

Double opening, split temporality, and new spatialities: an interview with Sandro Mezzadra on ‘militant research’

INTERVIEW BY GLENDA GARELLI AND MARTINA TAZZIOLI

Let us start from the expression ‘militant research’. How do you understand it? Does it refer to theoretical work, to a work that happens in the realm of linguistic and conceptual production, or does it also imply a connection with the terrain of struggle?

When I think of militant research, of militant investigation, I tend to take the link with struggles for granted. This is what defines the very idea of militant investigation. There are of course many theoretical and political traditions in which the idea of militant research can be located. As far as I am concerned, coming from a background in the so-called Italian autonomist Marxism, the practice of militant investigation is linked to the experiences of the early sixties in northern Italy’s factories. If you look at that kind of historical conjunction, it is pretty clear that there was a unique situation in which it was possible to produce a kind of virtuous circle between struggles, militant investigations, production of new concepts, new theoretical language, and, again, struggles. And the concept itself of struggle was tested in that experience. One of the basic findings of the first militant investigations at Olivetti and at Fiat was that those workers’ behaviours such as individual acts of sabotage or absenteeism, which had been considered un-political up to that day, were in fact deeply political expressions of refusal and in themselves struggles. So there was this attempt to go beyond current definitions of struggle. This was not totally new; there were important experiences of militant research in the US in the 1950s: in Detroit with the group Facing Reality or with some important sociologists like Alvin Gouldner, for instance. These experiences were exploring new landscapes of workers’ behaviours and practices that were clearly linked with processes of individualization. And problems with unions emerged often. But in such experiences there was an attempt to discover a new concept of the political, to put it ironically, so this was an important point in the first experiences of militant investigation in Italy and it remains crucial today. I think that one of the questions that are at stake in any militant investigation is precisely the meaning of struggle, the meaning of the political, and this is even more true in the context of migration. There were of course also other important topics at stake in these experiences of militant investigation: the very concept of ‘class composition’ came out of the virtuous circle that I was evoking before. So independently from the discussion on the topicality of the concept of ‘class composition’ today, I think that this double opening of militant research is still very important. With ‘double opening’ I mean:

on the one hand, to put it metaphorically, an opening toward the bottom, towards struggles; on the other hand, I mean an opening toward the production of concepts and theoretical innovation. This is what defines militant investigation for me.

During our London workshop you talked about the notion of organizing as something very delicate and suggested that its relation to militant investigation is something to think through.

First of all there is something to keep in mind linguistically. When you are speaking of ‘organizing’ in English, you are thinking first of all of trade unions and labour struggles ... you may have community organizers but genealogically I think the figure of the organizer comes from unions and more generally from the labour movement, so it is something different than the figure of the activist. The distinction between organizer and activist is something that you don’t have in Italian. For me militant investigation is a tool for organizing, but this is a very abstract statement and you have to work the details to understand what it means. Militant investigation is an attempt to localize, within a specific situation, the points around which practices of organizing and struggle can match. This is a very important aspect of militant investigation. But you are also confronted with the problem of the subject of militant investigation, the kind of role which is played by the militant investigator, and the political bet here is to develop militant investigations on a plane of immanence, to play with the concept of Gilles Deleuze. But saying this I do not mean that organizing can be totally resolved in the field of immanence, in absolute horizontality. The very image I was using before (the localization of the points around which processes of organizing can develop) points to a kind of ‘crease’ on the plane of immanence, it points to kind of a rupture in the linear temporality of experiences that you are investigating from a militant point of view. So two metaphors, one is spatial and the other is temporal. How to negotiate this kind of very weird temporality and spatiality is of course one of the most important questions that we need to ask in militant investigations. And let me add that the temporal aspect is particularly important here: a militant investigation should always aim at identifying the conditions under which the very experience of time—time of domination as well as time of struggle—becomes a fundamental stake of political and social conflict.

So you are saying one of the tasks of militant investigation is to produce ruptures?

Yes, it is the ability to locate and consolidate the possibility of ruptures. You don’t produce ruptures through militant investigations but what you can do is to work toward the localization of the points in spatial terms and the moments in temporal terms of a potential rupture. I am talking about rupture in a very general sense. ‘Rupture’ means: something happens and after that things are not as they used to be before.

