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Abstract

The issue of immigration is one of the most debated fields in European politics, especially in terms of the interaction between a representational framework of identities and policy making instruments within legal structures. Within this context, Denmark poses a controversial example with its social democratic welfare model based on equal rights and universality, but also as a country which has been moving from a comparatively liberal stance on immigration towards a more conservative direction. The Danish parliamentary elections of 2001 and the following legal changes are one of the most important examples for this transformation.

The central aim of this thesis is to critically examine immigration governance in Denmark by focusing on family reunion. By examining the discursive transformation in immigration governance in Denmark, this research draws attention to the controversial dynamics in terms of the empirical gap between the ideational structure of policy making strategies and the definition of identities as a problem of the population. In order to reveal this gap, it proposes a methodological analysis which connects the top-down (political discourse on immigration) and bottom-up (subjectivation) analysis and generates a theoretical approach on the basis of a Foucauldian 'governmentality' framework. This framework focuses on problematisation of Danish immigration as a gendered and racialised discursive process by which borders between ‘included’ and ‘excluded’ are drawn.

By referring to ‘belonging’ as the main analytical concept, the governmentality framework in this research illustrates how a biopolitical governance of immigration controls and manages the population in Denmark through particular modes of subjectification. In connecting macro and micro level of analysis it shows how subjective interpretations of immigrants are shaped in face of truth discourses on immigration governance in Denmark. For doing this it refers to a narrative analysis of the data obtained by interviews with immigrant women as subjects to Danish immigration governance. Through this examination, this research ultimately aims to examine the interplay between governmental discourses and self-positioning of subjects. By revealing the complementary and contradictory discourses by immigrant women it challenges the way subjects are represented within immigration governance, and offers a deeper perspective to the politics of identity and immigration.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 The politicisation of immigration as a security issue in Europe and the construction of boundaries of belonging

In recent decades, the issue of immigration has become one of the most prominent fields in European politics. Today, immigration and the integration of immigrants are central topics of debate across the European Union (EU), right at the top of the political agenda of European electorates and European politicians. Parallel to this development, immigration is conceptualised as a security concern across Europe. Within the realm of immigration, the border between security, terrorism, immigration and social fear has become very thin, turning immigration into one of the greatest security concerns of the 21st century (Buonfino 2004, p. 23).

The politicisation of immigration is seen as the inevitable outcome of the unsolvable contradiction between the discourses of unity and plurality that democracy poses and that governments are faced with (Buonfino 2004, p. 24). Recently, these contradictions have been transformed into a general anxiety over the adaptation of immigrant groups to the social, political and economic arenas within oppositional discourses of multiculturalism and assimilation. At the same time, the views and policies of extreme right parties are no longer on the political fringe; on the contrary, they are incorporated into the security agenda of the EU and are represented by the policies of Conservative and Liberal governments within the member states (Fekete 2006, p. 2). Moreover, the move away from an overtly neo-fascist discourse to a more nationalist-populist one has allowed extreme right parties to expand their electoral support, which has paradoxically led to an increase of racist discourse in more diffuse
and subtle forms, up to the point of being expressed as the denial of racism (Kryzanowski and Wodak 2009, p. 1). In this context, immigration is identified as one of the main factors that weaken national traditions and social homogeneity (Huysmans 2000, p. 758). As a result, nationalism today is becoming more defensive about immigration and is defined by reference to immigrants and other marginalised groups, as opposed to the past when it was defined by reference to other nations (Kryzanowski and Wodak 2009, p. 2).

Alessandra Buonfino (2004, p. 23) argues that the securitisation of immigration is a construction which derives from the creation of boundaries between *us* and *others*, between *inside* and *outside*, as a result of which issues of solidarity, ethics and human rights become secondary to issues of security. In defining *us* as opposed to *them*, immigrants come to represent the *stranger*, somebody whose position is determined essentially by the fact that he did not belong to a particular setting from the beginning and therefore should actually be excluded (Buonfino 2004, p. 27). In today’s European politics this logic seems to find an explanation in monolithic conceptions of belonging. Accordingly, the boundaries between *us* and *them* are constructed within a *terrain of un-fixity* (Buonfino 2004, p. 25). This means that they are defined by ‘the construction of a discourse of collective identity, which conceives values as integral parts of such an identity (constructed, maintained and transformed in and through political struggles - social antagonism)’ (Buonfino 2004, p. 25). In this perspective, *othering* of immigrants exploits xenophobic frames such as ethnocentrism, male chauvinism and ordinary prejudices in subtle ways, with the ideas of cultural fundamentalism (Kryzanowski and Wodak 2009, p. 2). This contributes to the creation of a binarism between western, European, Enlightenment values and those of the *other* such as non-western and Muslim. (Fekete 2006, p. 8).
There is enough evidence that normalisation of *othering* is taking place at all levels of the discourse, ranging from media, political parties, and institutions to everyday life (Kryzanowski and Wodak 2009, p. 2). At the same time, especially since September 11th, almost every EU country has introduced restrictive policies such as citizenship reforms, revised its integration policies and brought in immigration laws that limit the rights of existing citizens or long-term residents to family reunification (Fekete 2006, p. 2). These restrictive policies can be seen as means of immigration control, which (re)emphasise and (re)negotiate monolithic constructions of identity. Through these legal/policy changes, various social issues such as protecting jobs, cultural differences etc. come to constitute the locus of identity problematic in terms of normalisation of boundaries between the *insiders* and *outsiders*.

Family immigration is a good example of dividing practices in the construction of *us* and *them* along certain values which are represented as European. For example the Netherlands were the first European country to direct a pre-arrival integration exam with a heavy emphasis on a mono-cultural Dutch identity at family reunion applicants (Fekete 2006, p. 4). Only non-EU immigration candidates had to take a civic integration test on their command of the Dutch language and their knowledge of Dutch history and culture (Letzioni 2007, p. 356). Similarly, in Germany applicants for citizenship had to pass a lengthy interrogation on their beliefs and attitudes towards religious freedom, equality of the sexes, promiscuity, freedom of expression, and the concept of honour and forced marriages (Fekete 2006, p. 5) Among the questions were: ‘Do you think a woman should obey her husband and that he can beat her if she is disobedient?’ and ‘How would you react if your son says he is homosexual and plans to live with another man?’ (Fekete 2006, p. 5). The main aim of the interrogation test was said to find out if the person who wants to become
German shares the fundamental principles and values of the state (Fekete 2006, p. 5). In Denmark, the Danish Aliens Act 2002 has removed the statutory right to family reunification on the grounds of wanting to secure the best possible base for integration to allow applications to be individually assessed especially to understand that a marriage was contracted voluntarily (Fekete 2006, p. 6) The UK also limited family reunification rights on the basis of a cultural argument, which represented immigrants with backward attitudes and oppressive practices against women (Fekete 2006, p. 6-7).

The above examples are not limited to Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands or the UK; there is a general restrictive trend across all the EU in terms of identity construction and immigration. Nonetheless, it is still not possible to talk about a common European approach and policy making to immigration, and heterogeneous patterns continue to develop among member states. In this perspective, despite the common securitisation of immigration, the degree and the form of othering depends largely on the institutional and historical characteristics of each state, which define the patterns of belonging through a set of discursive processes of classification. Here, immigration functions as a central site through which national communities are imagined and materially constructed (Vukov 2003, p. 363). The boundaries of imagined communities are generated in part through immigration policies (Vukov 2003, p. 363).

Accordingly, the articulation of immigration shape forms of politics that regulate the population and national borders along the lines of us and them, and securitisation of immigrants takes place in the articulation of those who are undesired within the national borders of a particular state (Vukov 2003, p. 363). Here it becomes important to examine how each state adapts legal and political structures to take the emergent
diversity and the perceptions as to what diversity means into account (Bellier 2008, p. 136). In this research, I am mainly interested in further investigating immigration governance as a terrain of identity articulation. Accordingly, I want to question how governmental policies and strategies of immigration are related to representations of collective identity that designate the borders between us and them. In this understanding I will refer to belonging as a central unit of analysis to question and critically examine how immigration is problematised as a discursive site through which communities are constructed. I will explore in what ways and how immigration as a political issue defines and articulated boundaries of belonging. By doing this, I will challenge the ways in which individuals are subjected to immigration governance through specific representations.

In this analysis I will focus on the impact of immigration governance from the perspective of immigrant subjects by drawing on Foucault’s power theory and governmentality framework. In terms of identity articulation and construction, immigration functions as the constitutive outside for the definition of self-identity (Mouffe 1993, p. 2, cited in Buonfino 2004, p. 28). In this study I will deconstruct immigrant identities within hegemonic discourses by revealing the multiple and fragmented forms of subjectivities among immigrant women in Denmark. Hence, this will constitute an attempt to create a new domain for a critical examination of diversity by putting emphasis on the re-conceptualisation of boundaries of belonging which are not limited within monolithic constructions.

This study involves a focus on different facets of immigration governance, which includes the perspectives of the marginalised-insiders and as well as the outside-perspective that includes a hegemonic identity discourse (Kryzanowski and Wodak 2009, p. 4). This duality is key for understanding the socio-political trend in
immigration governance and how immigration is constituted as a policy problem. Furthermore, it is central to the politics of belonging and the identity problematic. From this perspective this research will contribute to an analysis which examines the link between hegemonic discourses of identity and subjectification. In the following sections and chapters I will elaborate more how I build my theoretical framework on the work of Foucault and why I think it is useful for this research.

1.2 The case of Denmark: A laboratory of imagined boundaries of belonging within a restrictive trend in immigration governance

In this research I will offer an examination of Denmark as a single case study for the analytical model I will propose in the following chapters (Chapters 2 and 3), which will draw on a Foucauldian governmentality approach. Denmark poses an interesting and controversial example with its transformation towards a rather conservative direction in terms of its immigration laws in the last decade. The Danish parliamentary elections of 2001 are one of the most important examples for this change, as they were followed by radical legal changes on immigration legislation that brought in new rules for both newcomers to Denmark and non-national residents. Denmark’s immigration issue has been on the political agenda not only in its domestic politics; it also elevated to global notoriety in 2005 with the so-called Cartoon Crisis, which concerned twelve images of the Prophet Muhammad and which subsequently became a foreign policy issue.

Denmark is among the wealthiest countries in the industrialised world with a strong Scandinavian welfare model based on universality and social equality. At the same time, it has been adapting itself successfully to the challenges of the open market economy and neoliberal policies in the last decades. As a result it provides lessons on
the changing nature of the Scandinavian model with its adaptation to neoliberal principles and its increasing emphasis on the labour sector in terms of distributing benefits. Hence, marginalised groups such as immigrants and ethnic minorities are at the centre of debates concerning the equality principles that underlie the Danish welfare state and in terms of the extent to which they can qualify for these egalitarian principles.

These debates are worth examining, especially after the Liberal-Conservative Coalition came to power. In the 2001 elections, the Liberal Party (LP) (Venstre) emerged as the largest single party and formed a coalition government with the Conservative People’s Party (CPP) (Det Konservative Folkeparti). For a parliamentary majority in the intervening period, this coalition relied upon the support of the right-wing, anti-immigrant Danish People’s Party (DPP) (Dansk Folkparti). This was the first time the DPP, an enthusiastic supporter of restrictive immigration laws and an opponent to the EU on key issues became a significant player in Danish Politics. After the elections, the party has functioned as the government’s main coalition partner and was given five chairmanships and six vice chairmanships of parliamentary committees and the initiative to influence the reform packages with regards to the changing immigration policy (Rydgren 2005, p. 16).

The Liberal-Conservative coalition government introduced one of the most restrictive anti-immigrant policies passed by a Danish government in May 2002, the Aliens Consolidation Act (no.608). Later, in Chapters 4 and 5, I will explain the changes in Danish immigration law in more detail, but some of the noteworthy measures of the Act of 2002 are:

1. Refugee status will be granted only under stricter conditions (except those fleeing from war or famine);
2. Permanent-residence permits will be granted after seven years of residence, instead of three;

3. Residents are no longer permitted to bring in a foreign spouse under the age of 24 (raised from 18);

Spouses will not be allowed to join their partners in Denmark unless the couple has a sufficiently large income;¹

4. Applicants for Danish nationality must demonstrate the linguistic ability of a 14-year-old native;

5. Reunification with parents over 60 years of age is abolished (Roemer and van der Straeten 2006, p. 253).

With the introduction of the Aliens Consolidation Act 2002, Denmark became the country with the strictest family reunification legislation within the EU (Fekete 2006, p. 6); the law therefore received a lot of criticism from various interest groups, other EU member states and the United Nations (Gulicova-Grethe and Yahirun 2004, pp. 4-5). At one point, the Council of Europe’s Commissioner for Human Rights, Alvaro Gil-Robles, described Danes as ‘primitive nationalists’ (Fekete 2006, p. 3), and the UNHCR (The UN Refugee Agency) criticised the declaration of loyalty,² which was introduced by the new government by saying that it was formulated in a way that created the anticipation that foreigners will not respect certain values that are fundamental in a democratic society, and that they will commit the type of crimes mentioned in the declaration (Fekete 2006, p. 3). The Danish Institute for Human Rights has warned that the new law, which removed family reunification from a

---

¹ The person who is residing in Denmark had to provide 50,000 Danish kroner (circa 6,700 Euros) to cover any public expenses to support the spouse in 2006 Aliens Act, but this amount has been subject to adjustment and has increased each year.

² This is a condition for naturalization and stipulates that the applicant swears loyalty to Denmark and the Danish Society and declares his or her willingness to observe Danish legislation and to respect fundamental Danish principles of law.
rights-based framework, allowed for considerable administrative discretion, enabling state officials to act unimpeded on their suspicions on Muslims (Fekete 2006, p. 6).

Even when the general restrictive trend and the securitisation of immigration throughout Europe is considered, the conservative policy changes in Denmark seem to be extraordinary. In this sense, while these policies do not constitute an exception to the general trend, Denmark can still be counted as the most restrictive country within the EU, especially in the area of family reunification. In this thesis, I will discuss how this restrictive trend is connected to the Danish national imaginary with regards to a collective identity. This will include an exploration about how Denmark has gone furthest in terms of demands for conformity to an unchanging and homogeneous cultural norm (See Kofman 2005, p. 462).

What makes Denmark a fascinating laboratory with regards to identity politics is also the debatable combination of Scandinavian universalism and exceptionalism. Being one of the most egalitarian countries in the world with a high standard of living and with a traditional self-perception of being a humanitarian global actor, Denmark’s social interpretation of the welfare state as universalist seems to be paradoxical with regards to its relationship with its non-EU immigrants. The clash between universalist values and representations about immigrants together with the opposition to immigration provoke questions on the inclusiveness of non-EU immigrants to these universal values. In order to further examine this clash, it is important to understand how immigration has become a problem through the language of culture in which cultural difference defines a specific otherness and also became the central topic of debates of immigration, overriding other social considerations.

From a general perspective the debate about exceptionalism often focuses on the limits of the rule of law (Huysmans 2004, p.324). Exceptionalism may vary according
to its scope: it may refer to a number of policy areas subjected to exceptional measures, or to the degree to which these measures are confined within specific institutionalised areas such as a detention centre (Huysmans 2004, p.329). The exceptionalism referred to in this thesis concerns the area of immigration and focuses on the exceptional measures for family integration. I prefer to elaborate it within the Danish context as the paradox of *liberal egalitarian universal welfarism* versus *conservative xenophobic immigration securitisation* throughout this study.

In this perspective while I acknowledge the validity of other case studies to apply within in the field of immigration, I argue that Denmark is especially worth examining as an interesting example of how the culture argument in identity politics in contemporary Europe dominates immigration governance, while at the same time demonstrating clearly how cultural claims can operate within a paradox of universalism versus exceptionalism.

In this study I will explore the securitised nature of immigration in Denmark and its impacts on the creation of identities by referring to the Aliens Consolidation Act 2002 as a milestone in Danish immigration governance. Accordingly, the factors that have been influential in the differential treatment of population groups and the redefinition of criteria of belonging within the categories of insiders versus outsiders will be put under scrutiny. Here, I analyse immigration as a gendered and racialised process. The radical changes in immigration legislation are examined as a rhetorical problematic within Danish identity and nationalism. They are at the same time taken as a reference point as contributing to the production of social realities with regards to (third-country) immigrant women. While immigration policies appear to be gender-neutral in Denmark, much of the policy is constructed on gendered assumptions about third-country immigrant groups. This appearance of gender neutrality echoes the broader
paradoxical dynamic of *universalism* versus *exceptionalism*, especially because these gendered assumptions are also represented with cultural differences.

Overall, this study will show that the boundaries of belonging have sharpened with the transformation of the immigration laws and that it has become more difficult for population groups that are defined as ethnically and culturally different to be received into Danish society. The novelty of this research, however, is not to study immigration as a gendered and racialised transformation as such, but to offer a framework of analysis for tracing the impact of this transformation on immigrant women’s self-presentation of belonging. Hence, this research will offer an analysis for identity articulation among family immigrant women by investigating their subjectivity in the renegotiation or redefinition of their positioning within Danish society. Accordingly, this study will contribute to the under-researched field of immigrant women’s belonging in Denmark with the assumption that the voices of marginalised women need to be privileged if we are to focus on the implications of the transformation in highlighting how politics of normalisation take place through policy making (Bacchi and Eveline 2009). For this I will refer to primary data I have obtained through interviews with immigrant women.

This thesis acknowledges that there is no example of a specific state that treats its immigrants in an ideal way throughout the EU or even the overall Western world. Similarly, my aim by doing this research is not to suggest an alternative ideal way to tackle the problems of immigration and treatment of immigrants. It is important to note here that from an epistemological point of view my examination is not about putting forward positivist assumptions about a specific truth of immigration with regards to legislative action. On the contrary, it should be regarded more as an academic exercise that seeks alternative ways to positivist paradigm for escaping
categorisations and fixed notions of identity. For doing that, it focuses on specific problematisations of immigration in order to investigate the effects of politics of identity.

Having stated that, it should also be acknowledged that although there are common issues, which can be seen as indicators of the general restrictive or conservative trend, I argue that these specificities have to be also considered separately in order to have a deeper view of how different versions of the same immigration regulation problem exist. By this approach, I also assert that the conditions, policies and strategies to tackle immigration are not inevitable outcomes, but should rather be examined as results of specific problematisations about immigration and immigrant. Accordingly, it is important to recognise the factors that make up the realities about immigrants and immigration in order to enhance the understanding of politics of immigration.

In this analysis family reunification is my issue case and I examine family immigrant women’s subjectification. There are several reasons for this. First of all in the last two decades family-related immigration has been the dominant form of legal entry in the EU (Kofman 2004, p.243). Family reunification is a politicised topic throughout the EU; for example, there is a EU directive on the right to family reunification. While the EU Directive on the right to family reunification for third-country nationals determines the conditions and criteria for third-country nationals residing lawfully in an EU member state and refugees for bringing in their spouse, under-aged children and children of their spouse (Council Directive 2003/86/EC), Denmark has opted out from this directive.

At the same time, the discussions on forced and arranged marriages, the veil etc. also show how family reunification moved away from a rights framework and became a political issue. Gender is central in the definition of identities and in the
problematisation of immigrants with regards to this politicisation. The case of Denmark is a distinctive example for revealing the outcomes of the problematisation of immigration. For example, the introduction of the 24 years rule is the most controversial change within the context of family reunification.

Accordingly, this thesis will look at the factors behind family reunification legislation’s politicisation and link the implications of this transformation to immigrant women as its subjects by conceptualising it as a process of identity articulation. By focusing on the self-constructions of family immigrant women in terms of their self-positioning in Danish society as opposed to the legal framework of immigration and policy formulations it will seek to put forward a critical view on Danish immigration governance from a broader perspective. This examination can be useful to restructure ways, through which political action can interact with its subjects, in order to better evaluate the policy outcomes and changes in law.

Denmark’s position will be further explored with regards to gender and family reunification by also contextualising its policies in the context of international law and with regards to EU level policy making in Chapter 5.

Therefore, by taking family related immigration as my issue case I intend to analyse how politics of immigration can become a ground where various interpretations of identity compete with each other within politics of truth. In this process, it is important to understand how the state can interfere with private lives purporting to be apolitical and make individuals subjects. From this perspective, the main aim of this research is to show how immigration governance takes place through mechanisms of problematisation, truth construction and politics of belonging, and most importantly through interaction with its subjects leading to particular subject positions.
1.3 Research position: reconciliation of diversity from the perspective of subjectivities

In this research, by focusing on the changing Danish family reunion laws for an analysis, I intervene in the discursive construction of the reality about immigration so as to provoke criticisms on the representations of identity that dominate immigration politics. I take this position especially to prioritise the subjects of immigration laws. Challenging the constructed identities is essential for developing further strategies in accommodating minority groups in society. I also assert that this approach is more useful for unmasking the complex power relations within the categories of gender and ethnicity than the approaches that take these relations for granted.

In the above perspective my aim is to interrogate the very processes of the discursive constitution of immigration policy issues as a social problem to be dealt with through the various strands of policy under examination, by drawing attention to the subjects as insiders. Insider perspectives are especially important to overcome casual explanations of racism and to come up with relevant information about different facets of discrimination with regards to marginalised and vulnerable groups (Kryzanowski and Wodak 2009, p. 4).

