constantly displaced more than being managed into a defined space. In this respect, we suggest that further research can situate subtractive operations within a history of tactics of dissuasion, harassment and containment that migrants who arrived there have been subjected to. The implementation of financial-digital technologies in humanitarian interventions highlights a fundamental discrepancy between territorial governmentality and circuits of data exchange that have tangible and direct effects on migrants' lives.

By focusing on technologies of subtraction and extraction, we proposed to advance work that has challenged the binary oppositions that have tended to structure the literature on biopolitics: inclusion and exclusion, affirmative and negative biopolitics, making live/making die. In turn, by rethinking biopolitics in the light of political technologies used for regaining control over 'unruly' migration, it becomes possible to move beyond the binary opposition between migrants' agency and resistance on the one side, and migrant victimhood on the other. In fact, such a binary opposition does not capture the heterogeneous effects that political technologies generate on migrants' lives, as well as the tactics that migrants engage in. A more thorough engagement with migrants' struggles and practices of resistance against modes of subjection through extraction and subtraction could be the object of future research.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iD

Martina Tazzioli https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0866-7611