Could you maybe give us a couple of examples of these ruptures within the field of militant investigation on migration? During the London workshop we organized a panel around the titles of some books which, for us, functioned as these gravity

points towards ruptures. When you wrote Right to Escape,¹ for instance, you framed it as cutting through a very complex reality; through a sort of conic gaze ...

Yes, in general terms I agree and support this kind of perspective. At the same time one has to be a bit cautious and I'll tell you a very simple anecdote. I published *Right to Escape* in 2001, and it was an important moment in the development of migrants' struggles in Italy: in 2001 and 2002 there were these great mobilizations against the Bossi-Fini laws² and there was a campaign against detention centres with militant actions all over the country including a big demonstration in Turin in November 2002—it was the biggest demonstration against detention in Europe of the past decade. Then I continued to write on migration, as you know, and in 2006 the publisher suggested to make a second expanded edition of *Right to Escape*. I was of course enthusiastic about the idea and he sent to me a proposal for the cover of the book: the cover was a big migrant demonstration staging the banner 'Right to Escape'. I said to the publisher: No, you cannot put this on the cover of the book. It is just an anecdote, but it tells you something of the tricky aspect of thinking of a linear implementation of some theoretical frameworks and even militant investigation. So you have to handle this with care, to valorize the gaps, work through the gaps, and never think a book may produce the struggle. And even if it happens, struggles are always something different; things which need to be interrogated according to their own principles, to put it philosophically.

This is a very important point. But when we asked the question, we had in mind the opposite direction of the movement: we were not thinking of struggle developing from a book; we were instead thinking that maybe you came up with the idea of a 'right to escape' because you were situated within a struggle, you were part of migrants' struggles.

Yes, of course. But again you have to think back to what I was saying about the virtuous circle of the sixties, because this is an important kind of model but you don't have to take it too literally. So take that particular book, *Right to Escape*: was it a militant investigation? It's hard to say because it is a highly theoretical book, which however came out of a decade of engagement with migrants' struggles, particularly in Genoa, the city where I was living in the 1990s. I could not have written the book without that involvement. So in this sense there is a lot of militant investigation in that book, and the very idea of 'right to escape' as well as my emphasis on the subjective side of migrations was a lived experience that, with many comrades and friends, I contributed to shape. So again it is not simply a kind of reflection of that particular experience. The experience itself was ridden by tensions, by conflicts, and the book has also a kind of individual side, although this particular individual, myself, was part of a collective. So you always have to negotiate these very elusive boundaries. Being aware of this helps not to fall into the kind of representation trap that has been so effectively illustrated by Gayatri Spivak. Or at least this is what I hope ...

Was this engagement that you speak of that of a militant and/or of someone who was doing militant investigation?

I never did ‘research’ on migration in Genoa. Academically I was doing something totally different at the time; I was working on German constitutional history. And politically I came from more than a decade of ‘autonomist’ militancy. When I started to get involved in movements and struggles of migration, in the early 1990s, those struggles changed my own political imaginary, the way in which I was thinking of politics and of being a militant. Retrospectively, it was one of the most important political experiences in my life in the sense that it was productive of a real displacement. And with a certain delay in time, it also changed the agenda of my research work.

What would you say is the specificity of a militant investigation on migration today?

Well, this is a very important question. I don’t think there is a kind of universal answer to the question. What is definitely true is that the work I have been doing with many others on migrations points to ... let’s say ... to the density of the migratory experience, it points to the ability of migration as a social movement to produce its own spaces both in very general terms—just think of the debate on transnationalism—and in more localized terms—the way in which migrations change the urban space ... I am thinking for instance of the work done by Nicholas on the migrant city³ which is very inspiring for me. So this posits peculiar challenges for those involved in militant investigation on migration because what needs to be investigated is a process of production within which of course subjectivity is at stake. So in very general terms I would say that this is a very important point to be theoretically reflected on in practices of militant investigation on migration.

Do you think that today this virtuous circle between ‘struggle’ and ‘theory’ is at play somewhere, and what may its limit be? And do you see that there is a distance between the struggle of migrants and the struggle of people who are trying to support migrants?