Carol Bacchi (1999, p. 2) states that, rather than being a response to existing conditions and problems, a policy constitutes more of a discourse in which both problems and solutions are created. Following this view, I will examine policies and changes in legislation as competing interpretations rather than as given facts. This examination will not be about problems, but about problematisations (Bacchi 1999, p. 2). This distinction is important in achieving a shift in the focus of the research for provoking an analysis that begins with asking what is the problem that is represented, what presuppositions are at stake or taken for granted in the problem representation
which is offered, and what effects are connected to the representation of the problem (Bacchi 1999, p.2). The focus on effects means that the discourse does not only refer to ideas or to ways of talking, but to practices with material consequences (Bacchi 1999, p.2).

In a similar understanding as Bacchi, this study asks why and how certain immigration issues make up the political agenda in Denmark leading to certain changes in the legislation (Bacchi 1999, pp. 2-3). By taking this approach, I will offer a framework of analysis which allows for a space ‘to consider competing constructions of issues addressed in the policy, and the ways in which these constructions leave other issues untouched’ (Bacchi, 1999, p.4).

From this perspective my overall position can be defined as a problematisation approach through which I aim to look at governance of identity via a critical discussion of immigration legislation. The best way to do this is from both inside and outside, by examining how immigration as a policy problem has been constituted both at the level of the political discourse and of the subjectification of immigrants. The main aim is to see how subjective interpretations of immigrant women are shaped in the face of the conditions for their membership in the Danish society and how these perceptions affect their personal idea of belonging. Hence, I put the focus on subjectivities and study how the subject is situated as opposed to the assumed identities and reality of belonging in Denmark. My overall puzzle in this thesis is: ‘What is the problem with immigration in Denmark?’ This question derives from Bacchi’s approach, which is about a ‘close analysis of items that do make the political agenda to see how the construction or representation of those issues limits what is talked about as possible or desirable, or as impossible or undesirable’ (Bacchi 1999, p 3). In this study I extend this analysis to the subject while I explore the ways in which
changes in immigration laws produce a truth about individuals’ relationship with the society within a broader perspective of politics of belonging. This necessitates a broader examination of immigration governance from the perspective of immigrants.

1.4 Substantive research questions and main argument

My main argument in this study is that the restrictive legislative measures on immigration in Denmark are indicative of a distinctive gendered knowledge about immigrant identities through a binarism of western and non-western. This knowledge is developed in line with neo-liberal themes and a simultaneous reproduction of a welfare myth that is based on a homogenous society. Here, neoliberalism is examined as a form of rule, which informs a certain form of belonging in society and a new ethical subject. Accordingly, it is important to draw attention to how the centrality of culture argument and particularistic aspects of Scandinavian welfarism become embedded within a neoliberal ethos.

While I am mainly interested in the identity claims which reflect the binary constructions, I focus on how immigration is rendered governable by excluding and including individuals as part of normalising and regulating populations. The inclusion and exclusion practices inform the truth about belonging in Denmark about the desirable and fit subjects. From this perspective, by studying the empirical transformation of Danish immigration governance, I aim to critically analyse its implications from the perspective of subjects, immigrant women. Accordingly, the substantive research questions addressed are as follows:

• How has immigration been problematised in Denmark with regards to identity construction and designated insiders and outsiders?
• How is the Aliens Consolidation Act justified, while it at the same time specifies the identities of immigrants and native Danish?

• What role does the Danish problematisation of immigration have on the identities of third-country immigrant women?

The articulation of belonging can be mediated through different discursive processes. In the Danish case, I mainly focus on governmental policies and the national identity discourse for explaining the binarism with regards to native and immigrant identities. As I will explain more in detail in my methodology and theoretical perspective in Chapters 2 and 3, I will discuss the construction of identities in a Foucauldian sense by taking two levels of analysis into consideration. Those are related to the inside and outside perspectives I mentioned earlier: 1) the truth about immigration and immigrant identities that enables practices of normalisation, 2) the subject, discursive definition of ‘self’ in relation to the ‘other’ (Jones and Kryzanowski 2008, p. 46) in terms of the mediation and self realisation of the truth about immigration.

In the above context, my main aim is to examine the ways in which ‘public policy problems achieve their reality’ (Bacchi 1999, p. 38), not only at the level of policy change but also at the level of subjects. I will further elaborate my analytical scope in the next chapter (Chapter 2) where I will introduce and discuss my epistemological position and methodology in detail. In the theory chapter (Chapter 3), I will explicitly explain Foucault’s power paradigm and his power-knowledge and truth axis. Prior to the elaboration of concepts and theoretical perspectives, I will first discuss in this chapter how the issue of immigration is generally dealt with in the academic literature with regards to identity politics. Here, I will briefly refer to contemporary positivist approaches, which examine immigration as an identity problematic around themes such as recognition, rights and equality perspectives. As opposed to these approaches
I argue that the incorporation of a poststructural perspective to the identity problematic can be useful for challenging the discursive boundaries of identity. Later in the subsequent section I will outline the structure of this research and explain briefly how I will proceed in the rest of the thesis.

1.4 Academic approaches to the reconciliation of diversity within European immigration and analysis of the variable of gender in immigration research

The issue of immigration seems to divide the academic literature as well as the European society from different perspectives over the reconciliation of diversity within populations. These discussions on immigration are centred around divergent views about the presence of non-EU immigrant groups in European society and questions of how to accommodate these minority populations to the social setting. Together with these divergent views, immigration in general seems to become a central form of critique about the future of society and in theorising what an ideal society is. Accordingly, academic debates usually concern discussions on inclusion and exclusion problems from the perspective of integration dilemmas. These discussions generally centre on claims on behalf of immigrant/minority groups as opposed to autochthonous groups or vice versa, and are problematised with regards to the notions of equality and difference.

From a broader perspective, these scholarly debates are about politics of identity which focus on struggles over identity, encompassing questions such as arguments or critiques about the conditions an individual needs to fulfil in order to belong in society. Within these discussions, the concept of citizenship and the categories of class or gender are examined or challenged along the dividing lines between various approaches of multiculturalism and assimilation in search for explanations for
overcoming social hierarchies and adaptation of minorities to European social and political setting. These hierarchies are also presented as definitive characteristics of distribution problems. Below I will give examples from contemporary academic debates which characterise politics of identity. In this thesis I will challenge certain aspects of these perspectives, especially the ones which subsume ‘identity into a particular set of modernist logics and the assumption that such structures of identity necessarily define the appropriate models and sites of struggle’ (Grossberg 1996, p.88).

One important aspect of this critique is on how culture is equated with identity politics. While cultural diversity, assimilation, and multiculturalism are in the realm of the discussions of immigration, in these debates third-country immigrants are generally referred to as cultural or ethnic minorities, as a group to be incorporated into European society. Here, before mentioning how the arguments on difference take shape within the academic literature, I will argue that studying immigrant groups or immigration from a taken for granted perspective on cultural diversity is problematic and further contributes to a binary of European versus non-European. In this binarism, culture is generally understood as a fixed concept, and immigrant groups tend to be understood as homogeneous. At the same time, whether the debates are associated with assimilation or with multiculturalism, the questions about the cultural and territorial boundaries of immigrants and minority groups seem to be left unanswered because of the difficulties in achieving a consensus on the forms of civic commonality (Mitchell 2004, p. 648). In the following sections I will try to bring together general academic approaches to diversity, immigration and gender before I pinpoint my specific approach.
**Multiculturalism and its discourses**

Multiculturalism is associated with a broader trend in liberal social thought, in which cultural difference is acknowledged and valued as opposed to the national imperative to assimilate immigrants and minority groups (Mitchell 2004, p.642). One of the most well-known theories on multiculturalism was articulated by Will Kymlicka (1995), who argues that modern societies have been experiencing a challenge of multiculturalism through which they are confronted with the demands of minority groups for recognition of their identity and accommodation of their cultural differences (Kymlicka 1995, p. 10). Combining individual autonomy and societal culture, Kymlicka (1995, p. 105) states that it is possible to reconcile multicultural rights with a liberal conception of individual rights and that this is in fact essential because people’s membership in their societal culture is important for ‘enabling meaningful individual choice and supporting self-identity’; since freedom of individuals is intimately related to and dependent on culture (Kymlicka 1995, p. 74).

Another advocate of multiculturalism is Bhikhu Parekh (2005, p. 6), who defines multiculturalism as a normative response to cultural diversity in a society; however, he sees problems with Kymlicka’s theorisation by suggesting that it misses a plural understanding of culture and suggests that a theoretical framework capable of appreciating and accommodating plural understandings of culture is essential (Parekh 2005, p. 60). My argument here is that, from a broader perspective, multiculturalism has certain challenges because it is limited to a discursive terrain which generally treats culture and ethnicity as given and fixed. One good example of its challenges is about how discussions on multiculturalism take a controversial turn when the variable of gender is in question. Feminist scholars are divided over the issue of multiculturalism.
According to some feminist scholars, the reconciliation of rights and duties within a multicultural setting is more complicated than Kymlicka or Parekh suggest. These scholars such as Lister (1997) and Okin (1994) argue that multiculturalism can simply lead to constructions of a citizenship discourse of equality, which does not match the sociological reality. In this context, Lister (1997) states that multicultural citizenship is problematic as it runs the risk of freezing cultural differences and of treating cultural groups as homogeneous and closed. It ignores differences such as gender or class and the fluid nature of boundaries between groups. At the same time, the multicultural model can accept a solely liberal toleration of diversity confined to the private sphere rather than genuine acceptance and recognition of such diversity in the public (Lister 1997, p. 50).

From a liberal feminist perspective, Susan Okin (1994) argues against multiculturalism on the grounds of equality. She states that gender itself is an important category of analysis and the fact that there are differences among women should not prevent the possibility of generalisation about many aspects of inequality between sexes (Okin 1994, p. 20). Okin (2008) understands gender equality and multiculturalism as two distinct projects which compete with and contradict each other by referring to practices such as forced marriages, clitoridectomy, polygamy, the lack of penalties for men who rape women and women who might be forced to get married to their rapists. Accordingly, feminism and a multicultural commitment to group rights for minority cultures create tensions because most cultures have the control of women through the possible practices stated above as one of their principles. Moreover, it is arguable that the ‘female members of the culture have a clear interest in its preservation’ (Okin 2008). Furthermore, ‘many (though not all) of
the cultural minorities that claim group rights are more patriarchal than the surrounding cultures’ (Okin 2008).

The above point of view clearly contradicts Parekh, who argues that culture constitutes a much more important place and a woman might actually prefer her culture over any kind of extra gender equality. Okin (1994, p. 19), however, perceives this problem from a liberal feminist perspective as a question of justice: she points out how oppressed people often internalise their oppression so well that they lose their sense of what they are entitled to as human beings, which is a situation in which asking people what they want does not always provide accurate results to overcome injustices. In order to overcome inequalities, Okin offers a specific focus on within-group inequalities because the inequalities between sexes are rarely public and not always visible.

Not all feminists are in agreement with Okin. Birte Siim (2007), for example, does not agree with the claim that multiculturalism is problematic. She states that arguments against multiculturalism perceive culture as a static concept and minority women as victims of their culture or backgrounds. For Siim (2007, p. 492), ‘multiculturalism refers to a normative vision about how a just society deals with diversity and difference as well as to different strategies for reaching this vision’. She criticises Okin’s approach from two different perspectives: ‘first it neglects patriarchal roots and religious oppression of women in majority cultures; and secondly, it forgets that the patriarchal and religious oppression of women in minority cultures is not a universal truth’ (Siim 2007, p. 492). Accordingly, the intersection between gender and ethnicity necessitates a more elaborate examination and takes into account ‘the contextual nature of conflicts between religious and cultural values, family norms’ (Siim 2007, p. 492).
Anne Phillips (2007, p. 26) also criticises Okin for having a static conception of culture, which understates the extent of ‘internal contestation and processes of cultural change’. For her, multiculturalism has to be reconsidered in terms of social justice and equality as having enough potential for the consolidation of cultural diversity; it is also compatible with gender equality since ‘gender equality is not culturally specific and it can be asserted as a widely shared norm’ (Phillips 2007, pp. 35-36). According to Phillips (2007, pp. 8-9), the biggest problem with culture is ‘the inclination to represent individuals from minority or non-Western groups as driven by their culture and constrained by their culture to behave in particular ways’; in other words, culture becomes dangerous when it relocates the human agency and used as a tool to define individuals (Phillips 2007, p. 9). Yet culture constitutes a very important place in individuals’ life and it is inescapable:

> Culture matters, as part of the way we give meaning to our world, as an important element in self-ascribed identity, and as one of the mechanisms through which social hierarchies are sustained. … It correlates with differences of gender, race, ethnicity, and national origin, and does so in a structured manner that goes beyond questions of identity or choice. The individuals concerned may have no interest in defining themselves by reference to their sex, ethnicity, or supposed culture, but they cannot thereby escape all forms of discrimination or disadvantage visited on “their” group.

(Phillips 2007, p. 15).

The above explanation however does not tell so much about where the boundaries of culture start and the boundaries of human agency end. Moreover, the intersection of gender and ethnicity proves to be more challenging to contextualise because firstly the interrelationship between gender and ethnicity is hardly symmetrical and secondly the concept of social exclusion and distributional effects of a welfare system bear
complex characteristics in the case of women immigrants. Borchorst and Siim (2002) refer to the necessity of being aware of the analytical distinction between gender equality and equality of ethnic minorities. They argue that ‘an important discursive difference between the integration of women and the inclusion of ethnic minority groups exists because women have been defined to be one of us and ethnic minorities as the other’ (Borchorst and Siim 2002, p. 93).

In the above perspective I find it necessary to re-emphasise the deficits of multiculturalism from the perspective of subject as I have mentioned before and possibilities of masking certain power relations in a society. I also argue that discussing women’s place in immigration from the point of view of assimilation versus multiculturalism is problematic. First of all, multiculturalism can serve rhetorically as a defence of national culture and tolerance, which emphasises the need to keep communities separate (Kryzanowski and Wodak 2009, p. 2). As a result, cultural categorisation and consideration of culture as a monolithic conception might be further reinforced through multicultural discourses. This is related to the ways in which new forms of othering and racism incorporate an ostensible anti-racism, thereby dampening criticism (Kryzanowski and Wodak 2009, p. 2). In the same manner, liberal values are functionalised for countering multiculturalism and are inverted (Kryzanowski and Wodak 2009, p. 2). Hence, the equality discourse merges into assimilationist views, which strive to make ethnic categories irrelevant; however, this generally results in reinforcement of othering. An example of this is a critique which states that multiculturalism can embody otherness by conceiving ethnicity embodied as foreignness, which is also seen as something that one can willingly shed in exchange for legitimate citizenship (Frontier 2005, p. 574). Here, ‘the recognition
of others as legitimate subjects reconstitutes them as *other* through a double process of de-racialisation and re-racialisation’ (Frontier 2005, p. 559).

The effects of multiculturalism can be debatable depending on whether they imply equality or exclusion with regards to the fixed conceptions of culture. For example, state initiated multiculturalism might reproduce new forms of dominance by re-emphasising ethnic identities. Pierre Bourdieu and Loic Wacquant (1999) bring forward a criticism which implies the necessity to conceptualise identity politics one step ahead of the debate, which is currently represented as an opposition between *liberals* and *communitarians*. In their article, they warn against the dangers of certain systematic theories’ way of communicating, which can finally legitimise various other inequalities.

This is a crisis that the word ‘multicultural’ conceals by restricting it artificially just to the academic microcosm and by expressing it in an ostensibly ‘ethnic’ idiom when what is at stake is not the recognition of marginalised cultures by academic canons but access to the instruments of (re)production of the middle and upper classes – and, first among them, to the university- in the context of massive and multifarious state retrenchment.

(Bourdieu and Wacquant 1999, p.42).

In view of the above scholarly debates this research will challenge the academic literature with regards to reproduction of identities bounded by discourses such as culture, minority or immigrant. Instead of examining identities as fixed constructions as a result of which certain social problems are taken for granted I will offer an examination which will look at state policies from the perspective of a conceptualisation of identity as a fluid concept. I will put forward a perspective that
will go beyond communitarian and liberal arguments and that critically examines construction of particular identities as products of power relations.

**Political and legal belonging**

Before I elaborate my theoretical approach in this study I find it important to mention other aspects of belonging and identity discussions within academic debates. In this section I will mention certain perspectives which focus on belonging in national versus post-national forms in relation to citizenship arguments. These arguments go back to T. H. Marshall (1950), who defines the institution of citizenship as the basic criteria for rights with regards to civil, political and social aspects within the borders of a state. In this context, despite possibilities for post-national forms of belonging such as the idea of constitutional patriotism (Habermas 1998), the arguments about the dominance of a national citizenship are still very relevant. Rogers Brubaker (1992), for example, states that citizenship is perceived as a ‘last bastion of sovereignty’. He argues that it is the foundation of the modern, liberal-democratic state to provide a framework of belonging and as such it is linked to the conceptions of the nation-state and sovereignty. Every modern state formally defines its citizenry by attaching certain rights and obligations to the status of citizenship (Brubaker 1992). The best known challenge to this classical understanding of political belonging is Yasemin Soysal's (1994) discussion on supranational citizenship. In this context, Sosyal, who has studied the guest worker experience in Western Europe, argues for the changing character of national citizenship, which has been losing ground as opposed to a post-national form, with the migrants deriving rights on the basis of universal personhood.
I will argue that approaching the problems of cultural diversity only from the perspective of citizenship is also controversial. I think that legal belonging is important because it is not any more possible to talk about human rights norms, which include the right to family life or the right to non-deportation to a persecuting country within territorial and social margins for non-citizens. There is a significant population of third country nationals in the EU – three in one hundred ‘European’ workers are third-country nationals who cannot get full access to civic rights because of their non-national status (Bhabha 1998, p. 598). However, it is also worth noting that legal belonging does not always mean recognition, nor that it reinforces the feelings of belonging.

Despite the contradictory discussions on the framework of citizenship; the novelty here is not so much about the so-called challenges of immigration towards national tradition, social homogeneity or classical forms of belonging, which result in different ideas of membership; but about the divisions between insiders and outsiders created as a result of the re-definition of identities in opposition to the idea of universality within broader conceptions of belonging as a result of power relations which result in certain hierarchies. In this view, the contradictory elements between forces of normalisation and differentiation, universalism and particularism, freedom and order, individual rights and responsibilities, and of identity and difference are also important to consider in discussions of citizenship (Weber and Yuval-Davis 1999).

**Citizenship as a contested concept**

When it comes to immigration, citizenship as political belonging is a common form of problematisation of diversity within the discussions of equality and difference. However, the vocabulary of citizenship which concerns individual rights, obligations
and belonging is a *contested concept* (Siim 2000, p. 1). From a feminist perspective, citizenship has been challenged because of its patriarchal roots (Pateman 1989, p. 183). Pateman argued that citizenship will remain a men-only concept:

To demand that citizenship as it now exists should be fully extended to women accepts the patriarchal meaning of citizen which is constructed from men’s attributes, capacities and activities. Women cannot be full citizens in the present meaning of the term; at best, citizenship can be extended to women only as lesser men.

(Pateman 1989, p. 197)

While Pateman challenges the idea of equal citizenship here, the incorporation of the immigrant variable makes this argument even more complex and necessitates the reconsideration of power relations within society. Iris Marion Young mentions the difficulty of obtaining social justice and equality through the extension of equal citizenship because of unequal power relations in her discussion.

Those social activities that most determine the status of individuals and groups are anarchic and oligarchic; economic life is not sufficiently under the control of citizens to affect the unequal status and treatment of groups. I think this is an important and correct diagnosis of why equal citizenship has not eliminated oppression.

(Young 1989, pp. 250-251)

Young also states that problems associated with treating everyone on equal and general terms can arise: universality as generality and universality as equal treatment is built on an understanding of homogeneity of citizens. This has not been the case, not only for women but also for certain groups with distinct cultures through the history of the capitalist welfare state (Young 1989, p. 251).

Helma Lutz (1997) brings another critique to the understanding of difference from a binary in her analysis of immigrant women’s positioning within the categories of
European versus immigrant. Lutz (1997, p. 94) refers to this binary division from the perspective of racialised gender relations, by focusing on the institution of citizenship in term of the accessibility of immigrants to formal, substantive and symbolic rights. She suggests that difference should be defined as a multifaceted concept, which can be constructed as a form of exclusion or inclusion and an analysis of citizenship should include these various facets and take into account different positionings of different groups of women in a society with regards to different opportunity structures (Lutz 1997, p. 107).

Women’s role in immigration

The examination of gender in immigration is not limited to debates on citizenship. Certain academic discussions point towards women’s roles in contemporary immigration. While gender has been a recent interest and focus of analysis, it encompasses different perspectives about immigration and belonging. The feminisation of migration is cited by Castles and Miller (2003, p. 9) as a new form of immigration within the current international political order which has been developing in the post-Cold War period. Although the global migration history has always been characterised by gender variables, the awareness of the specificity of women has grown in this period (Castles and Miller 2003, p. 9).

Apart from multiculturalism and citizenship, different perspectives such as the role of welfare structuring are given emphasis with a focus on different aspects of positioning of immigrant women (Sassen-Koob 1981; Boyd 1984; Morokvadic 1984; 1991 Young 1989; 2003; Pedraza 1991; Fraser 1994; Lutz 1997; Phizacklea 1999; Nira Yuval-Davis 2006; Kofman 1999; Pessar and Mahler 2003; Morissens and Sainsbury 2005; Siim 2007). Over the last decades, feminist scholarship has been emphasising the
heterogeneity of women’s positions within the migration stream, their presence in the labour market, their contribution to welfare and their increasing political activities (Kofman, Phizacklea, et al. 2000). Within this perspective, a considerable part of the current literature on immigration and gender focuses on the participation of immigrant women in host societies from different aspects such as economic, social or political integration to the society.

At the same time certain scholars examine the role of women in immigration both from the perspective of causes and consequences in immigration flows, and draw attention to the mechanisms through which women take part in these immigration processes with a consideration of the reasons to immigrate. These studies mostly focus on the transnational aspect of immigration and attempt to develop a gendered theorisation across national borders (Pessar and Mahler 2003; Phizacklea 1999). In terms of the incorporation of social policy analysis to a gendered perspective of immigration, mostly the social positioning of immigrant women is taken into consideration from different aspects by examining particular dimensions such as citizenship or family reunification laws etc.

**Politics of belonging interpretation**

The heterogeneity of European immigration makes it more challenging to examine various implications of different structures such as family reunification and the occupational structure of women who migrate to Europe (Kofman 1999, pp. 269-299). Kofman attempts to explore the diversification of female immigration from this point of view. She states that women as agents have been generally absent from international research on immigration and even when they were included they were mostly examined as dependants within the limits of the private sphere (Kofman 1999,
p. 270). In this thesis, I acknowledge Kofman’s point by offering a focus on the subject and by studying women as agents in order to overcome the general tendency to take identities for granted.

As I tried to show above briefly, the inclusion of the immigrant variable to categories of gender and ethnicity usually addresses the transformation of this issue to the sphere of identity politics within complex dilemmas of exclusion and inclusion. In this approach I propose a break with these theories by replacing them with an interpretative method for overcoming certain epistemological contradictions on behalf of positivist approaches to multiculturalism, gender and immigration.

From this perspective I offer to replace the politics of belonging, which takes the issues such as citizenship, ethnic and religious identity, and so on, for granted with the politics of belonging interpretation. This approach will be about bringing identity claims by immigrant women into empirical research and examining them from a critical perspective, rather than looking for definitive answers to the questions of diversity. At the same time I argue that within mainstream approaches to multiculturalism and problems of equality and diversity, immigrant women are inaudible. Accordingly, I aim to foreground the agency and subjectivity of immigrant women by shifting the methodological theoretical premises of immigration research (Erel 2007). This approach will necessitate an examination of complex power relations in society at the conjunction of immigration and gender. In this view, the changes in immigration legislation, for example, cannot merely be explained by the role of the state, which acts upon economic or socio-political questions; it is essential to look at the forms of knowledge upon which certain policies and legislations are

---

3 Here I adapt a similar approach to Nancy Fraser (1989, p. 292), who presents a politics of need interpretation.
implemented. As Michel Foucault (1982, p. 778) argues, in order to privilege ‘the subject’, and to understand how objectivising of the subject happens, we need to expand the dimensions of power. In other words, this will be an analysis of power relations through the antagonism of strategies rather than from the point of their internal rationality (Foucault 1982, p. 780). For focusing on the subject I will conduct a discourse analysis of the primary data I have obtained through interviews by referring to Foucault’s theorisation. In Chapters 2 and 3 I will elaborate this perspective in detail and explain how it is applied within the Danish case.

1.4 Structure of the chapters

In this chapter, I introduced the main problem of this research as the conservative transformation of immigration politics across the EU a result of which identities are constructed within fixed boundaries. I have also explained why I chose Denmark as my single case study and family reunification as my issue case to examine this transformation. My main aim in this research is to analyse immigration politics from the perspective of its effects on identity articulation and belonging. Accordingly, my focus will be on the subjects of immigration – family immigrant women – where I will be using a problematisation approach to examine their subjectification. In doing this, I especially emphasise the interplay between governmental policies and self-positioning of subjects by a narrative analysis of subjectification. Depending on a Foucauldian understanding of power, I will not use subjection and subjectification as two distinct concepts. For Foucault, subjection are the ways in which individuals experience themselves as subjects both through domination and self-making (Foucault 2000b, p.331). This understanding is about a de-centred construction of subjectivity within heterogeneous subject positions – both hegemonic and counter-hegemonic
(Heller 1996, p.79). As a result, in a Foucauldian theorising subjectification equals subjection (Heller 1996, p.79). Here in this text I will refer to both concepts interchangeably.

Chapter 2 of this thesis deals with the methodologies applied within this research and bridges the different analytical levels for tackling the issue of immigration within the above perspective. Here, I first outline my epistemological position by mentioning poststructural feminism and a Foucauldian analysis of biopolitical governmentality. Then I introduce the main concepts and explain why I prefer the particular theoretical perspectives. In this research I use a combination of analytical models such as discourse analysis and narrative analysis. After mentioning these models I discuss how they are referred for theoretical operationalisation of interviews with Turkish immigrant women. Consequently, I sum up my research objectives and further elaborate my research questions by mentioning them within the specific methodological terrain of this study.

Chapter 3 provides a theoretical discussion based on a Foucauldian governmentality approach. In the beginning I present an overview of his notion of power, which forms the basis of his understanding of subject, biopower and biopolitics. This is done to further the argument about the connection between the truth discourses and modes of subjection in contemporary immigration politics in Denmark. The totality of this framework calls for a subtle discussion of immigration governance and for an interpretation of the dynamics of change. It tries to show how subject and power in governance are linked in complementary and contradictory ways as part of the constitution of insiders and outsiders within Danish immigration governance through the discourses on belonging. This discussion provides the background of the narrative analysis where subjecthood of immigrant women is put under scrutiny.
Chapters 4 and 5 reveal my empirical investigation with regards to the biopolitical
governmentality of immigration in Denmark. Chapter 4 presents a broad overview of
how Danish immigration is constituted from an institutional and political point of
view. This chapter forms the background of a more specific discussion about Danish
family immigration, which will constitute the subsequent chapter, Chapter 5. In this
perspective Chapter 4 gives a general understanding about the space of knowledge
with regards to the issue of immigration, immigrants as opposed to collective Danish
identity. Here I first give an overview of the immigration to Denmark within the
recent history in relation to identity claims on the basis of a political economy
perspective by which (third-country) immigrant population is problematised. I also
discuss how this problematisation creates a binarism within the Danish population
between natives and third-country immigrants. This is about how immigrant identity
is constructed as opposed to Danish identity within a particular regime of truth. For
this analysis I refer to the primary topics of homogeneity, consensus/cohesion and
equality and explore how immigration to Denmark has become a topic of identity and
belonging.

Chapter 5 refers to more specific examples from family reunification legislation and
governmental discourses on gender equality in order to depict a clearer picture of
identity construction which will be linked to modes of subjection. Here I first analyse
family reunion in Denmark by focusing on the legal changes which came after the
2001 elections, with the Aliens Consolidation Act 2002. The basic aim is to show how
these legal changes can be understood as discourses that constitute the bigger picture
of the political economy of immigration and at the same time they are practices of
normalisation through which belonging is mediated. In this perspective the articles of
the Aliens Consolidation Act 2002 reveal how immigration is rendered governable as
a gendered and racialised process and interacts with its subjects within broader political economic dynamics.

Secondly, I mention governmental discourses on gender equality by referring to examples such as gender equality plans and discuss how these changes are linked to truth discourses on identities. Overall, I present immigration legislation and governmental strategies of gender equality as interventions that are addressed to the Danish population along ethnic and gendered categories. In this perspective I find it useful to examine them alongside the same analysis as complementary data. Both of them point towards how gendered discourses present a clear binary opposition between Nordic/Danish and immigrant or non-Western cultures wherein, equality is used as a measure of difference. I will analyse the convergence of gender, equality and culture arguments.

Chapter 6 presents an analysis of the subjectification of immigrant women and focuses on self-constructions of family immigrant women in terms of the processes of their identity articulation and understanding of belonging. For this analysis, I have conducted interviews with immigrant women of Turkish origin with a family reunification background. This chapter studies these women’s interpretation of belonging within narratives and analyses their subjectivity in Danish immigration governance. By studying immigrant women’s narratives I sketch a variety of different possibilities about how they could be subjectified through micro technologies of power, by putting the individual into the spotlight, not only as a victim of her social environment but also as an active agent. This examination is done in order to demonstrate the complimentary and contradictory discourses of belonging between immigrant women’s interpretation and broader truth discourses in Danish society for discussing the tension between the two. In this analysis I refer to narrative segments
within specific themes which came out as significant in my previous empirical analysis. I analyse immigrant women’s self-interpretations about these themes in parallel to the hegemonic discourses of identity and belonging.

Chapter 7 is the concluding chapter of this thesis. In this chapter I sum up the main practical implications of this research. I go back to the research questions and discuss them with regards to the theoretical framework I employ in this research. This chapter can be seen as a summary of the whole thesis where I also stress how the theoretical approach contributes in different ways to scholarly work about identity politics and immigration research. At the same time I also put forward some suggestions for further research to improve or expand the scope of this study.
Chapter 2

Methodological Signposts

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter I will elaborate my approach to the methodologies applied throughout this research and provide explanations as to why certain theories, concepts and perspectives are preferred. Methodology in social research is about the possibilities of connecting produced knowledge to any actual reality; in other words it is the connection between ideas, experience and material and social realities (Ramazanoglu and Holland 2004, p. 9). Ramazanoglu and Holland (2004, pp. 10-11) identify four major concerns about methodology in social research in western thought as below:

1. a social and political process of knowledge production;
2. assumptions about the nature and meanings of ideas, experience and social reality, and how/if these may be connected;
3. critical reflection on what authority can be claimed for the knowledge that results;
4. accountability (or denial of accountability) for the political and ethical implications of knowledge production.

In the following sections, I will try to explain how and in what ways this research is informed by a complex set of epistemological, methodological and ethical issues and discuss how it deals with the concerns put forward in the above formulation by Ramazanoglu. I will first of all talk about how I will examine immigration laws by
using a governmentality framework and then mention how I use narrative analysis for investigating its impacts.

This research attempts to create an understanding of the recent empirical evolution of the Danish immigration regime towards a restrictive direction within the broader institutional and political context. In analysing the problematisation of immigration governance in Denmark it specifically looks at the gendered nature of immigration legislation. In this context, immigrant women are examined as a group who are made visible through gendered and racialised processes within binary constructions of identity. One of the central aims in this study is to investigate how immigrant women as subjects to changes in Danish immigration legislation are situated within the broader dynamics of binarism in the light of their differential position in Danish society as others. The empirical approach is rooted in the analysis of self-interpretations of immigrant women in relation to their experience of the restrictive changes. This analysis seeks to deconstruct the binary oppositions of immigrant and native (Danish) by examining by immigrant women's narratives of belonging in Denmark in relation to governmental macro discourses. Accordingly this examination can be seen as an attempt to critique objectivity (Scott 1991, p. 786), whereby alternative understandings and personal meanings of immigrant women are investigated in the face of a constructed truth within law and politics. In doing this privileging the voices of immigrant women as marginalised subjects will draw attention to the implications of the transformation in Danish immigration by highlighting how politics of normalisation take place (see Bacchi and Eveline 2009). From a general perspective this investigation will be about what difference and being different mean in Denmark, which is conceptualised as otherness and examined by focusing on the othered subject.
It is acknowledged that the context of such an examination opens up numerous possibilities of perspectives within a vast field of research regarding women's role in immigration such as equality and difference, or, reconciliation of diversity in contemporary western society. I use in-depth qualitative and descriptive methods, secondary data (books, articles, internet sites) and primary data (interviews with family immigrant women). The epistemological orientation is largely informed by feminist poststructuralism within which I generate a framework of analysis based on Foucault’s concept of governmentality and his approach to the discursive constitution of subject. Before explaining in what ways a Foucauldian analysis will be referred to, it would be useful to reflect upon general claims for knowledge in feminist poststructuralism and certain ethical concerns with regards to the constitution and positioning of the subject.

2.2 An epistemology between feminism and Foucault

Feminist theory is heterogeneous and there are controversial approaches to its methodology. Among these controversies, the major tension seems to be the epistemological conflict between scientific rationality (feminist empiricism), which holds that there is an independent, objective truth that can be attained objectively, and the poststructuralist accounts that challenge the relationship between knowledge and an underlying reality (Ramazanoglu and Holland 2004, p. 86). From the perspective of feminist theorising, this implies a conflict between a ‘knowledge of gender relations that take existence of women for granted, and theories that take apart the grounds of feminist claims to knowledge, and treat women and gender as products of ideas rather than of embodiment, patriarchy or social construction’ (Ramazanoglu and Holland 2004, p. 4).
I find poststructural feminism more useful within this thesis’ particular context of immigration research, especially for challenging modernist assumptions of identity. Within a Danish context this is related to an analytical interpretation of the reality of immigration and immigrant for refraining from fixed notions of identity that are constructed on binary assumptions of western and non-western. At the same time, I am in agreement with Jane Flax (1987, p. 623), who argues that ‘further development of feminist theory also depends on locating our theorising within and drawing more self-consciously upon wider philosophic contexts of which it is both a part and critique’. Accordingly, while this thesis facilitates poststructural terrain for opening a critical space to think about social complexities in Danish immigration governance it owes a lot to the connection between Foucault's theorising and feminism. In this study, the theoretical perspective based on Foucault's notion of power, his approach to subject and his governmentality framework are generated in linking the subjective experiences of immigrant women to hegemonic power structures in Danish politics. In the following sections this epistemological link will be brought more into light by explaining how Foucault can be used within a feminist approach and in what ways this togetherness facilitated this research. For the sake of clarity, however, it would be useful first to discuss more about poststructural feminism before I explain how it is connected to a Foucauldian understanding.

Poststructuralism rejects the possibility of absolute truth and objectivity and considers knowledge to be socially constructed as transient and inherently unstable (Gavey 1997, p. 52). While feminist empiricism combines empiricist methodology, which is rooted in positivism with feminist political goals (Campbell 1994, p. 90), the alliance between positivism and the idea of objective knowledge is a source of suspicion for
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poststructural approaches, especially with regards to the socially shaped hierarchies of power, which inform the questions of research method and the power inequalities between researcher and the researched (Oakley 1999, p. 160). In poststructuralism, knowledge is considered to be neutral with its production depending on power: ‘those who have the power to regulate what counts as truth are able to maintain their access to material advantages and power’ (Gavey 1997, p. 52). This understanding not only challenges the nature of knowledge, but also the ways by which we acquire it.

From this perspective, an examination of how immigration is rendered governable in Denmark that goes beyond scientific rationality can have a better potential to challenge the current power structures that legitimise certain hierarchies and inequalities in society by questioning common assumptions about the reality of immigration and the identity of immigrants. In understanding the subtle dynamics of exclusion and inclusion, power becomes a central dimension, especially because it is the majority in a society that shapes the processes of inclusion for newcomers and minorities under state auspices via democratic institutions (Brochmann 2003, p. 1). Here, it is important to remember that each contextual case with its own peculiarities masks the various mechanisms for imposing new forms of social and individual controls which shape the present power relations (Bellier 2008, p. 136). By deconstructing the taken for granted truth, which serves as legitimisation for certain practices, poststructural accounts can help to create a distance from the beliefs which normalise these relations of power (Flax 1987, p. 624).

Poststructuralism also offers a useful interpretation of human experience (Flax 1987, p. 624). Modern power is about the systematic replacement of new rationalities to produce governing effects on conduct by seeking to arrange and rearrange conditions so as to oblige subjects to transform themselves in certain directions (Scott 1995, p.
The mechanism of power referred here ‘forces an individual back on himself and ties him to his own identity in a constraining way’ (Alcoff 1988, p. 415). Within the limits of modern power, it can be difficult to overcome the barriers against treating women as passive objects. For example, essentialist formulations of womanhood tie the individual to her identity as a result of which it cannot represent a solution to sexism (Alcoff 1988, p. 415). This can be seen as a result of conceptualising identity as fixed. Accordingly, dealing with issues like citizenship, ethnic and religious identity can be problematic because of the dangers of further objectification of subjects. Multiculturalism, as I have discussed previously in Chapter 1, might serve new forms of *othering* by its emphasis on the construction of boundaries between communities.

This problematic is evident in the politics of identity discussions which assumes certain forms of identity and difference as the dominant model of political organisation, with the understanding that every individual is a representative of the totality (Grossberg 1996, p.87). Instead of understanding identity as static or fixed, and subject as ‘a rational transparent entity that could convey a homogenous meaning on the total field of her conduct by being the source of her action’ (Mouffe 1999, p. 370), poststructural accounts can instead provide a more thorough understanding of the subject. Subject is understood as a plurality which is dependent on the various subject positions through which it is constituted within various discursive formations. There is no *a priori* necessary relation between the discourses that construct its different subject positions (Mouffe 1999, p. 372). The poststructuralist paradigm recognises both the constitutive force of discourse and discursive practices; while at the same time recognising that people are capable of exercising choice in relation to those practices (Davies and Harre 2003, p. 262). Poststructuralist subjecthood makes
it more possible to be ‘able to turn a reflexive gaze on discourse and able to work on discourse itself in order to reconstitute the world in less oppressive ways’ (Davies, Brown et al. 2006, p. 89) In this perspective, a poststructuralist critique of subjectivity offers both a space for the plurality of differences unrestrained by any predetermined identity formulated either by patriarchy or cultural feminism and enables to deal with the mechanisms of oppression and the construction of specific gender categories by relating these to social discourse (Alcoff 1988, p. 418). I will further elaborate how the Foucauldian subject is used in this thesis for analysis in the later sections of this chapter. It is important to note here that I am aware of the discussions in feminism about the value of Foucault. In section 2.5 I will talk more in detail about how I facilitate a Foucauldian perspective as a way of understanding gendered constructions in immigration governance.

2.3 Belonging as the main analytical concept in examining the problematisation of immigration and subjectification

Before discussing Foucauldian governmentality and subjectification in detail, it is important to mention how a politics of difference with regards to Danish immigration governance will be investigated from the perspective of immigrant women. For this I refer back to the problematisation approach that I mentioned in the introductory chapter. Previously I mentioned how the governance of identity can be problematised by examining immigration legislation.

Before it has also been suggested that the conservative shift in immigration politics and its implications can best be understood from the perspective of the divisions between insiders and outsiders that are created as a result of the redefinition of identities in the problematisation of third-country immigration. This examination can
be closely related to Foucault's later work which was dominated by the notions of government and problematisation (Flynn 1985, p. 532). Problematisation for Foucault meant the ‘ensemble of discursive and non discursive practices that makes something into the play of the true and the false and constitutes it as an object of thought’ (Flynn 1985, p. 533). Government, on the other hand refers to the ways in which men governed themselves and others, by means of the production of truth (Flynn 1985, p. 533). The close association of truth and politics in Foucault's theory is important to mention here before I further elaborate his approach in the following chapter, Chapter 3. According to this close association, Danish immigration politics can be seen as the space of problematisation circumscribed by the practices of truth through which insiders and outsiders are created by the notions of difference. From a general perspective, notions of difference are about ‘how people are actually situated in relation to others, and also what these differences mean and how they are constituted, regulated and experienced’ (Ramazanoglu and Holland 2004, p. 106) In the context of this study, governmental aspects in relation to the construction of difference about immigrants are examined. This construction also determines who really belongs in Denmark and who is to be excluded.

This research aims furthering the understandings of subjectivity of identity among immigrant women within the governmentality of immigration in Denmark. In other words, I am especially interested in examining how immigrant women (re)define, (re)negotiate, accept or challenge the truth about belonging in Denmark in the face of their relationship with changing immigration legislation. The discourse of immigration reflects a complex reality, which necessitates the consideration of various levels of analysis. In this study, I limit my investigation of subjectification of immigrant women to the notion of belonging as the main analytical concept in
examining the complex interaction between hegemonic representations of identity in Danish governmental discourses and personal meanings by immigrant subjectivities. Subjectivity is understood to be ‘the site of process of making sense of our relation to the world – is the modality in which the precarious and contradictory nature of the subject-in-process is signified or experienced as identity’ (Brah 2001, p. 473). Belonging is examined as a discursively constructed concept within power relations through certain regimes of truth whereby individuals engage with the discourses and technologies of immigration in the process of their ongoing subjective constructions.

The notion of belonging is also fundamental in revealing the link between the personal and collective levels, and it facilitates a thorough assessment of how interviewees of this research define the ‘self’ in relation to the other (Jones and Kryzanowski 2008, p. 44). As Jones and Kryzanowski suggest, the concept of belonging is not only useful for analysing the relationship between self and the other but also between personal and collective levels:

In a purely conceptual way belonging is about the relationship between personal identity and a collective identity—there is something about one’s personal belonging that is comparable to one’s perception of the aims, constitution or values of a given collective.

(Jones and Kryzanowski 2008, p. 44)

Identity and belonging are constituted of a range of fluid processes, which are discursively constructed, reconstructed and reinterpreted by actors in a multiplicity of ways (Jones and Kryzanowski 2008, p. 43). As far as the immigrant experience can be generalised, belonging has to be based, to some extent, on elective attachments and it can only be understood in terms of an individual situating himself or herself in relation to a collective at some point (Jones and Kryzanowski 2008, p. 46). This
research seeks to investigate the impact of dominant immigration discourses on immigrant women’s self-representation of belonging and their perceptions of their situation and presence in Danish society. Accordingly, within the limits of this study, the notion of belonging will cover a variety of topics in relation to Danish hegemonic discourses in which immigrant identity is problematised and a truth about deserving versus undeserving immigrants is constructed.