Regarding the first question, at the beginning of the interview I was stressing that what happened in Italy in the early sixties was due to a unique historical conjuncture. Today it may be even dangerous to have that particular circle in mind as a goal to be achieved because the conditions were really unique ... just think of what the labour movement was in Italy, I mean it was a couple of years after 1956 ... the pace of so-called internal South-North migration in the 1950s and 1960s was extremely high, which made the situation really explosive. And I think that—and this is a point of disagreement with some comrades and friends—it does really not make any sense to have that particular virtuous circle in mind as a goal for the present. Everything is much more complicated, but maybe also much more interesting. So you don’t have to look for linear kinds of realizations of that model. Nevertheless, I think that the idea of a circle

struggle-investigation-theory-struggle still continues to spur the radical imagination in many parts of the world. I think there are some places in which there were partial tests of this. It's not easy to give you an example ... Let's take Argentina, for instance, a place I know very well as I have been working there for more than 10 years, developing a deep and productive relation with the people of the Colectivo Situaciones in Buenos Aires. They worked on militant investigations in a way that is quite peculiar. One could say that they intervened in situations basically after the moment of struggle and more in the sense of contributing to a kind of consolidation of the situation itself and to a production of knowledge from within that situation. It is difficult in this case to say if this has been an implementation of the model we were discussing before but maybe it is not so interesting to put it in this way. It's more complicated, there is no linearity. Let me give you just one simple example of the type of work they do: it's really that there is a school in the neighbourhood of Moreno, in the periphery of Buenos Aires, and the school is dismantled and there is a collective of teachers, parents and students who decide to take the school over and self-manage it. After this, a relationship with the Colectivo Situaciones starts. The Colectivo tries on the one hand to support that experience and on the other hand to extrapolate from that particular experience some kind of conceptual consequences. Or take the example of the Piqueteros. Of course the comrades of the Colectivo were part of the movement of the Piqueteros, participating in the demonstrations and so on, but the real militant investigation within the movement of Piqueteros happens after 2001 with the MTD (Movimiento de Trabajaadores Desocupados) of Solano, which is again in the periphery of Buenos Aires. There was an encounter in struggle, which is a nice image ... I would describe the practice of the Colectivo as a multiplicity of encounters within struggles that open up the spaces for militant investigation, which is a very interesting model. You also have to keep in mind that this practice is predicated not merely on the Italian workerist tradition but that there is a whole tradition of *educación popular* in Latin America that plays a very important role in the forging of a methodology of political intervention and militant investigation. But in this case it is difficult to use this idea of the virtuous circle, although—again—I do not think this is really important.

The question of distance ...

This is a difficult question ... so many times we have met at European Social Forums or other transnational events to speak about migration and there were no migrants at all or just a few—this is more the rule than the exception and this is a problem. From a pragmatic point of view in my experience this was not such a big problem until the people involved had a real background of daily political work with migrants on a daily basis. But then this daily background started to be missing and it became a huge problem. We can talk for hours about procedures and practices that rule access to voice and to political activity. These devices of inclusion and exclusion are not only the usual ones like race and gender ... of course these are important but there are also other kind of problems, like money, the kind of daily life one has. For example, we had dramatic and, to a certain

extent, even successful migrants' struggles in the logistics in the last few months in northern Italy. If you take a migrant who works in the logistics in the region of Bologna for 10 hours a day and has one free day a week, he is not necessarily keen to go to London to discuss migrant struggles in Europe on that one day. The problem you were mentioning resonates with another problem and it is the problem of the distance between migrant struggles and other social struggles. So I think it would be particularly interesting for instance to do militant investigations on the new occupations in Rome where a majority of the squatters are migrants but they share not only the building but also the processes of political organization with subjects who are not migrants. I am mentioning Rome not by chance: in Rome there is an important tradition of struggle for housing and occupations. The intervention of migrants changed not only the composition but also the practices of occupation struggle. And there are experiences of occupation also in other Italian cities, although these experiences are often informal—not as organized as the last occupations in Rome. If you read Chatterjee's *Politics of the Governed*⁴ many traces of what he describes in Calcutta can be found also in Italy, although with many differences: clientelism, there are flats that are squatted and rented, so it's a very spurious practice, although crucially important. Of course the more politicized experiences of occupation confront the problem of clientelism but also try to negotiate it, so you will not find clientelism in political occupations. These experiences are really important, not the occupations of buildings by political militants, political activists, but socially spread practices that can crystallize in a political occupation. Here the role of migrants has been very important in continuously pushing this issue of housing that nowadays is a catastrophic question for many people—not necessarily only migrant but also many people who are Italian citizens. One may say—to disseminate some optimism—that migrants were able to open up or reopen a question, the question of housing, which does not only concern migrants.