In this analysis, the method is about linking of personal experiences to dominant power structures in society. With this aim I will examine a set of discourses by immigrant women, by breaking them down to themes, which are transcribed through interview passages. I choose these themes as significant content issues of my empirical examination of hegemonic Danish identity discourses. Accordingly these themes concern the primary discourse topics within the Danish politics of truth about belonging. I use them in my analysis of subjectification of immigrant women in order to make sense of how changes in Danish immigration politics and the conservative trend penetrate into their self-realisations and how these topics are deployed within their subjective constructions. Through this examination, I specifically aim to elaborate the tension between the Danish hegemonic discourses and the immigrant women’s negotiation of particular truths in their self-reflective subjective positions. Accordingly the main themes I will refer in the analysis of the interviews are as follows: citizenship, integration, gender equality, arranged marriages, the 24 years rule, and future expectations.

In the above perspective these specific themes are framed in line with the Danish immigration discourse on politics of belonging as will be referred to in Chapters 4 and 5. In Chapters 4 and 5 I will show how a truth about belonging has developed within Danish immigration governance, which later will be analysed within interpretations of
immigrant women. Constructions of belonging by immigrant women reflect different ways of practising agency, whereby immigrant women (re)define, (re)negotiate or challenge their current positions. To sum up, this research aims to explore how immigrant women normalise existing truth discourses of Danish immigration by challenging, accepting or reworking them in negotiating their identities. By using a governmentality framework I will investigate how the subjectification of immigrant women is situated within a broader picture of power relations.

2.4 Foucault’s power paradigm and governmentality approach

The concept of governmentality offers a conceptual link between the macro (power in governance) and micro level (subject) analysis or, in other words, a connection of the top-down political rhetoric with the immigrant subject. This is found particularly useful for the incorporation of the idea of belonging from a broader perspective. Basing on Foucauldian literature, this study assumes that the formation of the subject in the management of immigration in Denmark cannot be separated from the politics of the Danish government. In this view, the concept of belonging will be examined from both a legal perspective that is essentially linked to the implementation of immigration laws within a macro level political discursive context as well as from the perspective of subjectification of immigrants. This link is about how governmental practices in the legal or socio-political context have an effect on the life of each individual, which can be seen as the connection between the political and the personal.

Hence, this research is an investigation of how knowledge about immigration and immigrants is connected to power relations in the Danish society and how the immigrant subject is reworked within this system. Here, immigration legislation is
examined as a multiplicity of normalising practices of power relationships. Subjectification will refer to the ways of how individuals examine, confess and regulate their own thoughts and behaviour in accordance with a certain concept of normality as a result of normalising practices (Bevir 1999, p. 66). In exploring the connection between normalising practices and subjectification, this study assumes neither a complete binary opposition between the governmental discourse and micro discourses, nor a mono-casual link between the two. On the contrary, depending on the existing literature, it re-emphasizes a need to look for a more subtle and complex relationship in understanding the connection between macro and micro levels rather than only paternalistic attempts at the micro-management of conduct (Rose 2003, p. 6). This subtle and complex relationship will be examined by studying contradictory and complementary narratives of immigrant women within the socio-political context of immigration governance.

**Biopolitics and governmentality**

The theory of biopolitics as interpreted by Foucault\(^5\) is a useful perspective in explaining the effects of governmental practices on immigrants and linking it to subjectification. I will refer to biopolitics within a governmentality framework as techniques of power which seize life as the object of its exercise (Lazzarato 2002, p.100). Biopower here refers to a general strategy of power that takes into account processes of life and the possibility of controlling and modifying them (Lazzarato 2002, p.99). In my empirical investigation I will analyse family immigration as the dominant form of immigration to Denmark for showing how gendered biopolitics play a role in controlling populations. Before that I will refer to the theory of
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\(^5\) For other interpretations see for example Agamben (1998), Esposito (2008) or Hardt and Negri (2000).
biopolitics and its significance with regards to immigration governance in more detail within the theory chapter, Chapter 3.

One of the main arguments of this study is that the restrictive legislative measures in Denmark are indicating distinctive gendered biopolitics which take place within neoliberal themes and a simultaneous reproduction of a welfare myth that is based on a homogeneous society. Within this context, I discuss immigration governance from the perspective of its effects on the management of populations and use the concept of biopolitics in order to show how power in governance affects the creation of identities and a particular truth about the idea of belonging. Here, biopolitics works its way through the immigration regime by excluding and including individuals as part of normalising and regulating populations. An examination of the changing immigration regime within a biopolitical scheme will indicate ways in which belonging may take gendered or cultural forms in the normalisation of populations.

According to Foucault, biopower has come to be exercised at the level of life (Rabinow and Rose 2006, p. 196). From this perspective Foucault also became ‘interested in determining what there is in life that resists, and that, in resisting this power, creates forms of life that escapes its control’ (Lazzarato 2002, p.100). In this research I will try to explore the subjectification of immigrant women by examining how they resist, negotiate or rework governmental discourses in their narratives of belonging. I will explain Foucault’s understanding of subject in more detail in Section 2.5.

Rabinow and Rose (2006, p. 197) propose a framework for operationalising the notion of biopower, not only as a concept but for analytical utility, where they mention the following elements to be included in studying the governmentality of biopower:
- The truth discourses, and the authorities who are considered to be competent to speak that truth.

- Strategies for intervention upon collective existence that are addressed to populations and which are sometimes specified in terms of categories of race, ethnicity, gender or religion.

- Modes of subjectification, through which individuals are brought to work on themselves, in relation to truth discourses

Depending on the above framework, the examination of how immigration is rendered governable at a level of intervention to life will first of all seek to understand the problematisation of immigration in Denmark, which set its focus on third-country immigrants as problematic identities to be disciplined through political and legislative means. It will investigate what kind of truth discourses and political rationalities are used in the construction of the problematic identities. With this aim, Chapter 4 will examine how immigration is constituted within the broader institutional and political context in Denmark. This chapter will demonstrate how Danish collective identity was articulated as opposed to immigrant groups’ identities, constructing them as undeserving and culturally anomalous subjects, while at the same time (re)defining itself as deserving and western through ethical claims in Denmark. Here, I will discuss how the strong connection between cultural homogeneity and egalitarian democracy, together with economic and ideological arguments on the Danish welfare state, achieved a basis for the truth discourses about Danishness. In Chapter 5, the family reunification aspect of the Danish immigration legislation will be addressed as a problem space, and will be examined as a strategy of intervention upon the collective existence of the population in Denmark. In this process, while specific identities are defined as unethical subjects as opposed to the ethical ones, life becomes
the object of power through gendered constructions, which purport to be apolitical. An examination of the legislation changes and implementation of particular policies will point to the ways that population is regulated and normalised. At the same time Foucault’s inductive approach to power will allow to investigate governmental policies ‘from bottom up, in its heterogeneity’ (Coleman and Grove 2009, p.491), which is facilitated to focus on subject in this research.

As Foucault (2007, p. 56) stated, ‘law refers to a norm and that the role and the function of the law – therefore the very operation of the law – is to codify a norm, to carry out a codification in relation to the norm’. In this view, through family reunification laws, immigration is constituted as a target of government and made manageable through legal action that is justified by modes of subjectification in relation to binary constructions of native Danish and gendered immigrant subjects. These binary constructions mainly inform who belongs in Denmark and who does not. This point towards a normalising society, which is managed by biopolitics through exclusion and inclusion.

2.5 Constitution of subject within discourse

Depending on a Foucauldian discourse analysis, this thesis analyses immigration legislation as a discursive practice. For Foucault, discourse is the link between power and knowledge. Accordingly, the subject is constructed within discourse by becoming the bearer of the kind of knowledge which discourse produced (Hall 2001, p. 79). The subject is at the same time the object through which power is relayed (Hall 2001, p. 79). This means ‘it is the discourse, not the subjects who speak of it, which produces the knowledge’ (Hall 2001, p. 79).
Foucault’s approach to discourse is more abstract than the textually oriented discourse analysis (Fairclough 1992, p. 37). For Foucault, discourse analysis is not the same thing as linguistic analysis, nor can discourse be equated with language; Foucault sees discourse analysis as concerned with *statements* (Fairclough 1992, p. 40). A discursive formation forms a particular set of statements through rules of formation, which are constituted by prior discursive or non-discursive elements; the articulation process of these elements makes discourse a social or discursive practice (Fairclough 1992, pp. 40-41). While Foucault used discourse in a very broad sense, during the course of his work the status of discourse also acquired different meanings (Fairclough 1992, p. 39). In his work *The Archaeology of Knowledge* he focused on the types of discourses as rules for constituting areas of knowledge; whereas in his genealogical investigations he studied power and knowledge and how power made the discursive transformations possible; later his work was oriented towards the formation of the self (Fairclough 1992, p. 39). Theoretically and methodologically, Foucault placed the effects of discursive practice upon social identity at the centre of his work (Fairclough 1992, p. 45).

Critical discourse analysis based on a Foucauldian study centres around the following questions: ‘What is valid knowledge at a certain place and a certain time?’; ‘How does knowledge arise and how is it passed on?’, ‘What functions does it have for constituting subjects?’, ‘What consequences does it have for the overall shaping and development of society?’ (Jager and Maier 2009, p. 34). Foucault’s theory ‘makes an important contribution to a social change theory of discourse and power, the discursive construction of social subjects and knowledge, and the functioning of discourse in social change’ (Fairclough 1992, pp. 37-38). In this understanding, discourses make the subject: ‘the subject is of interest not as an actor but as a product
of discourses’ (Jager and Maier 2009, p. 37). At the same time discourses are ‘firmly connected to power relations in power/knowledge complexes’ (Jager and Maier 2009, p. 35); as a result they are also in active relation to reality (Fairclough 1992, p. 42).

Discourses determine reality, though of course always via intervening active subjects in their social contexts as co-producers and co-agents of discourses. The subjects are able to do this because they are entangled into discourse and therefore have knowledge at their disposal. Discourse analysis is therefore not only about the retrospective allocations of meaning, but also about the analysis of the ongoing production of reality through discourse, conveyed by active subjects.

(Jager and Maier 2009, p. 37)

This study uses discourse as a social practice (Kryzanowski and Wodak 2009, p. 21), which also serves particular ends in the exercise of power (Jager and Maier 2009, p. 35). In this view, discourses are societal means of production which produce subjects and reality (Jager and Maier 2009, p. 37).

Foucault and gender-blindness

Before explaining how women's self-interpretation and narratives will be used within a discourse analysis, it should be clarified how the criticisms against Foucault’s conceptualisation of the subject in terms of women’s experiences are dealt with in this research. Foucault has especially been criticised in terms of sexuality for gender-blindness, hence lacking a basis for normative discussion on social practices, which generally is seen as a result of his monolithic relativism (See for example Bartky 1990, Ramazanoglu 1993, Fraser 1990, McNay 1991, Taylor 1984). Looking at Foucault’s account of the disciplinary practices that produce docile bodies, Bartky (1990, p. 65), for example claims that Foucault is blind to those disciplines that treat
the body as if it was one and as if the bodily experiences of men and women bore the same relationship to the characteristic institutions of modern life. Another set of criticisms comes from arguments on Foucault’s account of subjectivity, his reluctance to attribute explicit agency to subjects (Deveaux 1994, p. 228) and his lack of a rounded theory of subjectivity or agency (McNay 1991, p. 125). In a similar understanding, Foucault’s notion of power is criticised as only examined from the perspective of how it is installed in institutions and not from the point of view of those subject to power (McNay 1991, p. 134). In my take on Foucault, this study will focus on women’s experiences of belonging as subjects to immigration governance in Denmark. The question of agency will be answered by exploring the ways immigrant women as agents resist or challenge the normalisation of binary identities in their self-interpretations. Below I will argue that Foucault’s approach to subject and his governmentality perspective by which he examines subjectification are especially useful in analysing immigration governance from a broader perspective in de-essentialising gendered identities.

Where there is power there is resistance

According to Deleuze, Foucault's legacy to some is to have asked the questions: ‘what is the nature of truth in today's world and how is it modulated by power and the ability to resist it?’ (Deleuze 1986, p. 124, cited in Kirtzman 2000, p. 33). These questions sum up the ethical contribution of Foucault well. As Foucault himself (cited in Shiner 1982, p. 384) said once: ‘the intellectual's role is not to provide vision and leadership, nor is it to offer a global social and economic theory. Rather it is to provide an analysis of the specificity of the mechanisms of power’. Foucault does not only challenge the present power systems, but also offers a space in his theory for
questioning transformation and why individuals accept certain practices of power, yet resist others. In terms of investigating Danish immigration governance and the visibility of gendered and racialised identities in Denmark, this understanding of Foucault’s theory took shape in asking questions about subjects and a desire to give voice to them as agents. Being aware of the limits of Foucauldian research and the criticisms about his gender blindness, I will mention the perspectives below that are essentially important in the knowledge production of this study and concern the reasons why I choose to use Foucault's theory for conceptualising of subjectivity through discourse by a governmentality framework.

First of all, Foucault’s notion of positive power helps us to think of subject differently in an anti-essentialist way by treating it outside dichotomies such as the duality of oppressed and oppressor or subject and objective structures (Newton 1998, p. 418). In Foucauldian thinking subject is not a pre-given unitary and sovereign constitution; instead it is intimately bound to power/knowledge relations, which traverse both subjects and social structures (Newton 1998, p. 418). This implies an interconnectedness between subject and power in governance, which is essential in understanding how the boundaries of identity are constructed. I also think that, especially in the analysis of immigration governance, the concepts of biopower and biopolitics are crucial for de-essentialising feminine identities, questioning any gendered destiny (Amigot and Pujal 2009, p. 650), and forming a critical ground for analysing the normalising techniques in their relation to the subject. Foucault was interested in how individuals became self-monitoring while believing themselves to be free (Bacchi 1999, p. 47). The idea of self-making and being made constitutes the core of governmentality studies.
Moreover, the fact that subjects are constituted by discourse does not mean that such a constitution rules out the capacity of the subject to make conscious choices with respect to the discourses of power which impose meanings upon subject (Farahani 2007, p. 44). Foucault's (1979, p. 95) positive notion of power – ‘where there is power there is resistance’ – implies an antagonistic nature of power, which depends on strategic relationships (Foucault 2002, p. 342). This means that in a Foucauldian understanding of the subject there is always scope for resistance. Resistance here refers to ‘the possibility of ignoring or rejecting the social demands and expectations that certain subject positions direct at those filling them’ (Oels 2005, p. 187). In line with this approach I will look at how women reflect over the dominant discourses on belonging in Danish society and how they normalise these discourses in resisting or negotiating them while building their own reality of belonging. I am mainly interested in seeing how immigrant women practice their agency under the dominant images of a right ‘subject’, who is seen as deserving to belong in Denmark. In this perspective, I also want to investigate what kind of relationship exists between immigrant identities and particular claims for belonging.

In the above context, this research uses narratives of immigrant women as tools for understanding how specific processes of normalisation are entangled in articulation of identities and meanings of belonging. By studying each woman’s interpretation of belonging and contextualising their talk with regards to the common themes that surface Danish immigration politics I analyse their subjectivity, not only as victims of their social environment, but also as active agents. In order to do this I demonstrate their agency through discourses and narratives in our analysis.
2.6 Analysing discourse in narratives

The majority of the governmentality analyses use data, like primary data texts that emanate from particular institutions, especially the state, such as policy documents etc. A sole focus on policy will, however, tell only the half of the story – especially because policy may not be implemented exactly as written or indented, and policy documents do not always tell about the exact effects of governmental strategies on subjects. Therefore, I think that speaking subjects themselves can give better insight into the substantive subjective effects of governmental technologies like immigration legislation, even if I do not take their words as transparent reflections of reality. In this perspective, situating the subject in focus will fill a gaping hole in governmentality studies. Below I will discuss how I will make use of the interviews with immigrant women in my primary data analysis to investigate their experiences of belonging.

In this study narratives constitute the primary empirical data for examining and understanding the competing and complementary discourses, which construct immigrant women's belonging. By using interviews I seek to carve out experiences of immigrant women in family reunification by drawing upon their belonging. In discourse analysis the subject is constituted of discourses; ‘analysis in narrative studies opens up the forms of telling about experience, not simply the content to which language refers’ (Riessman 1993, p. 2). In narrative analysis through their expressions of experience, the interviewee's subjectification is observed. In this research of personal narratives of immigrant women, I examine their subjectivity.
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6 These studies also focus on the development of specific political rationalities, formulation of different governmental programmes, strategies etc. For example: Mitchell (2006), Larner and Walters (2004), Sending and Neumann (2006).
First of all, it has to be made clear that the immigrant women referred to various narrative genres in their talks and their expressions were not always in the form of classic story telling. However, this is not incompatible with narrative analysis in social science. In fact, not all narratives are stories in a linguistic sense of the term and individuals may relate experiences using a variety of narrative genres, which do not necessarily incite conditions and culminate events but rather their narratives might take the form of habitual narratives-when events happen repeatedly or hypothetical narratives-which represent events that did not happen (Riessman 1993, p. 18). This also characterises the interviews in this research: the respondents were asked open ended questions and there was a diversity of narratives presented in their answers and expressions. At the same time narratives are intrinsically related to the power relations and social discourses and an individual's narrative might not be consistent from one setting to the next (Riessman 1993, p. 65). Below, I will briefly clarify my general approach to narrative analysis in this study.

In this research I acknowledge that in the telling there is an inevitable gap between the lived experience and any communication about it (Riessman 1993, p. 10). While the meaning shifts because it is constructed at a second level representation, the story might have taken a different form if someone else was the listener (Riessman 1993, p. 11). All this means that talking and listening together produce a narrative (Riessman 1993, p. 11). This raises the question of scientific objectivity with regards to researcher's own positionality in her relationship to the researched, and reflexivity as to her role as the researcher. Feminist research acknowledges and recognises the relationship between the respondent and the interviewer, which becomes the part of the data of the research and not external to it (Bano 2007, p. 101). Where a researcher is socially located and positioned vis-à-vis the researched is important in considering
the certain type of power relationship in the research process (Henry 2003, p. 238). During the course of my fieldwork, I found my position both as an insider and an outsider in my interactions with immigrant women originating from Turkey. Coming from Turkey and speaking Turkish I could relate to interviewees in different ways with an insider's knowledge. This was in many ways helpful to develop diverse and rich experiences with the researched group. However, my identity as a researcher also created certain difficulties in terms of a power relationship between the researched and the researcher.

In the beginning, I was thinking that my Turkish identity would give me better access to the Turkish community in Denmark. This proved to be both true and wrong. My background generally helped in communicating with immigrant women in terms of language and a more meaningful interaction in understanding certain cultural codes; thus establishing a trust relationship, but it also created uncertainties in representing and locating myself as a researcher. Often I encountered questions about my background, what kind of research I was conducting and the reasons for doing this kind of a research and which institution I was part of. During the research process, where subjectivities of immigrant women were at the locus of observation, I also came to challenge my own subjectivity and identity through a mutual relationship between myself and the respondents. This forced me to renegotiate and reconstruct my positionality within this research. Accordingly, I have to acknowledge a certain amount of self-reflexivity in terms of my interactions with the respondents.

Language is a powerful tool in producing meanings, so ‘interpretation of data is like translation in constructing rather than just conveying meaning’ (Ramazanoglu and Holland 2004, p. 118). Likewise, in my approach to objective truth it has to be noted that ‘narratives function as a means of constituting rather than reflecting value-neutral
facts’ (Rosenwald and Ochberg 1992, cited in Farahani 2007, p. 45) It is through this understanding that I offer a reflexive investigation of subjectification of immigrant women, which characterises their belonging. Here, I have to mention the perspective of *hermeneutic composability*, which is referred by Jerome Bruner (1991, p. 7), who suggests that, when there is a text through which somebody tries to express a meaning and from which somebody is trying to extract a meaning, there is a difference between what is expressed in the text and what the text actually means with no unique solution to the task of determining the meaning for this expression. This implies that narratives selected will be the ones which will help us construct our own interpretation. Accordingly, it is important to mention here that my primary concern is not the structure of narratives. As Bruner (1991, pp. 5-6) argues, the central focus in analysing narratives is not how narrative as text is constructed, but rather how it functions as an instrument of mind in the construction of reality. In this perspective, I try to understand how narratives operate in constituting the reality of belonging for immigrant women when they mediate their positions in Danish immigration governance.

At this point, a couple of issues have to be mentioned in terms of certain interpretative decisions I had to take in analysing narratives. First of all, it has to be made clear that I had to make conscious decisions for selecting and presenting the narratives, mainly by choosing which narratives to include in my study and which ones to take out. This was a natural outcome of the organisation of my thesis and the impossibility of incorporating all the data to the analysis. At the same time, I translated the interviews from Turkish into English. I acknowledge that translation in narrative analysis already constitutes the first interpretation (Tolliver, p.33). Secondly, this research does not seek substantive argumentations across different narratives, nor is my aim to construct
a grand narrative on belonging. In this perspective, the analysis of the narratives in this study should rather be seen as spaces of possibilities for mapping the contradictory and complex discourses, which intersect at the construction of immigrant women's belonging.

2.7 Interviewing immigrant women from the Turkish community

To carry out this research, eleven in-depth interviews were conducted with Turkish origin family immigrant women in Turkish language. The interviews in the study are analysed through the interpretation of conversations with the interviewees, ‘with the oral discourse transformed into texts to be interpreted’ (Kvale 1996, p. 46). The data collection in this research can be described partially as an ethnographic method in which first hand observation, interviewing, long and short conversations are used. My contact with the respondent immigrant women did not mainly depend on interviews, but also included long visiting hours to their households, sometimes a whole day for only one interviewee. This allowed making observations and getting familiar with their life styles, and to some extent their presence in the private sphere. In this context, together with the discourse analysis of interview transcripts the observations constitute a very important backbone of the analysis.