Going back to when you mentioned that migrants are a social movement producing new spatialities and that this is what militant investigation may want to focus on. The concept of the 'autonomy of migration' contributed to underline that migrations are a social movement ... now it seems like an emphasis on space is adding to this understanding of migrations as a social movement ... could you expand on this spatial dimension?

Yes, spatial issues have become more and more relevant in the past few years especially in the work I do with Brett Neilson. And in a way I could say that one of the basic ideas of *Border as Method*⁵ is that we are currently confronted with a kind of spatial turmoil, with a situation in which spatial categories can't be taken for granted anymore ... Maybe in 20 years there will be new spatial categories and partitions but nowadays we are living in this moment of spatial rearrangement, of spatial eruption, and in this moment many spatial categories that play an important role for social sciences and economic theory—just think of centre/periphery or international division of labour—need to be tested ... I don't want to say that they have nothing to say anymore, there are of course still situations where you can recognize a centre and a periphery, but these concepts do not point

anymore to stable kinds of partitions. So this is a situation in which the production of space comes to the fore ... in a way one of the basic things we are doing with *Border as Method* is to ask ourselves which are the kinds of antagonisms, the kinds of conflicts, the kinds of struggles, that characterize these moments of production of space. And migration plays of course an outstanding role in this process of spatial restructuring, within which, as you rightly said, Brett and I reformulate the autonomy of migration approach. On the one hand, the capacity of migrations as a social movement to produce space; on the other hand, the seminal role played by the control of mobility in the restructuring of power, of government, governance, governmentality, sovereignty, these are all categories at stake in this process. So mobility also provides an angle on the processes of governance and governmentality, on their connection and disconnection with the logics of sovereignty. Also the idea of border struggle is an idea that comes out of this theoretical conjunction.

One of the issues we have been discussing from the vantage point of our experience in Italy and in Tunisia is that there is actually a lot of militant research around these issues across the Mediterranean shores, to the point where it feels like an aesthetization of both militancy and research—a 'militant tourism' so to speak. There is on the one hand this notion of participating in struggles as tourists or as observers of the struggle while you are also trying to be contributing or to be part of these struggles ...

I know these problems very well; I have been negotiating these problems for 30 years. I remember in the eighties with the solidarity campaigns with Nicaragua and then Salvador, I spent two months in Salvador in 1992 soon after a peace agreement was signed, it was a very important political experience for me but still I was asking myself in which capacity I was there. This was a problem I had clearly in mind as I never went to Nicaragua in the early eighties after the Sandinista revolution and, while all my friends went, I never went exactly because I felt unease. What came to my mind while you were speaking—and what I consider to be a good balance of this negotiation—is Bonnie Honig's book *Democracy and the Foreigner*,⁶ where she speaks of xenophobia producing an image of the migrant as somebody who comes to take something and xenophilia as something that produces the image of the migrant as someone who comes to give something. I think that we could follow Bonnie Honig in the criticism of both these images, saying: it is a problem if you go to Tunisia thinking that you have something to give and it is also a problem if you go to Tunisia if you think you have something to take; you have to give and take at the same time, and it is only this kind of balance that makes an experience in Tunisia, in your case, politically valuable. This was the kind of experience I had in Argentina in the last few years. This is of course an abstract way to put it, but I think it gives an idea because there are many people who go there because they think they have something to give (the 'political line' for instance) but also many people, maybe the majority today, who go there because they want to learn. This second attitude is for me as problematic as the first one!

Going back to the nineties and being a militant struggling with migration, and then a book like Right to Escape being written somehow after this experience: what about the situation where you are conducting research at the same time as being involved in a struggle?

First of all remember that I said that it is not easy to talk about militant investigation. I can define my work as such only in very general terms. I have never been in the position you describe: until the mid-nineties my academic work was on Germany between the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, and for good reasons, for political reasons, as it was not possible in Italy in the 1980s to do what you are doing now as PhD students, and it was even less possible if you had a militant background as stigma. If you wanted to try an academic career you had to be very cautious in the choice of your topic at that time in Italy. This does not mean that I did not have a genuine interest in what I was studying. But I have to stress that until the mid-1990s there was a kind of split in my life, research and political engagement were quite accurately separated. So I did not have the personal experience you describe.

Focusing on knowledge production: you have been doing research on migration in these past few years and you are situated in an academic institution. At the workshop in London you quoted the Workerists' idea of working 'within and against'. What does it mean to be 'within and against' in an academic context, what does it mean especially in terms of knowledge production and the role of knowledge in migration governance?

These are different questions. In very general terms, I think that the point is to be able to use academic settings, positions, funding in order to open the production of knowledge regarding migration; opening it on the one hand toward a radical stance and on the other hand toward the involvement of subjects who are usually excluded from the production of knowledge upon which both migration management—as they used to say—and even critical migration studies are based. This is a very important point for me. In the research projects I have been doing on migrations I always try to do that. So the old workerist phrase 'within and against' acquires a very mundane and important meaning. How is it possible to do such work if not within and against? I really think that in this case there is no outside, you are implicated, you are involved and you are to negotiate these implications. I remember for instance when we did an event related to one European research project in a social centre in Bologna. We had a very interesting discussion with the people of the social centre and with some of the migrants who meet in the social centre and who participated in the event. If you organize such an event in a social centre you make a political contribution to this particular space because the event legitimizes it in a way. We invited people from the municipality, from the EU Commission, at a time when people in the social centre were struggling against eviction, so it was important. On the other hand, this was also a way to share some funding, involving a structure like a social centre or a coordination of migrants. You need to be aware of the fact that you are implicating a social centre—originally a squatting social centre—in the machinery

of European governance, you are doing that. Let's speak about the meaning of that involvement: it is in a way dangerous but at the same time you can amplify contradictions. So this is an example of what I mean using the old phrase of Mario Tronti, 'within and against'.

We have been witnessing a lot of research, self-defined militant research, on migration in these past few years. Our impression is that there has been a lot of important work on the juridical front—very important indeed in the attempt to map possibilities to break through the bordering character of laws. However, we wonder if there isn't somehow a fixation on the legal ...

I got it. Let me start by saying something else that maybe also links to other conversations we had on counter-mapping. Over the weekend when I was in Paris I was thinking about the critical use of maps and the peculiar French tradition of critical cartography—the most prominent example being the cartographers of 'Le Monde Diplomatique'. I was in a bookshop in Paris and saw a book by Hervé Le Bras and Emmanuel Todd,⁷ a book on the social predicament of France, illustrated through maps, so there were maps on income, on health, education, etc. Of course these maps are wonderful, but at the same time they look like Google Earth. These cartographers work on the representative side of mapping aiming at a total transparency. This is something that has to do with your question. If you think of some of the most important maps on migrations in France—starting with the map on detention by Migreurop⁸—we see what you were saying about the recent focus on the legal in militant investigations on migrations: they are helpful, maybe necessary, but politically they are quite empty, they emphasize the representative power of maps, they lose sight of what is not possible to represent which is probably the most important aspect of the topic at stake. You know very well the debate about mapping migrants' routes ... well, it's the police who do that, isn't it? So you always have to negotiate this. If you take the other well-known map of the Gibraltar Strait⁹ it was a very different attempt, the attempt to work at the limits of representation. I think that counter-mapping should work at the limits of representation and this is what the cartographers I was mentioning before don't do. If you take this idea of transparency you are linked to law as law is constitutively connected with the idea of making everything transparent. The way in which I have been working with Brett on law seems productive to me in this sense ... you may know I have this perversion: I read a lot on legal theory, it comes from my background in German constitutionalism. So what we have been doing in the last few years and you'll find in *Border as Method* is to take this idea of a new legal pluralism seriously, especially in the way it is analysed by Gunther Teubner, who tests the boundary of the legal norm. What is interesting from the point of view of our discussion is the idea that the purity of the legal norm is challenged and so the norm is open toward technical standards, toward economic rationality, toward humanitarian concerns and so on. If you follow this idea you have an angle from which you can stress the importance of law but at the same time you are compelled to challenge the autonomy of law itself. So from the point of militant investigation you cannot limit your investigation to the legal aspect.

This claim to transparency is ever more present in the governance of migration. The campaign against Frontex started as 'FrontExplode'—so Frontex should not exist—and now the new campaign is 'FrontExit' and is centred on transparency.