Interviews conducted in this research are semi-structured and developed their own momentum within the course of the conversations in which immigrant women usually expressed their experiences in a narrative form. In the beginning of the interview each interviewee was asked about their stories of coming to Denmark after getting married and how their lives are shaped here, if they work or not etc. During these background stories, each woman revealed her own understanding of being accepted in the Danish society. Some of the interviews were taped; some others were only transcribed upon
request of the interviewees. The interviewees belong to different age groups between 20 and 60, and their education levels range from primary school degrees to university education. Three of the interviewees were divorced and single. One of them was remarried in Denmark. Four of the women interviewed have arrived in Denmark after the changes in the immigration legislation in 2002, and the others have come to Denmark between the 1970s and the 1990s. The newcomers (post-2002) were all Turkish citizens, the others were Danish citizens. This gave a better grasp about the implications of the shift in immigration politics.

The biggest challenge about conducting interviews was finding the individuals who were willing to answer questions without hesitations by establishing a trust in a short time period. After spending some time close to the Turkish immigrant community it became obvious that one of the major problems among immigrants was a general distrust towards outsiders. In this perspective, existing networks of the University of Aalborg were very helpful to break the suspicions. However, it was also interesting to see that, once the trust was established, all interviewees were remarkably open and helpful; on certain occasions they did not have any hesitations to share even more intimate details than my questions required. It is important to note here that before each interview it was made clear that confidentiality of the interviewees would be respected. For privacy reasons and in order to prevent recognition of these women I use pseudonyms and avoid giving detailed personal information about them in terms of their experiences as a family immigrant. Accordingly, I mention them anonymously within the themes of belonging throughout this thesis.

In this research I do not focus on the ethnicity of immigrants. The Turkish community in Denmark is quite fragmented and immigrants coming from Turkey define themselves in diverse ways in terms of their ethnicity. The interviewees in this
research came from a variety of ethnic backgrounds; however, I chose to limit my study to the status of third-country immigrants originating from Turkey. What matters for this research is how this status is interpreted and negotiated in various ways by our respondents. Accordingly, I do not use the term *Turkish* as a marker of ethnic identity, but as a term to indicate that a person has emigrated from Turkey and defines herself as a member of Turkish community within Denmark.

It is also important to state that the class backgrounds of these women are not specified for the purposes of our study since the meaning of class in Turkey would not necessarily translate directly into the Danish context. Most of all, I did not want to reduce status into class by categorising these women’s backgrounds. However, this does not mean that I am totally disregarding the notion of class, but that my interest here is limited to seeing what an immigrant status means in the Danish context as a member of a relatively economically disadvantaged group. I am also mentioning the aspect of class downward mobility which was significant for one interviewee in terms of her interpretation of work. Here, it also has to be noted that this group was generally made up of individuals who came from financially and socially disadvantaged backgrounds in Turkey. I acknowledge that this situation can be a determining factor in their accommodation and acceptance in Denmark. I can clarify here that in the overall analysis of narratives of immigrant women I aim to avoid categorisations such as age, class, ethnicity and education.

In this study family immigration is found especially worth examining. Family reunification is highly politicised in Denmark. Despite being the object of immigration governance in Denmark, family immigrant women have been more or less voiceless. In this perspective, I specifically wanted to reveal these women’s perspectives and experiences. Secondly, biopolitics deserves a larger attention for
disclosing various gendered practices. The family unit can still be considered as a major patriarchal instrument in the governance of populations. I find it especially interesting to examine and analyse what kind of topics become relevant in the construction of identities when elements of family and gender are in question simultaneously.

My reasons for choosing the Turkish immigrants were twofold. One of the reasons is more pragmatic: it would be easier for me to arrange interviews with the individuals from the Turkish community because of my Turkish background and it would also be easier to communicate in Turkish language. Secondly, the Turkish community in Denmark is mostly made up of economic immigrants and today the only channel of immigration from Turkey to Denmark is family reunification. As a result I thought this group would be suitable for investigating family reunification. Moreover, the Turkish community in Denmark is a big one: Turkish immigrants were the largest group in 2001 in terms number of residents from non-EU countries (Blume, Gustafson et al. 2005, p. 6). As of 2010, the people with Turkish origin constituted 16 per cent of the overall non-western population (Statistics Denmark 2010b). First-comers from Turkey have arrived in Denmark in 1960s and were generally men. The majority of the wives joined them through family immigration after 1973 when the labour scheme ended with the oil crisis. Today it would be wrong to examine family related immigration only as female immigration and there is a remarkable population of imported husbands from Turkey. However, examining the situation of women is especially important and valuable in providing deeper insights to biopolitics of immigration in Denmark and how gendered constructions play a role in rendering immigration governable. As I will discuss in the following chapters, and explicitly in
Chapter 5, the case of Denmark is a good example in revealing how gendered notions dominate the construction of immigrant identities from various perspectives.

The interviews took place in different cities in Denmark: in Copenhagen’s Norrebro district and in the cities of Ringsted and Aalborg, between April and July 2009. The participants in this research were chosen through the snowball method with the help of the networks established during my field research at the Feminist Research Centre of Aalborg University in Denmark in the same period. The main advantage of snowball sampling is to obtain respondents where they are few in number or where a certain degree of trust is required to initiate the contact (Atkinson and Flint 2001, p.2). At the same time, the snowball method has a number limitations. First of all, since subjective choices of the respondents first accessed play a very important role, snowball samples can be biased and do not allow researchers to make claims to generality from a particular sample (Atkinson and Flint 2001, p.2). Moreover, there is the problem of the gatekeeper bias which refers to a situation where potential respondents act as gatekeepers to a particular sampling group and thereby have the control of access (Atkinson and Flint 2001, p.2). I acknowledge that the group I chose in my research is not representative of the entire family immigrant women in Denmark. Although Turkish immigrants constitute a large section of ethnic minority population in Denmark, I am aware of the diversity within family immigrants across different nationalities, groups or communities. Accordingly, it is also important to acknowledge here that other immigrant groups might be constructed differently in different ways in different countries as a result of which their self-positioning will be constructed differently. As such it is possible that the choice of the Turkish community as an example reflects certain elements specific to it which are translated
via culture, religion or even language in terms of the interpretations of identity and belonging during the interviews.

Yet, my aim is not to draw generalisations about one group or ethnicity; on the contrary, I emphasise the dangers of making generalisations by illustrating in what ways marriage migrants define themselves in contradictory and complementary narratives as opposed to the Danish governmental discourse. In doing this, I aim to sketch a variety of different possibilities about how they could be subjectified through micro technologies of power, by putting the individual into the spotlight. In short, I want to see how certain constructions or assumptions about immigrant identity and problematisation of immigration in a particular way are self-reflected by immigrant women. In doing this I emphasise the heterogeneity of the subject. Accordingly, the central idea is to draw attention to the dangers or problems of making claims to generality in terms of identity and subject making.

2.8 A two-tier analysis: linking politics to life

The point of departure in this study can be summed up as the link between big institutional sites of power and politics of everyday life (Hunt and Wickham 1994, p. 16). Foucault's theoretical perspective allows for such an analytical connection. Within the technologies to manage immigration I investigate in what ways third-country immigrants become subjects through the reality of belonging. The very subjectifications will also demonstrate the ways macro technologies depart from liberal norms of equality in local and fragmented forms. Basing my perspective on Foucault, I look at subjection from a duality: Being subject means both being subject to an external force by control or dependence; and at the same time it involves a self-conscious aspect of being tied to one’s own identity (Foucault 2000b, p. 331). In the
above perspective I will further elaborate the research questions of this study in the following paragraphs. Derived from the backdrop of the methodological perspective, the questions I formulated in Chapter 1 can be substantiated as below:

1) How has immigration been problematised in Denmark with regards to identity construction and designated insiders and outsiders?

In order to answer this question I will explore how the dichotomy of immigrant versus native Danish become a reality in Danish immigration governance. This concerns the kind of political rationalities, visibilities and knowledge about immigration in a broader perspective, which eventually leads to a stratification of rights and hierarchy within the political economy of immigration. In Chapters 4 and 5, I will specifically talk about constructions of truth about immigrant identity as opposed to native Danish identity with regards to political rationalities and knowledge about an ideal society. While this will concern national identity rhetoric, I will also discuss how this knowledge has arisen within a political economy perspective.

2) How is the Aliens Consolidation Act justified, while it at the same time specifies the identities of immigrants and native Danish?

This concerns the changes in family reunification that are significantly related to the assumptions of the dichotomy between native and immigrant and how these changes are justified and produce reality. In this study family reunification is analysed as a site to show how politics of truth functions producing new visibilities and knowledge as practices of normalisation. At the same time family reunion policies are discourses, which are rearticulated by the national identity rhetoric that is constituted as part of the political economy of immigration. Accordingly, they are practices of normalisation through which belonging is mediated and as such they are also
examples of legal action in revealing how problems about immigration or immigrants achieve their reality at the level of political discourse. In Chapter 5, I will mainly focus on the legislative changes that are related to the production of a neoliberal reality through a gendered process. I will also give examples from other governmental discourses such as Gender Equality Plans for showing how these practices are further normalised.

3) What role does the Danish problematisation of immigration have on the identities of third-country immigrant women?

This is about the kind of effects of the restrictive changes on third-country immigrants as its subjects. Here I am interested in exploring a subset of questions within the subjectification of immigrant women. This relates to how immigrant women are brought to work on themselves in relation to the truth discourses on desirable subject in Denmark within immigration governance. In Chapter 6, I will put forward a narrative analysis where I question immigrant women’s interpretation of truth about belonging in Denmark depending on primary topics in governmental discourses. Below are a few questions which relate to the investigation which focuses on how immigrant women as subjects rework, accept or reject the truth of belonging in Denmark.

a) To what extent do third-country immigrant women challenge these identity claims and how do they self-realise their belonging?

b) Do they see themselves as part of a patriarchal and non-western community and try to justify their presence acknowledging the boundaries drawn in the Danish governmental discourse?
c) Do they internalise the problematisation of their communities by the Danish state or do they reject the governmental discourse altogether and construct the reality of immigrant within counter-discourses?

2.9 Concluding Remarks

In this chapter I presented my approach to the methodologies I use with regards to the theoretical perspectives preferred in conducting this research. By doing this, I tried to reveal certain epistemological and ethical issues in the examination of Danish immigration governance and its impacts on its subjects, immigrant women. Having adapted a multi-faceted perspective in which I situated myself between feminism and a Foucauldian approach, this mainly concerned various assumptions about the meaning of social and political reality and how it could be connected to experience.

In making sense of the empirical evolution of the Danish immigration regime I proposed a framework within a poststructural paradigm, which I find useful for a critical reflection on the social complexities in Danish immigration governance. I also argue that questioning objectivity and absolute truth about the identities of immigrants is necessary given the general approaches in academic discourse on immigration and gender, which I have mentioned in Chapter 1. From this perspective, while this is a context-specific examination of Danish immigration in relation to a specific truth about immigrant identities and immigration phenomenon, the very framework of analysis can be applied to different case studies as an alternative to mainstream approaches which put forward fixed claims on identities. This will enhance our understanding of the subjection and positioning of immigrants in different contexts leading to specific empirical findings about each and every case study.
As an alternative to mainstream approaches about the reality of immigration and immigrant identities, I proposed a framework of analysis which takes the subjective interpretations of immigrants into account. For this analysis I have suggested that a Foucauldian perspective is useful in bringing together a broader understanding and local and fragmented elements of immigration politics. Through this understanding I wanted to emphasise the importance of considering the interconnectedness of power structures in society and processes of subjectification. I argue that Foucauldian power analysis within a governmentality framework offers a theoretical argument which fits well within this perspective. In the following chapter, Chapter 3, I will discuss in detail the theoretical perspective I adapt in this research. This will include an in-depth argument on Foucault’s positive notion of power, his governmentality framework and the question of subject.
Chapter 3

Towards an analytical framework: the biopolitical governmentality of immigration

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will explicate the theoretical perspective on the basis of which I conducted my research in order to analyse the changing laws in Danish immigration and their impact on its subjects, third-country immigrant women, with a focus on belonging. Accordingly, I will try to demonstrate how and in what ways a Foucauldian governmentality framework can be used in order to examine the connection between truth discourses and modes of subjection in contemporary immigration politics in Denmark. For this, I will mainly refer to the concepts of biopower and biopolitics for operationalising a governmentality framework, and I will generate an argument about immigration governance, which I conceptualise as an intervention to collective existence that is influential in modes of subjection. In Chapter 6, my analysis of immigrant women’s narratives will be developed on the basis of this governmentality perspective, which foresees the constitution of the subject within discourses and in an asymmetrical relationship to power in governance.

Governing the life of immigrants is not a strategy unique to Denmark in contemporary Western politics; however, as stated before, the Danish context proves to be a fascinating example as one of the more dominating regimes within the context of European immigration politics. By using a governmentality framework, this research aims to provide a critical examination of the space of knowledge within immigration governance in Denmark from the perspective of immigrant women who are both subjects and objects to it. This is an inquiry of self-representation in which speaking
subjects present their own interpretations of belonging. At the same time, the changes in Danish immigration laws during the last decade, as will be mentioned in the following chapters, reveal the necessity to reconsider their implications within a broader framework of political economy. From this perspective, this research also questions broader implications of the immigration governance by linking the personal experiences to the political sphere.

As the theoretical basis of my research, this chapter will raise problematisations presented by Foucault starting from his power theory to his conceptualisation of subject within the relevant themes of governmentality of Danish immigration. The idea of governmentality connects Foucault’s theories of power with subjectivity in a more direct fashion to the problem of state and politics than his previous investigations (Walters and Haar 2005, p. 288). Through the term governmentality, we understand how individual life can become the core of political strategies or how sovereign power manifests itself on different forms of life transforming into something not quite tangible but rather penetrating on different levels of the social body. Foucault uses the history of governmentality to show how the modern state and the modern autonomous individual codetermine each other’s emergence (Lemke 2002, p. 51). This is related to how the constitution of subject and the formation of state provide the link between the technologies of the self and the technologies of domination (Lemke 2002, p. 51). In this thesis I will try to show how the governmentality approach can be used for interpreting the dynamics of change in immigration legislation, in connection to third-country immigrants’ subjectification.

The investigation of biopolitics and the concept of governmentality involve an understanding of Foucault’s power theory, since his conception of power constitutes the main pillar of his work. Power becomes a persistent and a central element in his
investigations of hospitals, prisons and asylums. His genealogical approach later on is oriented towards an analysis of the problem of government, and combines the technologies of the self and the technologies of domination through which he investigates the processes of subjection by using the concept of governmentality. Accordingly, I will first mention Foucault’s conception of power from a broader perspective. Then I will refer to the governmentality analysis to explain how and why the connection between politics and life matters in examining politics of belonging. In this study I refer to family reunion strategies as examples that show how individual life can become the target of political power. In this context, governmentality analysis provides a theoretical elaboration, which potentially opens the practices of family-related immigration into critical and tactical thinking (O'Malley and Clifford 1997, p. 503).

**Immigration and biopolitical mapping of included and excluded**

In the examination of immigration governance *universalism* versus *exceptionalism* is defined as one of the important paradoxes which is constituted at the interconnectivity of rights and belonging. In Chapter 1 I identified this problematic in the Danish context as the paradox of *liberal egalitarian universalism* versus *conservative xenophobic immigration securitisation*. In the following chapters, I will attempt to reveal the political rationalities and the justification of the changes in immigration law with regards to the divisions between *included* and *excluded* from a biopolitical perspective.

In analysing the subjectivities of Danish immigration, I will also try to explore how biopolitical governmentality uses an increasingly neoliberal logic as part of securitisation of immigration. Before exploring relevant modes of subjection in the
Danish case, I will mention welfare cuts and reduced state responsibility that targeted third-country immigrants – especially unemployed immigrants – and I will demonstrate how these changes were articulated and justified by a dominant cultural rhetoric.

From the above perspective, the following sections (3.2 – 3.7) will put together a theoretical approach in order to identify basic perspectives and conceptualisations of my analytical model I have presented in the previous chapter. Here, I will mention in more detail how subject is to be understood through Foucault’s positive notion of power and what a biopolitical governmentality perspective offers in terms of the problematisation of the subject. I will also discuss neoliberalism as a form of rule, which has become dominant in the production of identities by informing a certain form of belonging within society and by making a new articulation of immigrant identity possible. From this perspective, I aim to bring the subject to the core of biopolitical governmentality for clarifying the dividing point of rights and belonging for a further argument and analysis of the contemporary Danish context in the following chapters.

3.2 Foucault’s productive power

Foucault described power as a strategic situation which is made up of multiple and complex relations that are heterogeneous and operate through mechanisms that shape and constitute actors in a society through enabling and constraining (Foucault 1979, pp. 81-97). This understanding implies that power, in Foucauldian terms, is not necessarily a negative force. As a matter of fact, this positive conception of power is what sets Foucault apart from the traditional political science theories of power (see for example Weber 1979; Bachrach and Baratz 1962; Lukes 1977). Unlike those,
Foucault refused to see power solely as repressive. On the contrary, he challenged this negative perception by emphasising its productiveness: because power had not only a repressive side to it, it also traversed and produced things, induced pleasure, formed knowledge and produced discourse (Foucault 2000c, p. 120). Foucault’s power becomes the guiding element in his analysis of political strategies. His approach allows us to consider not only the different fields of action upon which power is exercised but also the role of the autonomous individual within the complex technologies of power. Foucault’s research in this sense favours an analysis of the ways in which power penetrates subjects’ very bodies and forms of life (Agamben 1998, p. 5).

In the above context, the conception of power in question is a broad one, which goes beyond the understanding of a sovereign power and includes many kinds of relationships of force which form the basis of the whole social body (Foucault 1979, p. 94). Accordingly, ‘power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything but because it comes from everywhere’ (Foucault 1979, p. 93). With this perspective Foucault tried to show that an examination of power which is embodied in the state apparatus or in the formulation of law necessitates a theorisation of it as a rather complex phenomenon that goes beyond a sovereign power. This wider conceptualisation rejects a juridico-discursive conception that is traced back to the Middle Ages when law was used interchangeably with power (Foucault 1979, p. 81). At the same time, power could be understood neither as a structure nor as an institution (Foucault 1979, p. 93). Power relations cannot be solely analysed as domination and they do not refer to an asymmetrical relationship. Accordingly, they do not always result in a removal of liberty or options available to individuals; on the
contrary, they could result in empowerment or responsibilisation of subjects, with the enforcement of free decision-making in fields of action (Lemke 2002, p. 53).

...Power relations are deeply rooted in the social nexus, not reconstituted ‘above’ society as a supplementary structure whose radical effacement one could perhaps dream of. In any case, to live in a society is to live in such a way that action upon other actions is possible – and in fact ongoing. A society without power relations can only be an abstraction. Which, be it said in passing, makes all the more politically necessary the analysis of power relations in a given society, their historical formation, the source of their strength or fragility, the conditions which are necessary to transform some or to abolish others.

(Foucault 1983, p. 208)

Within the above understanding, Foucault considers the state as an abstraction which obscures the many other forces at work that create power relations. He stated that ‘the representation of power has remained under the spell of monarchy. In political thought and analysis we still did not cut off the head of the king’ (Foucault 1979, pp. 88-89). In other words: in order to understand how power mechanisms work as part of the political apparatus, one has to go beyond sovereign power and look from the perspective of different levels of the social body. Power has to be studied as the overall effect of its strategic positions (Foucault 1991, p. 26). Foucault’s critique of the juridico-political discourse challenged the idea that power can be possessed by a dominant class or state that it is primarily repressive in character, or that it can be located in a single, centralised source (Lemke 2002, p. 51).

Similarly ‘mechanisms of power are an intrinsic part of all of the relationships such as family or sexual relationships’ (Foucault 2007a, p. 2). Within this understanding the modern strategies of regulation point to a power situation in the social body which
fosters complex interdependence between the forces and institutions that are deemed political, and instances, sites or apparatuses which are regarded as non-political (Rose 1993, p. 286). This perception situates power in the politics of everyday life.

At the same time, power relations do not simply work their way through obligation or prohibitions on those who do not have it; power relations function by investing those without power, are transmitted by them and through them, they exert pressure upon them, just as they, themselves, in their struggle against them, resist the grip they have on them (Foucault 1991, p. 27). For example, in Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison, Foucault examines the power mechanisms behind the transformation of the penal system and shows how microphysics of power function. Here, Foucault places the body at the centre of antagonisms between different formations of power/knowledge (Hall 2001, p. 78). With a genealogical examination of the punishment system we see how the human body becomes a political investment of power relations not only through direct physical violence but also in a more planned out and organised strategy (Foucault 1991, p. 25). The disciplinary institutions such as the prison work towards the normalisation of society by means of creating docile bodies.

The study of this micro-physics presupposes that the power exercised on the body is conceived not as a property, but as a strategy, that its effects of domination are attributed not to appropriation, but to dispositions, manoeuvres, tactics, techniques, functioning; that one should decipher in it a network of relations, constantly in tension, in activity, rather than a privilege that one might possess, that one should take as its model a perpetual battle rather than a contract regulating a transaction or the conquest of a territory.

(Foucault 1991, p. 26)
This broader perspective on power allows a more subtle understanding of the subject, who can resist within the positive relations of power. While power is not only repressive but also productive, the resistance is not to be understood as an outside dimension. In this approach the truth in the construction of divisions of belonging and processes of normalisation becomes central. Accordingly, I am especially interested in seeing how immigrant women normalise the truth about belonging in Denmark. I study belonging as a measure of subjection that shapes the identities. Before I focus on the notion of subject in a Foucauldian sense, it is important to mention the relationship between discourse and truth. This relationship is important in determining the methodological consequences of this study that is based upon Foucault's understanding of discourse and the power–knowledge axis.