This is weird because on the one hand it is better to have transparency in a detention centre rather than not. On the other hand, transparency and accountability are pillars of neoliberal governmentality. Sitting around a table here it is easy to say but then in practice it is much more difficult. Think of detention centres in Italy ... a bit of 'transparency' would be definitely good for migrants but at the same time it could be a step towards perfecting these centres. So is it possible to think of this split temporality—you struggle for transparency and at the same time you are able to keep open the political struggle for the abolition of detention? This is very difficult in my experience. What I am talking about is *not* a double temporality: let's first reform the detention centre and then, at a later time, we'll close them. It is a *split* temporality in the sense that you are yourself split in the moment in which you negotiate with the municipality in the city where you are living about the conditions of detention in the centre and in the very same moment you are struggling for the abolition of detention.

Going back to the notion of struggles and investigations: what struggles and research directions do you think are currently challenging the Euro-Atlantic canon through which migration is being thought?

For me, of course, the Latin American case is particularly important and what is interesting is the possibility of linking movements and struggles of migration on the one hand and the emergence of a new regionalism. I am very interested in this idea of critical regionalism as Gayatri Spivak put it. Also in Asia there are interesting works on that, for instance the work by Ranabir Samaddar *The Marginal Nation*¹⁰ on transborder migrations between Bangladesh and West Bengal is an outstanding work in critical migration studies, also for this kind of spatial take on the idea of region, the construction of region, because region itself emerges as a contested construction. And also the work by Pun Ngai on internal migration and factory work in China¹¹ is a very important reference for me. More generally I think that we need to learn more about experiences of mobility and displacement outside the Euro-North Atlantic space, challenging the way in which—once again—particular experiences have come to shape the 'universal' categories employed within migration studies.

You've been working with other people; not just writing on your own. We wanted to get your perspective on the tensions, difficulties and struggles in communal intellectual work.

That's a wonderful question. I find writing alone more and more boring. Sometimes I have to do that but I really like writing with other people. I have written with many people, this is why I am so excited about the *New Keywords* project,¹² because it is an experiment in collaborative writing and not only collaborative working. It is crucial to be aware of the challenges that are

connected with collaborative practices and manage them on a daily basis. There are different ways of writing together. There is the most common one, you discuss together, and then split the work and then paste the work together, this is the easiest way to do it and so the most common. And this is the reason why I am so happy to have encountered Brett, we do it in a completely different way, which means that we sit in front of the computer and write each sentence together. You need a lucky encounter, not just an intellectual encounter, because writing is connected with neurosis and so on. Of course with Brett we did not write 400 pages in this way but the most important parts of *Border as Method* were written like that, sitting in front of the computer and writing each sentence together. It was fun, it was also a lot of fun, while writing is not always connected with fun so you understand why I say it was a lucky encounter. And this experience also changed the way in which I write individually.

(Bologna, June 2013)

Notes

- ¹ Sandro Mezzadra, *Diritto di fuga. Migrazioni, cittadinanza, globalizzazione*, Verona: Ombre Corte, 2006.
- ² An immigration legislation passed in Italy in 2002, introducing the executive removal of undocumented migrants, expanding length of detention for undocumented migrants and linking residence permits to work permits.
- ³ Nicholas De Genova, 'The Migrant Metropolis', forthcoming, 2013.
- ⁴ Partha Chatterjee, *The Politics of the Governed: Reflections on Popular Politics in Most of the World*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.
- ⁵ Sandro Mezzadra and Brett Neilson, *Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2013.
- ⁶ Bonnie Honig, *Democracy and the Foreigner*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- ⁷ Emmanuel Todd and Hervé Le Bras, *Le mystère français*, Paris: Seuil, 2013.
- ⁸ Migreurop, *Encampment Map*, http://www.migreurop.org/IMG/jpg/map_18-1_L_Europe_des_camps_2011_v11_EN.jpg.
- ⁹ Hackitectura, *Cartografía del Estrecho*, <http://hackitectura.net/blog/en/2004/cartografia-del-estrecho/>.
- ¹⁰ Ranabir Samaddar, *The Marginal Nation: Transborder Migration from Bangladesh to West Bengal*, New Delhi: Sage, 1999.
- ¹¹ Ngai Pun, *Made in China: Women Factory Workers in a Global Workplace*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005.
- ¹² Collective Project, 'New Keywords—Migration', *Cultural Studies*, forthcoming, 2013.

Copyright of Postcolonial Studies is the property of Routledge and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.