3.3 Discourse, truth and knowledge

As I sketch above, Foucault’s rejection of a negating power model lays the foundation for his understanding of how identities are constructed and how subjection occurs. Here, the discursive character of power relations is central in understanding how subjects are constituted within complicated power and knowledge relationships. Accordingly, the subject is constructed within discourse by becoming the bearer of the kind of knowledge which, discourse produced (Hall 2001, p. 79). It is at the same time the object through which power is relayed (Hall 2001, p. 79). This means that ‘it is the discourse, not the subjects who speak of it, which produces the knowledge’ (Hall 2001, p. 79). Subjects may produce particular texts, but they are operating within the limits of the episteme, the discursive formation, the regime of truth, of a particular period and culture (Hall 2001, p. 79).
According to Foucault, discourses are ‘the practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak’ (Foucault 1972, p. 49). Knowledge manifests itself as a power situation within a discursive practice and discourses will have effects in the way of thinking or behaving. They produce something else than the thing within or of themselves and cannot be analysed in isolation (Mills 2002, p. 17). Hence, they ‘emphasise the processes that produce the kinds of people, with characteristic ways of thinking and feeling and doing that live lives in specific contexts’ (Hunt and Wickham 1993, p. 7).

Foucault stresses that discourse should be studied as ‘a system of meaning that constitutes institutions, practices and identities in contradictory and disjunctive ways’ (Larner 2000, p. 12), rather than a mere framework of representation of one’s lived experience or a form of rhetoric promulgated by hegemonic groups (Larner 2000, p. 12). This means that discourses are not just the way that social issues get talked and thought about; but they also ‘structure the possibility of what gets included or excluded, what gets done or remains undone’ (Hunt and Wickham 1994, p. 8). In this study, discourse is mainly analysed from the perspective of its effects. Accordingly, I am examining discourse as a product and with regards to its social effects. I investigate how the Danish immigration discourse of belonging constitutes its subjects in contradictory or complementary ways. As Bacchi (2005, p. 201) states, the discovery of discourse for feminists has been most useful in identifying the ways in which women are positioned as other. In this research, I first identify dominant discourses on immigration and belonging and then explore the ways subjects move within the constraints imposed by those dominant discourses (Bacchi 2005, p. 201).

The notion of truth in this study should be understood within the same context and in relation to the conceptualisation of discourse. Accordingly, discourse generates truth
claims (Hunt and Wickham 1994, p. 11). Foucault states that each society has a particular regime of truth, which is produced by virtue of multiple forms of constraint, and which he defines as ‘the types of discourse it accepts and make function as true; the mechanisms and instances that enable one to distinguish true and false statements; the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true’ (Foucault 2000c, p.131). This understanding characterises my approach to study how the problem of immigration achieves its reality. This study considers the truth about immigration and immigrants as produced through power relationships by the exercise of knowledge claims. In this perspective, the implementation of immigration legislation depends on a certain knowledge about immigrant identities as opposed to native Danish. Here it is important to note that my aim is not to entirely investigate the frames in terms of dominant discourses of immigration, but to identify them as factors in shaping the self-understanding of immigrant women’s belonging.

For Foucault, discursive regimes function through social constraints that include phenomena such as the valorisation of some statement forms and the concomitant devaluation of others; the institutional entitlement of some people to knowledge claims and the concomitant exclusion of others; procedures for the extraction of information from and about people involving in forms of coercion and the proliferation of discourses directed towards objects of inquiry, which are at the same time targets for the application of social policy (Fraser 1981, p. 274). This perspective relates to the interconnectivity of power and knowledge in the discursive production of identities. For example, in the case of Danish immigration the construction of the
undesirable immigrant is examined with regards to particular knowledge claims on gender equality and forced marriages.

The themes of power and knowledge are already visible in *Madness and Civilization* (Foucault 2007b), even though these do not yet constitute the central problem of Foucault’s work as they did in his later analysis. By this investigation, Foucault not only challenges the truth about madness but also deconstructs the very processes by which madness is constituted through the boundaries between reason and unreason. By uncovering the social meaning of madness, Foucault examines the development of discourses around sanity, which are situated within certain knowledge systems and are produced through practice. Here, disciplinary institutions like mental hospitals or asylums are important to show the development of power/knowledge regimes in a local and fragmented fashion, rather than as systems, which are imposed from top-down (Fraser 1981, p. 276).

Knowledge is that of which one can speak in a discursive practice, and which is specified by the fact: the domain constituted by different objects that will or will not acquire a scientific status (the knowledge of psychiatry in the nineteenth century is not the sum of what was thought to be true, but the whole set of practices, singularities and deviations of which one could speak in psychiatric discourse)... there is no knowledge without a particular discursive practice; and any discursive practice may be defined by the knowledge that it forms.

(Foucault 1972, pp. 182-183)

While Foucault puts forward the various transformations of the forms of knowledge with regards to madness, it also becomes possible to examine them in relation to social control as this transformation also forms the basis of some kind of management of the social body through various mechanisms. As Gordon (2002, p. 127) suggests,
this is done by normalisation or construction of a normal and/or natural which can be interpreted as setting the limits for identities, interests and shaping the behaviour and excluding the unwanted/abnormal ones, or by the legitimisation of certain kind of practices for social outsiders. In other words, these divisions, or in Foucauldian terms dividing practices, help to systematise effective social control and the creation of specific identities along the principles of exclusion and inclusion within discursive practices. Below is a passage from Madness and Civilisation which is about how confinement as a dividing practice separated reason from unreason. It is also an example how opposition between reason and folly formed a principle of exclusion in history as part of the control of discourse or, in a broad sense, how discourse can function as a system of exclusion (Foucault 1971, p. 9).

Confinement merely manifested what madness, in its essence, was: a manifestation of non-being; and providing this manifestation, confinement thus suppressed it, since it restored it to its truth as nothingness. Confinement is the practice which corresponds most exactly to madness experienced as unreason, that is, as the empty negativity of reason; by confinement madness acknowledged to be nothing. That is, on one hand madness is immediately perceived as difference: whence the forms of spontaneous and collective judgement sought ... on the other hand, confinement cannot have any other goal than correction ... an operation to annihilate nothingness.

(Foucault 2007b, p. 109)

The argument on the transformation of knowledge with regards to social control raises questions about the location of politics. The ubiquitous nature of power makes it impossible to speak of different domains such as political, social or private (Cruikshank 1999, p.5). In this context, Rose argues that complex power relations make it difficult to distinguish those who have power and those who are subject to it
as a result of the diversity of the types of authority that are justified in different ways and that have different relations to their subjects (Rose 1993, p. 287). The political should be seen as transformed and reconstituted at the micro-levels of everyday life (Cruikshank 1999, p.5). In studying immigrant women’s subjectivity through their expressions of everyday life experiences of belonging, the framework of governmentality allows for the link between different levels of power. This problematic will be further mentioned with regards to the connection between technologies of the self and technologies of domination and an elaboration of the concept of governmentality in section 3.4.

In Discipline and Punish, Foucault (1991, p. 23) outlines a brief framework on how he developed his investigation of punishment as a complex social function. This outline gives important clues on how to approach the power problematic in employing a Foucauldian analysis from the perspective of subjectivities. First of all, Foucault approaches the punishment system as a field of specific power relations, which is transformed or enabled by specific technologies. These power relations are constituted on the basis of a field of knowledge, which at the same time presupposes these relations. Secondly, by referring to these techniques he looks at how man became the object of knowledge for a discourse by specific modes of subjections (Foucault 1991, pp. 23-24). Here both an investigation on how to approach power relations and the intrinsic relationship between power and knowledge are introduced. In the below section I will briefly focus on the problem of the subject in Foucauldian perspective before mentioning the concept of governmentality in the following section.
3.4 The question of the subject

For Foucault (2000b, p. 331), ‘subject’ had two different meanings: first of all it was being subject to someone else by control and dependence and secondly being tied to her own identity by conscience or self-knowledge. Accordingly, power made individuals into subjects ‘by applying itself to immediate everyday life, categorising the individual, marking him by his own individuality, attaching him to his own individuality, imposing a law of truth on him that he must recognise and others have to recognise in him’ (Foucault 2000b, p. 331). In this perspective what becomes important are the ways in which individuals experience themselves as subjects. In other words, subjection not only acts on an individual as a form of domination but at the same time it activates and forms the subject by designating a form of restriction in production which is necessary for the production of the subject itself (Butler 1997, p. 83). The process of self-making and being made by power relations that produce consent operates through schemes of surveillance, discipline, control and administration (Ong 1996, p. 737).

Foucault (2000b, p. 326) stated that the main goal of his work in analysing power has been to ‘create a history of the different modes by which human beings are made subjects’. He furthermore stressed that the multi dimensional conceptualisation of power was in fact necessary to study the objectivising of the subject (Foucault 2000b, p. 327). Throughout the course of his work, Foucault mainly dealt with three modes of objection, which transform human beings into subjects. These were firstly ‘the modes of inquiry which try to give themselves the status of sciences such as the objectivising of the speaking subject in linguistics, the objectivising of the productive subject such as the subject who labours, in the analysis of wealth and economics’ (Foucault 1982, p. 777). Secondly, he studied the objectivising of the subject with
regards to dividing practices through which the subject is either divided inside himself or divided from others, such as in the examples of the mad and the sane, the sick and the healthy, the criminals and the good boys (Foucault 1982, pp. 777-778). Finally, Foucault (1982, p. 778) focused on how a human being turned himself into a subject in the example of sexuality.

For Foucault, the conceptualisation of subjection on the basis of reciprocal relations of power made it insufficient to focus on the destruction of forms of identity without taking into account the production of new modes of subjectivity linked to governmental technologies (Lemke 2002, p.59). Foucault referred to the term *techniques of the self* to explain how power was transferred into forms of self-regulation, making it possible for individuals to self-govern, and defined this term as ‘the procedures, which no doubt exist in every civilization, suggested or prescribed to individuals in order to determine their identity, maintain it, or transform it in terms of a certain number of ends, through relations of self-mastery or self knowledge’ (Foucault 1997, p. 87). In one of his latest lectures, Foucault implied how techniques of the self, which permit individuals to operate through their bodies, minds and so on, were equally important as techniques of domination:

I think that if one wants to analyse the genealogy of the subject in Western civilisation, he has to take into account not only techniques of domination but also techniques of the self. Let's say: he has to take into account the interaction between those two types of techniques-techniques of domination and techniques of the self. He has to take into account the points where the technologies of domination of individuals over one another have recourse to processes by which the individual acts upon himself. And conversely, he has to take into account the points where the
techniques of the self are integrated into structures of coercion or domination.

(Foucault 1993, pp. 203-204)

The above perspective is significant within the context of immigration politics. This research is in many ways an examination of *otherness* which is constituted within an ethical and cultural discourse of Danish immigration and it seeks to understand how individual subjects are produced through power relationships while they themselves exercise power within those discursive spaces. In understanding how the immigrant subject is constituted, it is important to consider identity claims within hegemonic discourses, not only as oppressive but also as productive forces, which will have various effects on immigrant women’s self-interpretation of belonging and identity articulation.

At the same time conceptualising the subject as constituted by multiple power relations means that subjectivity is decentred (Heller 1996, p. 93). The idea of a decentred subject is explanatory in understanding what kind of subject-positions can coexist within a particular social formation (Heller 1996, p.97). In a Foucauldian perspective, one’s construction of subjectivity is bounded by discourses and is a process that is determined by the subject’s location within a specific institutional topography of a particular social formation (Heller 1996, p.91). Accordingly, studying the legislation change in Danish immigration with regards to the constitution of a decentred subject will be explanatory in this research in the struggle over the meaning of belonging by immigrant subjects and dominant discourses as two structurally opposed subject positions (Heller 1996, p. 97). In this examination ‘the concept of regimes of power/knowledge provides a way of looking critically at canonical narratives and discourses…’ (Amigot and Pujal 2009, p.651).
Within the same context, it is also necessary to note that Foucault’s account of power that is everywhere does not imply that it is equally distributed (Heller 1996, p.86). In this perspective, ‘although no individual or group has the power to control a social formation’s entire-power diagram, certain structural positions within that diagram enable certain individuals and groups to control more of a diagram’s mechanisms of power than others.’(Heller 1996, p.86)

On the basis of the above view and the conceptualisation of subject, it will be important to refer to government in order to highlight the relationship between the private and the political domains. Accordingly, the following section will be about the governmentality approach, which is used as a framework of analysis in this research to link the subject and power.

3.5 Governmentality as a concept and a framework of analysis

In line with his theory of productive power, Foucault suggested an alternative approach to the politics of state; according to this approach not the statisation of society mattered, but the governmentalisation of state (Foucault 2000a, p. 220). While Foucault opposed accepting state as a given functional unity, he furthermore stressed that this approach actually meant an overvaluation of state which at the same time reduced it to a number of functions. Thus, Foucault attempts to deconstruct the state by putting an emphasis on the notion of government:

The excessive value attributed to the problem of state is expressed basically in two ways: the form, immediate, affective and tragic, is the lyricism of the cold monster we see confronting us. But there is a second way of overvaluing the problem of the state, one that is paradoxical because it is apparently reductionist: it is the form of analysis that consists in reducing the state to a certain number of functions, such as
development of productive forces and reproduction of relations of production, and yet this reductionist vision of the relative importance of the state’s nevertheless invariably renders it absolutely essential as a target needing to be attacked and a privileged position needing to be occupied. But the state, no more probably today than at any other time in its history, does not have this unity, this individuality, this rigorous functionality, nor to speak frankly, this importance. Maybe after all, the state is no more than a composite reality and a mythicised abstraction, whose importance is lot more limited than many of us think. Maybe what is really important for our modernity- that is our present – is not so much the statization of society, as the “governmentalization” of the state.

(Foucault 2000a, p. 220)

The concept of governmentality within the above understanding can be seen as a guideline to analyse the technologies of power within society, which are not only within the monopoly of the state. With a rather broad definition, Foucault (Gordon 2000, p. xxix) refers to government as ‘conduct of conduct’; respectively, governmentality is ‘the way in which one conducts the conduct of men’ (Foucault 2008, p. 186).

Conduct has two meanings: to lead others and a way of behaving within a more or less open field of possibilities (Foucault 2000b, pp. 341). In this perspective the term ranges from governing the self to governing others (Lemke 2002, p. 51). In addition to the management of the state, the government can also be indicating the problems of self-control, guidance for family and for children, management of the household etc (Lemke 2002, p. 50). The exercise of power is ‘the management of possibilities’; and to govern is to structure the possible field of action of others (Foucault 2000b, p. 341). Accordingly, power can only be exercised over free subjects; and the power relationship and the free subject’s refusal to submit cannot therefore be separated
In this broad understanding governing individuals also takes a broad meaning:

The contact point, where the individuals are driven by others is tied to the way they conduct themselves, is what we can call, I think government, governing people is not a way to force people to do what the governor wants; it is always a versatile equilibrium, with complementarily and conflicts between techniques which assure coercion and processes through which self is constructed or modified by himself.

(Foucault 1993, pp. 203-204)

Dean (2002b, p. 119) states that the term conduct is used both as a noun and a verb: as a verb it means to guide or to direct and as a noun it almost equals behaviour, comportment. In this context, government includes any attempt to shape aspects of our behaviour according to certain sets of norms for reaching a variety of ends (Dean 1999, p. 10). The conduct which can be regulated or shaped for specific ends should be analysed as a rational attempt which is legitimised on a moral ground (Dean 1999, p. 10).

The governmentality concept can also be embodied as a particular framework of analysis. In his lectures Security, Territory and Population, Foucault (2007a, p. 116) states that the reason to study governmentality is primarily to tackle the problem of the state and the population. He offers governmentality as an alternative analytical framework to analyse the relations of power that is not limited to the exercise of sovereignty (Foucault 2008, p. 186). According to Foucault, it is important to know the type of power governmentality covers since governing is different from ruling or reigning and not the same as commanding or laying down the law, but a specific activity (Foucault 2007a, pp. 115-116). Here, government constitutes the link to analyse the technologies of the self and technologies of domination, the constitution
of the subject and the formation of the state (Lemke 2002, p. 50). In other words, governmentality is used for analysing power which is centred on population and is legitimised through its subjects. This again draws attention to the link between the micro and macro physics of power. As Lemke (2002, p. 51) points out, the history of governmentality attempts to show how the modern state and the modern autonomous individual codetermine each other’s emergence. When we think of the micro-psychics of power, as the practices conducted between individual human subjects within localised institutions (Macleod and Durrheim 2002, p. 41), the concept of governmentality is then a bridge between the micro level and macro level analyses, especially since governmentality as a framework shows how modern government is exercised through an ensemble formed by institutions, procedures, analyses etc. (Macleod and Durrheim 2002, pp. 41-44). In other words, it represents an intersection of mechanisms of power in their general forms (*macro-level, top-down*) and where they become capillary (*micro-level, bottom-up*) (Macleod and Durrheim 2002, pp. 43-44). Government then is the connection between the technologies of the self and technologies of domination; or the constitution of the subject and the formation of the state (Lemke 2002, p. 50).

How do we then analyse the power relations which are governmentalised (Foucault 2000b, p. 345)? In fact Foucault developed neither an entirely structured framework nor an apparatus for his governmentality analysis. For him, power that was governmentalised was to be seen as elaborated, rationalised and centralised under the state institutions (Foucault 2000b, p. 345). He highlighted certain themes in this analysis. These can be summed up as: *the system of differentiations* that permits one to act upon the action of others (e.g. the economic differences in the distribution of wealth); the *types of objectives* pursued by those who act upon the action of others
(e.g. maintenance of privileges), *instrumental modes*, which refer to systems of control (e.g. threat of arms or by the effects of speech), *forms of institutionalisation* (e.g. legal systems) and *the degrees of rationalisation* (economic cost) (Foucault 2000b, p. 344).

Building on Foucault, Dean (1999, p. 18) offered a more detailed and systematic conceptual framework in analysing power relations. In his perspective, an analytics of government is a study of the organised practices of governing, which he refers to as regimes of practices or government. Governmentality, on the other hand, considers the different ways of thinking about governing with different mentalities of government (Dean 1999, p. 16). The ways of thinking about government involves a particular knowledge which could be in the form of theories, ideas and philosophies or ideas as part of our social and cultural product (Dean 1999, p. 16). Through this knowledge the conducts are rationalised; at the same time, these conducts contribute to the production of certain kinds of behaviour or identities.

In a similar understanding, Lemke argues that there are two sides to Foucault’s governmentality. First of all, the term specifies a certain form of representation which is a discursive field defined by the government in which the exercise of power is rationalised (Lemke 1991, p. 191). Secondly, government is conceptualised as a comprehensive term through which the close link between power relations and processes of subjectification is obscured (Lemke 2001, p. 191). In this context, Dean (1999, p. 18) argues that truth or knowledge cannot be ignored in the analytics of government and draws attention to two important aspects of governmentality: first of all, we govern according to a particular truth about who we are and how we should govern in line with the very existence of ourselves; secondly, practices of governance lead to different ways of producing truth. This means that the analysis of government
should consider the various practices for the production of truth and knowledge within multiple forms of practical, technical and calculative rationalities together with certain programmes for their reform (Dean 1999, p. 18).

For Foucault, rationality of government meant the art of government, or in other words, systems of thinking about the nature of the practice of government (Gordon 1991, p. 3). Rose and Miller (1992, pp. 174-176) suggest an analysis of governmentality in terms of political rationalities and governmental technologies and describe political rationalities as

the changing discursive fields within which the exercise of power is conceptualised, the moral justifications for particular ways of exercising power by diverse authorities, notions of appropriate forms, objects and limits of politics, and conceptions of the proper distribution of such tasks among secular, spiritual, military and familial sectors.

(Rose and Miller 1992, p. 175)

Governmental technologies, on the other hand, are ‘the complex mundane programmes, calculations, techniques, apparatuses, documents and procedures through which authorities seek to embody and give effect to governmental ambitions’ (Rose and Miller 1992, p. 175). Political rationalities are different from theoretical discourses in the sense that they do not have systematic and closed characters (Rose and Miller 1992, p. 178); however, they do have certain regularities: they have a moral form upon which powers and duties for authorities are elaborated. These could be the ideals that the government should be directed to such as freedom, justice or economic efficiency (Rose and Miller 1992, p. 179). Moreover, they are epistemological, which means that they are articulated in relation to the objects governed (Rose and Miller 1992, p. 179) such as legal subjects with rights or specific
members of a flock to be led. Also ‘they are articulated in a distinctive idiom’ (Rose and Miller 1992, p. 179); in other words, they use language to render political reality. According to Rose and Miller (1992, p. 179), ‘political rationalities that is to say are morally coloured, grounded upon knowledge, and made thinkable through language’.

Rose and Miller (1992, p. 181) suggest that government is a problematising activity in the sense that the government owes its existence to the constant identification of failures and difficulties as a result of which programmes of government are elaborated. These programmes make use of a certain knowledge in a particular field in which the problem is addressed for exercising a legitimate power over them (1992, p. 182). Finally through the technologies of government such as standardisation of systems for training, procedures of examination, surveys, statistics etc., the political rationalities and programmes are articulated as suitable for implementation. At this point, a state centred conception of power already becomes weak; because what becomes possible is a rule at distance through a variety of agents and actors which have come to understand their situation in a similar language and logic (Rose and Miller 1992, p. 184). These agents and actors are assembled into mobile and loosely affiliated networks with shared interests that are constructed in and through political discourses, persuasions, negotiations and bargains.

Such political forces can only seek to operationalise their programmes of government by influencing, allying with or co-opting resources that they do not directly control—banks, financial institutions, enterprises, trade unions, professions, bureaucracies, families and individuals. A centre can only become such through its position within the complex of technologies, agents and agencies that make government possible.

(Rose and Miller 1992, p. 189)
Dean (1999, pp. 27-28) states that in the analyses of the regimes of government the key starting point is the identification and examination of specific situations in which the activity of governing takes place; this can be referred to as identification of problematisation. Secondly, this analysis gives priority to ‘how questions’, such as ‘how do we govern and how are we governed?’ Thirdly, practices of government should be approached as composed of heterogeneous elements on the basis of a certain regime of historically constituted assemblages through which we do things (Dean 1999, pp. 28-30). In his analysis of government, Dean brings together an analytical framework for a Foucauldian examination of governmentality. This framework of analysis is comprised of four main dimensions which are relatively autonomous, and Dean (1999, p. 33) states that none of these dimensions would be sufficient to reduce a regime to their characteristics. These elements are found useful in understanding the working definition of governmentality as a concept and within a theoretical framework. Accordingly, in the analysis of governmentality needs to include: (i) ‘field of visibility of government’ (forms of perceiving which characterises a regime of government and which are necessary to the operation of these regimes) (Dean 1999, p. 30); (ii) The techne of the government (the mechanisms, procedures, instruments, techniques, vocabularies and expressions which constitute authority) (Dean 1999, p. 31); (iii)The episteme of government (the forms of knowledge that arise and inform the activity of governing) (Dean 1999, pp. 31-32); (iv)The forms of collective and individual identity through which governmentality operates (Dean 1999, p. 32-33).

In terms of subject making, Dean states that regimes do not impose different forms of subjectivity; however, they do promote various capacities and qualities to particular agents and they are successful to the extent that these agents come to experience
themselves through such attributes. In this view, the understanding of subjection in the governmentality approach is ‘a specific form of self-reference and reference to others by means of the specific forms of rationality and technology of governing’ (Buhrmann 2005, p. 2)

3.6 From the problem of government towards the problem of population

In his conceptualisation of power as a productive force, Foucault (2000a) examined different forms of governmental regimes from the Middle Ages to the age of liberalism. Looking at these different regimes of power, he studied the link between state and government (Foucault 2007a, pp. 93-95). This link is important in understanding how the modern state functions within the realm of contemporary rationalities and techniques of power.

Foucault explained the emergence of the modern Western state as a unique type of organisation which integrated different arts of governing at the background of the ‘Christian pastorate upon which different forms of power regimes were built on it’.

These regimes are studied in different stages of development: the first one is associated with sovereign power whose objective is to reinforce, strengthen and protect the principality and the territory with the structures established in the period from Middle Ages towards the sixteenth century (Foucault 2000a, pp. 204-205). The second type of regime is the disciplinary government which is associated with the administrative state that started to come into being from the fifteenth century during which the state of the Middle Ages gradually became governmentalised (Foucault 2000a, pp. 220-221). The third one is governmentality or biopolitics. Foucault (2000a, p. 215) suggested that development of governmentality out of the realm of the

---

7 Christian pastorate or pastoral power is associated with the institutionalisation of Church and is explained to be at the beginning of governmentality by Foucault.
juridical framework of sovereignty coincides with the emergence of a new form of knowledge and respectively a different way of exercising power. This happened also in parallel with the development of the problem of population in the eighteenth century. The population has become the object of government in order to govern effectively in a rational way as a result of the constitution of knowledge with regards to the processes of population such as economy and respectively political economy that use methods such as statistics (Foucault 2000a, p. 217). Foucault (1979, p. 144) refers to this period as the era of biopower.

First came a state of justice, born in a territorality of feudal type and corresponding in large part to a society of law –customary laws and written laws … Second, the administrative state, born in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in a frontier and no longer feudal territorially, an administrative state that corresponds to a society of regulations and disciplines. Finally the state of government which is grounded in its population and which refers and has resort to the instrumentality of economic knowledge would correspond to a society controlled by apparatuses of security.

(Foucault 2000a, p. 221)

In this thesis I specifically focus on biopolitics as a form of governmentality in immigration governance and examine normalisation of identities and belonging within a space of knowledge where biopower controls individual life in regulating the Danish population. In order to understand how biopolitical governmentality can be examined I will specifically refer to how an economic knowledge about the society was embedded within securitisation of immigrant identities. Before doing that, first it would be useful to explore the concept of biopower more and to explain how it applies to population in order to further clarify this analysis.
First of all, unlike disciplinary power, which was exercised over the bodies of individuals, and sovereign power, which was exercised within the territory, biopower applies to man as a living being (rather than a body) or as a species (Foucault 2004, p. 242). Foucault (2007a, p. 1) explains biopower as ‘a set of mechanisms through which basic biological features of the human species became the object of a political strategy, of a general strategy of power, or in other words, how starting from eighteenth century modern Western societies took on board the fundamental biological fact that human beings are a species’.

In his series of lectures recorded in the book *Society Must Be Defended*, we come across the theory of biopolitics for the first time: here Foucault mentions that biopower came to be a phenomenon of the nineteenth century as the *power’s hold over life* or, in other words, *biological* coming under the State’s control (Foucault 2004, p. 239). In this work, Foucault links biopower to the classical theory of sovereignty which had the right of death and life as one of its basic attributes. In the nineteenth century this old right was complemented by the power to make live and let die (Foucault 2004, pp. 240-241). In *History of Sexuality*, Foucault (1979, p. 141) elaborates the theory of biopower and defines biopolitics as techniques of power to manage people as a group; the outcome is a ‘normalising society by technology of power centred on life’ (Foucault 1979, p. 144). His example of capital punishment clarifies the evolution and nature of biopower. He states that within the biopolitical realm the right to kill is exercised against those who represented a biological danger to others; ‘the ancient right to take life or let live is replaced by a power to foster life or disallow it to the point of death’ (Foucault 1979, pp. 137-138).

The emergence of biopower, however, does not imply that neither sovereignty nor discipline is eliminated; on the contrary, the idea of the government of population
made the problem of the foundation of sovereignty and the need to develop disciplines even more acute (Foucault 2007a, p. 109). Eventually, the new technique of biopower did not exclude disciplinary power but rather it modified it and integrated it (Foucault 2004). In this view, sovereignty, discipline and governmental management form a constituting triangle (Foucault 2007a, p. 108). Dean (1999, pp. 102-103) argues that these three rules can be defined by three lineages: sovereignty has taken the juridical form and transformed into a democracy on the basis of the rights of the political and legal subject; discipline has become a generalised regulatory mechanism for the production of docile and useful objects; and government has become a government of the processes of life and labour in which the subject is revealed in its social, biological and economic form.

**Immigrants and biopolitical territorialisation of belonging**

From a general perspective, ‘the concept of biopower serves to bring into view a field comprised of more or less rationalised attempts to intervene upon the vital characteristics of human existence’ (Rainbow and Rose 2006, p. 197). Within this field, the term biopolitics embraces all specific strategies over problematisations of collective human vitality, morbidity, and mortality (Rainbow and Rose 2006, p. 197). Accordingly, the study of biopolitics covers various themes, ranging from genetics, health/medicine, population, environment, and race, to gender etc. In this perspective, biopower seeks to achieve ‘a form of truth discourse about living beings and an array of authorities considered competent to speak that truth; strategies for intervention upon collective existence in the name of life and health; modes of subjection in which individuals can be brought to work on themselves, under certain forms of authority, in
relation to truth discourses, by means of practices of the self, in the name of individual and collective life’ (Rainbow and Rose 2006, pp. 203-204).

In this research I focus on identity-based exclusion, and investigate the paradoxes, which surround identity politics around the theme of immigration by focusing on specific problematisations about immigration. As I have tried to explain in the previous chapter, Chapter 2, by drawing on Rabinow and Rose’s (2006, p. 196) framework I have suggested the steps I will take to analyse biopolitical governmentality. These included a critical discussion of the truth discourses about immigration and respectively immigrant identities in Denmark with regards to the categories of gender and ethnicity. Later, in Chapter 6, I will focus on modes of subjectification in relation to the truth discourses.

In the above context, I frame the analytical investigation of biopolitics within the scope of the techniques and rationalities of power in immigration politics and modes of subjection in line with the related truth discourses on identities. In the following chapter, I will try to show how these truth discourses indicate a binarism of western versus non-western identity as knowledge claims for belonging. The term biopower is especially found as a useful tool in examining the borders, which are inscribed through these knowledge claims. From this perspective, the reinforcement of borders between populations or groups points toward an economy where territories, politics and life intertwine in specific ways (Giorgi and Pinkus 2006, p. 99).

Dean (1999, p. 124) gave a basic example of the position of illegal immigrants and refugees which depend on the governmental regimes that are founded on decisions on who is to be included and who is to be excluded from the juridical-political order. He argued that the paradoxical situation of including some at the expense of excluding others puts bio-politics into the zone of sovereignty:
There is also an unexpected bio-political dimension to the treatment of refugees when we consider that their status depends upon forms of knowledge, policy and legislation associated with notions of human rights. Such rights are ascribed to individuals, under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, at the moment of their birth…

(Dean 1999, p. 125)

Above, a refugee is a figure that provokes indecision whether s/he is the true subject of human rights or not (Diken 2004, pp. 83-84). This approach can be used in understanding the construction of stigmatised identities of third-country immigrants through an examination of political borders through which biopower, ascribes a process of separation and distinction (Giorgi and Pinkus 2006, p. 99). The immigrant’s legitimate membership to the society depends on certain biopolitical criteria, which are characterised by a duality between insiders and outsiders (Diken 2004, p. 88). In order to understand the economy of belonging where territories, politics and life are united in specific ways, we have to understand the kind of truth production, and the political rationalities behind the immigration governance that produce and reproduce specific borders.

3.7 Political economy of belonging and neoliberalism

A political economy understanding that is linked to subject

In the above perspective, this research draws attention to a broader economic and political context in exploring the dynamics of immigration governance and in discussing how identities are articulated through certain forms of subjections. Its scope includes legal changes in immigration governance with a focus on the Aliens Consolidation Act of 2002. These changes inform borders of belonging, upon the rationalisation of power. At the same time, the political rationality of immigration is
based on the construction of a binarism between *deserving* versus *undeserving* subject within economic criteria.

Accordingly, by using the governmentality approach developed by Foucault, this study brings together a perspective that takes into account the politics of belonging with regards to dynamics of political economy. Here I will try to show how an increasingly neoliberal logic dominates the Danish immigration governmentality and in what ways this is influential in the production of particular gendered identities and respectively subjection of immigrant women.

A biopolitics of immigration is about a government – population – political economy relationship (Lazzarato 2002, p.101). It should be noted that the political economy in question governs the whole of a complex material field, which also includes the conditions of life, the number of inhabitants, their life span, their ability and fitness for work and extends its classical critique of the relationship between capital and labour (Lazzarato 2002, p.102). By using the concept of governmentality, this research emphasises the importance of considering how the political economy perspective is embedded within a social reality that is constructed on the basis of a certain rationality (Lemke 2001, p.203). Here, I will first of all bring into focus the qualitative meaning of belonging within a neoliberal rationality, which is about the moral aspect of belonging that endeavours *an economic actor*, and is related to the state’s controlling of individuals without at the same time being responsible for them (Lemke 2001, p.201). This perspective is relevant for illustrating how power in governance is linked to subjectivity and forms of self-regulation. In terms of immigration governance it will be important to consider how the demands of neoliberalism with regards to individual scope for self determination and
entrepreneurship (Lemke 2001, p.202) meet the securitised immigrant identity. At this point, I will draw from liberalism’s dynamics of freedom and security.

**Liberalism, security and freedom**

For encompassing a better understanding about the immigrant figure as an undeserving and anomalous subject in a liberal Western setting, one has to consider the problematisation of immigrant identities and the legitimisation of restrictions on certain freedoms such as family reunion in relation to the *freedom security dilemma* within the logic of liberalism which makes it possible to govern through a freedom and security problematic. This logic is important in understanding how the differential treatment of immigrants as opposed to natives is normalised by constructing the *culturally anomalous immigrant*, who does not have sufficient autonomy to exercise certain rights on the same level as rest of the population and thus is securitised as a figure who represents a threat to the democratic liberal order and civilisation.

The origins of liberalism as a rationality with a government-limiting critique can be found at the end of the eighteenth century with the emergence of biopolitics (Dean 1999, p. 108). Rose argues that liberalism can be studied as a rule that sought to the limit the scope of political authority, while at the same time exercising vigilance over its exercise. The strategies of liberalism involved shaping the domains of the market, the public sphere and the liberty of an individual in desired directions without destroying their autonomy or existence (Rose 1993, p. 291). This can be seen in parallel with the dilemma of the liberal government as a self-questioning rule: ‘the fear of not governing enough versus the fear of governing too much’ (Rose 1993, p. 292). The justification of governmental interventions was done by a notion of security which produces forms of liberty for market participation (Dean 1999, pp. 115-117). In
this perspective a circular relation between security and liberty became intrinsic to liberalism; security disciplined individuals to direct them on how to exercise their liberty, while at the same time liberty was necessary for the security of functioning of the economy and populations (Dean 1999, pp. 115-117).

Similarly, the liberal ideal of ruling through the free activities of autonomous individuals is incomplete unless the traditional view of liberalism which presupposes that substantial parts of humanity do not possess the minimal capacities for autonomous action is taken into account (Hindess 2002, p. 133). As Dean (2002a, p. 47) argues, ‘the liberal governing through freedom, or in a manner consistent with individual liberty, does not necessarily mean that individuals should be governed as if they were already capable of such autonomy’. On the contrary, liberalism depends on free individuals, but it also has to regulate this freedom in line with certain norms of civilization by effecting a division between the civilised member of society and other members which lack the capacities to exercise their citizenship (Rose 1993, p. 291).

Immigrants’ membership and presence in society in many ways reflect this division between the ones who are assumed to have capacities and the ones who are not. I argue that neoliberalism as a rationality should be considered here in order to further enhance the understanding of how the ethical aspect of autonomy is shaped as individuals’ capacities are in question with regards to the governmentality of immigration. Accordingly the securitisation of immigration allows the state to intervene in human life. This interference is not in contradiction with the liberal ideal of ruling; on the contrary, it is legitimised on the basis of the dynamics of a freedom and security logic. Here the political rationality of neoliberalism draws attention to how particular restrictions on human life take shape and on what grounds they are made possible.
From liberalism to neoliberalism and neoliberal subjects

Within the scope of this research it is equally important to consider how neoliberalism leads to particular modes of subjectification. This has to do with how certain policies or legislative regulations that are based on a neoliberal rationality calls for a certain type of individual who is deemed as ethical. I will mention below what is meant by the transfer from a liberal towards a neoliberal ideal of ruling.

Rose (1993, pp. 285-292) defines the late nineteenth and early twentieth century’s liberal rule as welfare state as a formula for recoding the relations between the political field and the economic and social affairs. The rise of the welfare state during this period generated a regime which governed persons or activities from a distant centre through society and in relation to social norms that were set out by a variety of professionals (Rose 1993, p. 293). The state was to become the guarantor of both the freedom of the individual and the capital enterprise through socialising mechanisms for creating a collective security, such as social insurance and social work (Rose 1993, p. 293).

The Keynesian techniques of social intervention such as adjustments of monetary policy etc. were claimed to be establishing also a form of security in which the health of the society and the health of the economy became mutually reinforcing over the course of the economic cycle (Dean 1999, p. 150). While government was understood as an activity of the national welfare state and as a unitary establishment which also acted upon a unitary society, it at the same time attempted to care for population from the perspective of economics and security (Dean 1999, p. 150). This caring role was fused with the idea of Christian universalism and notions of citizenship as an exclusionary status within the liberal regime of security (Dean 1999, p. 150).
It is argued that in the last fifty years the strategies of rule with regards to welfare have changed and a new formula, *advanced liberalism* (neoliberalism) has been taking shape. Unlike the welfare state, this rule governs through the regulated choices of individual citizens rather than through society. The professionals are detached from the apparatuses of political rule and are relocated within a market by rationalities of competition, accountability and consumer demand (Rose 1993, p. 285). Dean (1999, pp. 149-150) refers to advanced liberalism as a broad ‘realm of the various assemblages of rationalities, technologies and agencies that constitute the characteristic ways of governing in contemporary liberal democracies’. Accordingly, advanced liberalism or neoliberalism can be considered as the dominant rationality of contemporary government and it coexists in complex interrelations with multiple other rationalities such as neo-conservatism and populist, anti-governmental reaction as well debates on morality and community (Dean 1999, pp. 149-150).

Here the argument is that neoliberalism as a form of rule informs a new understanding about the relationship between the state and the individual, which is directly related to the production of identities and the interpretation of belonging. In other words, it explains how immigration is rendered governable. The transformation towards an advanced liberal rule was seen as a result of an elaboration of liberal doctrines of freedom, which were put to practice creating contractual notions of mutual relations between citizens and society; the ones who were incapable of carrying obligations were now to appear anti-social under a new legitimacy (Rose and Miller 1992, p. 180). The basic argument was that new forms of globalised production relations and financial systems were forcing governments to give up the welfare state and focus on economic efficiency and international competitiveness (Larner 2000, pp. 6-7). According to Rose, neoliberalism articulated a range of criticisms towards the welfare
state in terms of its cost, its bureaucracy, its paternalism etc., but its real success lied at its capacity to render these criticisms technical. Doing this, neoliberalism became potent to associate itself with certain key elements of an alternative formula of rule by creating a new set of relations amongst people and authorities in its governmental mechanisms (Rose 1993, pp. 294-296).

As an ideology\(^8\), neoliberalism is associated with the preference for a minimal state, and markets are perceived as better tools for organizing economic activity in terms of their efficiency, competition characteristics and freedom of choice (Larner 2000, p. 5). At the same time, it implies a form of governance that encourages individuals and institutions to conform to the norms of the market (Larner 2000, p. 12). In doing this, neoliberalism puts forward a new formulation about market and state relations and a new economic/entrepreneur subject. This also means that neoliberal strategies of rule could be found in diverse realms of society and diffused themselves in various ways for a new conception of a population which is made up of market oriented free individuals.

In the above perspective, the transformation from a liberal towards a neoliberal form of rule is not only about the problematic of state and market relations but it is about a new truth about society, which informs a new kind of political subject as an ethical one (Lazzarato 2002, p.100). The neoliberal subject is an individual who is morally responsible for navigating the social realm, using rational choice based on market

\(^8\) It is important to note that I conceptualise neoliberalism within a framework of governmentality analysis. Here, neoliberalism is not understood neither as a political theory nor as an ideology. For example, while economic theories of scholars such Hayek (1960) and Friedman (1962) emphasise the importance of dominance of market over state and theorise neoliberalism as an answer to the Great Depression and totalitarianism by a reaction to Keynesians; a governmentality perspective discusses neoliberalism from the view point of the rationalities that underline certain values. As such this framework brings forward an ethical aspect to question. From a general perspective, this is about the relationship between a type of power and regime of truth or knowledge. Accordingly, this analysis facilitates an examination of subjectivity by putting focus on the link between political economy and a certain kind of ethical subject produced on the basis of a particular regime of truth.
principles to the exclusion of all other ethical values and social interests (Hamann 2009, p.37).

Within biopolitics it is the society, not the individual, that is the direct object of power (Hamann 2009, p.55); however individual life also transforms along with the transformation of governmentality. From this perspective, the new political subject should be considered with regards to overall change on the idea of belonging within immigration governance. From an identity perspective this is about a certain form of transformation of the discourse on social rights within the welfare state from a citizenship approach which is ‘based on social collective needs to another one which is based on individual market opportunity’ (Hansen 2000, p. 144). Within this transformation ‘the citizen is re-specified as an active agent both able and obliged to exercise autonomous choices’ (Larner 2000, p. 13). This might also be interpreted as eroding Marshall’s (1950, pp. 10-11) conception of social citizenship by which he referred to the right to economic welfare and security. The new politics of the welfare state is claimed to be characterised by retrenchment policies and de-socialised forms of citizenship.

…the social policy agenda of the late twentieth century has been shaped by the “politics of austerity”. The forces of globalisation and post industrialism, the revolution in family forms and gender relations, and an extended period of modest economic growth have created a very different social and political climate from that in which contemporary welfare states came to maturity between the 1950s and 1970s. (Myles and Quadagno 2002, p. 35)

At the same time economy, which was once seen as a self-regulating system and a part of national economies in mutually advantageous international trade, has been replaced by a new zero-sum competitive game. As a result of this zero-sum game the
economic efficiency and competitiveness became the constituents of a new liberal problematic of security (Dean 2002a, p. 54). Accordingly, all other activities of government such as those of the welfare state or immigration start to be assessed in terms of the availability of resources or whether they contribute to economic efficiency (Dean 2002a, p. 54).

Cox (1998) argues that the changes that are under way and of the recent past such as the welfare reform made it obsolete to talk about welfare state in terms of its classical understanding of solidarity, universalism and social rights as its basic principles, because today’s welfare state is considerably different than of the past. The post-war idea of the welfare state has been transformed to a less formal, more discursive notion of social entitlement (Cox 1998, pp. 2-3). At the same, the current debate about restoring the obligations of citizenship reflects a discursive theory about social rights: ‘rather than viewing rights (consequently welfare entitlements) as absolute claims, there is an increasing tendency to view them as negotiated claims that balance not only the freedom and autonomy of the claimant, but also concerns and voices of other members of society’ (Cox 1998, p. 12).

In this view, the content of social rights has been changing in the sense that social policy has become more inflexible and impersonal with an increasing emphasis on the recognition of obligations regarding citizenship and there is an inclination to consider situations on a case-by case basis not according to uniform rules (Cox 1998, p. 12). Similarly, the entitlement of fewer people to claim a certain benefit as it happens with austerity measures of the welfare reform is not only about economics, but it should be seen as a declaration that the right in question is no longer available to some people (Cox 1998, p. 9). This signals a shift in the universal understanding of social rights towards selective assistance (Cox 1998, p. 9). The selective assistance understanding
can be seen as justified by the individualisation led by neoliberalism, because the new welfare thinking sees the problem of unemployment as an individual rather than a structural problem. This implies that dependency on the social welfare system is more and more seen as a skill’s deficit of the unemployed individual rather than a social problem (Brodie 1997, p. 237).

According to Pierson (1996, p. 145), the new politics of the welfare state which is characterised by retrenchment (Pierson 1996, p. 144) is a distinctive process resulting from a ‘combination of economic changes, political shifts to the right, and the rising costs associated with maturing welfare states. At the heart of efforts to turn these demands into policy have been newly ascendant conservative politicians’. The shift in goals and context created a new politics which was marked by pressures to avoid blame for unpopular policies and resulted in new political strategies of policymakers (Pierson 1996, p. 146).

When we examine immigration politics within the scope of these new political strategies, the link between the shift towards a more restrictive direction in terms of immigration politics and general discursive change in rights and belonging becomes relevant. Accordingly, the impacts of neoliberalism go beyond an economic perspective and grasp a larger domain in which state power is redefined. While the political rationality of neoliberalism allows for state intervention in various domains through securitisation, the re-problematisation of immigration has radical effects within the politics of belonging. Janine Brodie explains these effects with regards to the redeployment of state power in a different way as a result of which certain groups are marginalised:

Neo-liberalism is more than a strategy for economic growth. This discourse marks the ascendancy of the market over the state and inside the state and thereby, atrophies the
public, closes political spaces and further marginalises the already marginalised—those very groups most likely to challenge the growing social inequalities and restructuring is creating. But the ascendency of neo-liberalism does not mean that the state is disappearing. Instead the state power has been redeployed from collective provision to the enforcement of the market model in virtually all aspects of the everyday.

(Brodie 1997, p. 235)

In the above perspective, neoliberalism as a political rationality can be considered in thinking about boundaries of belonging in Denmark in terms of insiders and outsiders. This has to do with an emphasis on the ethical subject of neoliberalism who is represented with gendered and racialised discourses of identity. In the following chapters I will show how Danish state deploys its power with a new knowledge about society which results in different modes of subjection which can be examined in relation to neoliberal governmentality. Accordingly, it is important to note here that a neoliberal logic is prevalent in designating the fit, desirable versus unfit, useless subjects within Danish society mainly through dividing practices of creating productive and unproductive individuals with reference to certain economic criteria.

At the same time, the truth of the neoliberal subject also underlies the cultural and gendered arguments on belonging with a securitisation of immigration. The following chapters, Chapter 4 and 5, will refer to truth discourses and the space of knowledge in relation to Danish collective identity and binary opposition of immigrant and native more in detail. I will also argue that immigration policies reveal how neoliberalism as a form of rule can have uneven marginalising effects on a population effecting certain disadvantageous groups more than others. At this point, a critical questioning of neoliberal practices within governmentality analysis provides valuable insights to
particular knowledges, visibilities or technologies of the government in relation to immigrant women as marginalised identities.

3.8 Concluding Remarks

Throughout this chapter, I tried to bring together different elements of a Foucauldian perspective in order to clarify my approach for analysing how immigration is rendered governable in Denmark. This can be seen as an exploration of the analytical opportunities for creating a theoretical basis in order to study the problematisation of immigration in Denmark from a critical perspective. By drawing on Foucault’s conceptualisation of power as the point of reference, I proposed a governmentality analysis for linking the (state) power to (individual) microforms of power and modes of subjectification. My empirical investigation about the transformation of immigration politics in Denmark is based on Foucault’s comprehensive understanding of the concept of governmentality. I already mentioned the analytical consequences of this interpretation in Chapter 2, where I located myself within poststructural feminism.

Within the framework of governmentality, I brought together heterogeneous concepts such as biopower, biopolitics and neoliberal governmentality. Through these notions, I stressed a broader understanding of identity politics, which questions how certain rationalities within certain forms of rule can become influential in constant reproduction of boundaries between the insiders and the outsiders. This analysis highlights the intimate relationship between the ideological domain and the political economy (Lemke 2001, p.203). It investigates how the autonomous individual is linked to forms of political rule and economic exploitation (Lemke 2001, p.203).
The constructions of *insiders* and *outsiders* are conceptualised as products of asymmetrical power relationships on the basis of a neoliberal topography.

In the following chapters I aim to look at specific forms of identity and forms of knowledge within Danish immigration politics, by bringing together a two level macro and micro analysis. This will eventually lead to a critical analysis of *subject* in Danish immigration governance through which I will examine the narratives of immigrant women about their self-interpretations of belonging. This examination is important for showing how the autonomous individual is integrated into structures of power within immigration governance.
Chapter 4

Danish immigration, politics of truth and the discursive field of belonging

4.1 Introduction

An overview of space of knowledge about immigration in Denmark

This chapter is designed to provide a general understanding about the space of knowledge with regards to immigration and immigrant identities in Denmark. Before specifically focusing on the changes on family reunion laws in the following chapter, Chapter 5, I will discuss here how Danish immigration is constituted within a broader institutional and political context in order to clarify the ways in which particular discourses gained currency in identity construction, and in designating the *insiders* and *outsiders*. Subsequently, in Chapter 5 I will further enhance this critical discussion in terms of how the category of ethnicity submerges within the variable of gender by specifically referring to the Aliens Consolidation Act 2002 and governmental discourses in Gender Equality Plans.

Before focusing on gendered aspects of immigration governance, this chapter will start with general information and a discussion on changes in Danish immigration discourse that were influential in the production of milestone election rhetoric and results in 2001. For doing this it will put forward a general characterisation of political discourse that has been dominant up to date in terms of third-country immigration within a political economy perspective. Here, I will mainly talk about how an ethno-cultural construction of a national identity is represented in parallel to the political economic redistributing instruments of the state.
Within this discussion, I will specifically focus on three concepts: homogeneity, consensus/cohesion, and equality as primary topics within the Danish national identity discourse. These three concepts are found as keys to understanding how political rhetoric and policy/legislative developments consolidate into a populist hegemony regarding the representation of immigration as part of the politics of truth. Accordingly, in the Danish national imaginary, homogeneity seems to be the precondition of cultural consensus/cohesion, which is presumed to be the foundation of equality. As a result, it is seen as the primary means of maintaining the current system of hierarchy of privileged rights and entitlements, which is particularly foundational to the welfare state. It is also understood that cultural consensus will be sustained by a numerical majority, which itself is maintained through exclusion (restricted immigration) and marginalisation of minorities (restrictive rights for resident immigrants). The immigrant discourse is generally used interchangeably with an ethnicity discourse. The meaning of culture here seems to be embedded within an ethnicity discourse, which is associated with an understanding that particular ethnic groups are immutable and inflexible. As a result, those coming from certain cultural backgrounds can never fully assimilate into another culture.

From the above perspective, this chapter forms a basis for understanding the general transformation of immigration governance in Denmark and at the same time provides an overview of how restrictions in immigration law were legitimised as strategies for intervention within a binarism of identity construction. By doing this it aims to reveal how immigration is problematised in Denmark, leading to the creation of a dichotomy between native and immigrant as a result of a dividing cultural process of knowledge production. The first sections are designed to provide a general understanding of the immigration changes. I will discuss the primary discourse topics of Danish national
identity as opposed to immigration by presenting historical, political and demographic
dimensions of Danish immigration. Sections 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 will mostly provide
factual information about the Danish political structure, immigration and legal
background in relation to immigrant populations. Sections 4.4 and 4.5 will then
discuss how and in what ways discourses on immigration and immigrant identities
found a justification in relation to, or as opposed to Danish identity within a particular
regime of truth. Before doing that, I will briefly explain below how I discuss
belonging within a broader perspective of Danish immigration governance.

**Danish immigration as a topic of identity and belonging within a political
economy perspective**

Denmark’s immigration issue is highly controversial and its domestic politics is very
much characterised by debates over non-EU immigrants. Immigration in general has
been a hot topic within the political discourse since the late 1980s. The Danish
parliamentary elections of November 2001 are one of the most significant examples
for the contemporary saliency of this issue. The 2001 election campaign was strongly
influenced by an anti-immigration rhetoric. This rhetoric formed a mono-cultural
discourse, which saw immigrants as a homogenous and inherently problematic sector
of the Danish public (Lawler 2007, p. 120). The elections were eventually followed
by radical legal changes on immigration. Today the status of immigrants is frequently
discussed by politicians, civil society and media within the context of the restrictive
legislation and the issue of immigration continues to be a popular topic in public
debates (Andreassen and Siim 2007, p. 7).

The problematisation of immigration in the Danish political discourse is directly
related to the understanding of an ethical subject versus an unethical one, which finds
explanations within a broader political economy perspective, articulating who deserves to belong in Denmark. The binarism of immigrant versus native which is justified by a cultural and a gendered rhetoric is compatible with modes of subjection within the discursive field of neoliberal rationality. I argue here that reduced state responsibility for immigrants together with differential treatment with regards to social policy can be analysed from the perspective of the moral ground upon which ideas such as equality, economic efficiency and freedom are co-articulated with a specific knowledge of immigrants’ identity that is represented by cultural and gendered arguments. The Danish discourse of immigration can be examined against the backdrop of a neoliberal orientation which links the social and economic context to specific ways of truth construction through which justification of restrictive immigration politics happens.

In this research, while I focus on the conservative shift in Danish immigration governance, I consider the legal changes that came after the 2001 elections in terms of their effects on belonging and as a forceful attempt in governing the life of immigrants and managing the population in Denmark. This is an examination of the state/government and population relationship. By using a governmentality perspective, I show how immigration policies/legislations are related to a normalising society and how the technology of power that is centred on life is part of these practices (see Foucault 1979, p.144). From this perspective, I examine immigration within discourse topics of identity and belonging by considering it from the perspective of the domain of economy as a social field of regulated practices (see Lemke 2001, p.194).

In the above context, discourses on Danish national identity that are constructed in opposition to non-EU immigration relate to the analytical investigation of biopolitics.
Through these knowledge claims about identity, policies or legal changes can be examined within the framework of a strategic coordination of power relations. These are conceptualised as interventions that are addressed to the Danish population in terms of immigration governance. From this perspective, the theory of biopolitics becomes a useful link between the dynamics of sovereign power, socialisation of forces and biopower (Lazzarato 2002, p.104). Accordingly, this not only is a broader vision about society and government relationship, but also a useful way of looking at the truth discourses through governmental strategies in terms of the categories of culture/race and gender, which bring individuals to work on themselves.

In the above context, I will try to show in this chapter how belonging is defined within boundaries of identity in Denmark. These boundaries clearly differentiate between immigrants and native Danish through cultural criteria and reproduce the reality about who really belongs in Denmark. In this process, being Danish reflects an ethno-cultural reality. For example, immigrants or their descendants who hold a Danish citizenship do not necessarily become Danish (Andreassen and Siim 2007, p. 7). The process of othering also applies to second and third generation immigrants born in Denmark despite the fact that they are Danish citizens (Wren 2001, p. 147). The Danish Statistics Organisation’s data on resident population is a good example for this where it divides the population, in its data collection into the categories of immigrants from Western Countries, immigrants from Non-Western countries, descendants and persons of Danish origin (Statistics Denmark 2010a). Here, the category of descendant shows that being a Danish citizen is not a sufficient criterion for reaching the same discursive status as of natives.

A descendant is defined as a person born in Denmark whose parents (or one of them if there is no available information on the other parent) are immigrants or descendants
with foreign citizenship. If there is no available information on either of the parents and the person in question is a foreign citizen, the person is also defined as a descendant.

(Statistics Denmark 2010a)

Moreover, the political discourse endeavours to maintain homogeneity by reducing the numbers of others justified by the arguments of need to better integrate existing resident immigrants. In the light of this situation, this study will not make a clear-cut distinction in its focus between the legislation, which regulates existing (long term) resident immigrants and the entry requirements to the country. In this chapter, I prefer to endorse a broader discussion on changes about the immigration and their discursive impacts on identity construction for having a general understanding on the concept of belonging.

4.2 Immigration in Denmark

Recent history of immigration, current composition of immigrant population

The problematisation of immigration in Denmark can be linked to different stages of capitalist development: during the 1960s and early 1970s immigration was seen as necessary for the economic restructuring; during the later period, when the guest worker scheme ended and neoliberal rationalities started to dominate, it has evolved into a discussion within the politics of exclusion and inclusion (Wren 2001, p. 144). In this context, it has become a discursive ground on which identities are negotiated through the constant definition of self (Danish) and other (mainly in ethnic terms). The process of othering within the power structures of economic redevelopment, demonstrates an enduring presence of discrimination and inequality with regards to
the culturally other. This situation also draws attention to the welfare state, which further informs an ethno-nationalistic Danish identity.

Immigration in Denmark is a relatively recent phenomenon; it has involved several distinct waves, which could be categorised by three main periods (Roseveare and Jorgensen 2004, p. 9). Before 1960, immigrants who constituted a very small proportion of the population were almost exclusively from other Nordic countries, Germany and the United Kingdom. Between 1960 and 1974 Denmark recruited a significant number of workers from abroad due to labour-market shortages as a result of the fast expansion of the economy; these immigrants were mostly from Turkey, Yugoslavia and Pakistan (Roseveare and Jorgensen 2004, p. 9). This was a period of high growth for the international and national industry, when the Danish welfare state and the public sector were expanding (Goli and Rezaei 2005, p. 6). This made it easy to reach a consensus between various actors such as the Danish government, trade unions, the public and the media over immigrant workers to fill out the gaps at least for a certain period of time (Goli and Rezaei 2005, p. 6). The widespread perception that immigrant workers would eventually go back to their countries of origin caused them to be classified as foreign workers or guest workers with an emphasis on their status as temporary residence. Denmark reflected a similar situation in terms of its European counterparts, such as the Netherlands and West Germany: being guest workers, immigrants were regarded as strangers and their participation in civic or political life was beyond question (Goli and Rezaei 2005, p. 6).

From 1973/1974 onwards, Denmark has experienced high levels of unemployment and moderate growth rates, which also signalled a turn from a welfare system marked by passive support schemes of Keynesian policies towards active involvement (Abrahamson 2002, p. 8). Since 1973, with the end of the Foreign Worker Scheme,
third-country immigrants have arrived in Denmark primarily either as refugees or family immigrants via family unification (Siim and Borchorst 2008, p. 9). The emergence of a *problematic discourse* with regards to immigration started when the need for labour immigrants had diminished, especially after the 1973 oil crisis. This was also the period when Danish nationalism experienced a reawakening as a reaction towards the perceived threats of European integration and immigration; however, it was not until the 1980s that the issue of immigration became part of a cultural discourse (Wren 2001, pp. 149-150). This can be in some ways related to Denmark’s relatively liberal refugee policy until mid-1980s, which resulted in the presence of significant numbers of refugees from Muslim-majority countries. This resulted in perceiving immigration specifically as Muslim invasion primarily of refugees but also of labour immigration (Wren 2001, p. 147). Today the Danish immigration discourse is specifically anti-Muslim which harbours a centuries-old binary opposition of the *civilised modern Europe* against the *other, barbaric Islamic world* (Wren 2001, pp. 147-148). In this understanding, the negative representation of *others* has been justified by a discourse of liberal values (Wren 2001, p. 141). This has nurtured the anti-Muslim sentiment and specific form of otherness as the fundamentalist Islamic world (Wren 2001, p. 148).

After 1985, refugees and asylum seekers have become significant, coming from countries such as Sri Lanka, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon and in 1990s from the Balkan countries, Afghanistan and Somalia (Roseveare and Jorgensen 2004, p. 11); however, the number of immigrants who arrived with family reunification later on exceeded the number of immigrants entering Denmark as refugees and asylum seekers. From 1980 to 2001, the number of immigrants and their descendants in Denmark rose from 152,958 to 415,331 persons; which equalled to an increase from 3.0 per cent to 7.7 per
cent of the total population (Nannestad 2004, p. 758). As of January 2002, there were 332,000 first generation immigrants and 99,000 second generation immigrants living in Denmark, which equals almost 8 per cent of the total population. More than half of this immigrant population had arrived in the previous 10 years (Roseveare and Jorgensen 2004, p. 11). Most immigrants were aged between 25 and 49, while the descendants were much younger.

Table 1: Third Country Migration Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third-country nationals as part of the population (2006)</td>
<td>3.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born as part of the population (2004)</td>
<td>6.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-country national population (2006)</td>
<td>198057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities with largest third-country national population (2001)</td>
<td>Copenhagen (9%), Aarhus (5%), Odense (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest Third-countries of Origin (2005)</td>
<td>Turkey, Iraq, Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration of Third-country nationals</td>
<td>17123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest Category of long-term migration (2004)</td>
<td>Family Reunion (42.1 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Asylum Seekers (2006)</td>
<td>1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Students (2004)</td>
<td>13222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Rate for third-country nationals</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to nationals</td>
<td>-12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate for third-country nationals</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to nationals</td>
<td>+8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acquisitions of nationality (2005) 10197

Largest third-country groups for acquisitions of Nationality (2005) Somalia, Former Yugoslavia, Iraq

(Migrant Integration Policy Index 2007 b)

By the mid-1990s, the immigrant population demanded the right to be considered as *ethnic minorities* through lobbying, which resulted in referring to immigrants and descendants with *non-Western* or *non-EU* origin as *ethnic minorities* in public debates (Goli and Rezaei 2005, p. 6). In this way, ethnicity became a major issue in public debates which contributed to the prominence of *culture* arguments (Goli and Rezaei 2005, p. 6). In this way, immigrant groups were defined as the culturally *other*. In parallel to the rise of the culture arguments, the 1990s were also a time when immigration had become permanently salient among Danish voters (Andersen 2003, p. 188). As a matter of fact, by the late 1990s it was one of the most significant political issues on the agenda in Denmark, fuelled by the idea that ‘integration has failed and immigrants have become a threat to the future welfare of Denmark – economically, culturally and religiously’ (Stenum 2005, p. 1). This perception prevails in contemporary debates. A good indication is that the 2001 elections took place at a time when the salience of taxes, political distrust together with the issues of unemployment and economic problems were low (Andersen 2003, pp. 186-188). Moreover, although the general election was held in the aftermath of September 11 2001 foreign policy issues and global politics were not among the most important issues in voters’ minds (Andersen 2003, p. 187). In this environment, the issue of immigration continued to attract popularity.
Denmark’s immigration challenge is debatable: foreigners as a percentage of the population constituted the middle of the OECD range from 1985 to 2000 (Roseveare and Jorgensen 2004, p. 12). Moreover, illegal immigration does not seem to be a major problem in Denmark, as it is generally limited to the construction and entertainment sectors (Roseveare and Jorgensen 2004, pp. 12-13). This could be explained by a number of factors: institutionalisation of public and private sectors’ administrative systems which involves practices such as the use of a unique civil registration number, sanctions on employers for using illegal workers or under-paying legal immigrant workers together with the financial assistance opportunities provided by the state do not leave much space or possibilities to remain clandestine (Roseveare and Jorgensen 2004, pp. 12-13).

The most visible problem seems to be the labour market participation, since economic integration is a key indicator of immigrant integration into Danish society (Roseveare and Jorgensen 2004, p. 13). Most of the time, integration is used interchangeably with entrance into the labour market in the popular discourse. Labour force participation, especially amongst women, is quite high in Denmark; however, immigrants are less likely to integrate in the labour market. The unemployment rates among third-country nationals seem to be contributing to negative attitudes towards immigration and to the construction of a reality of an incapable subject. Non-EU citizens in Denmark have an unemployment rate of 12.2 per cent, and this figure is 8.3 percentage points higher than Danish nationals. For young people aged 15-24, the unemployment gap rises to 25.2 per cent (Migrant Integration Policy Index 2007b). On the other hand, rates of integration into the labour market are higher for the groups who have spent a longer time in Denmark (Roseveare and Jorgensen 2004, p. 13).
Yet, the above figures may not be totally explanatory when the legal framework in terms of discrimination is considered. The Racial Discrimination Act, (Law no.289, 9 June 1971) frames discrimination mostly on the basis of race (Wren 2001, p. 148); it does not include either labour market discrimination or acts of discrimination by public authorities (Wren 2001, p. 148). The migration integration policy index indicates that the low participation of immigrants in the labour market is debatable because of the limited definition of discrimination. Danish law takes race and ethnicity or religion and belief as the criteria of discrimination; however, discrimination based on nationality is not defined in Ethnic Equal Treatment Act or the Employment Act (Migrant Integration Policy Index 2007a). Similarly, differential treatment based on nationality is not covered in areas like employment or access to housing and healthcare; for this, case-law needs to confirm if criminal law covers direct religious discrimination in social protection and advantages (Migrant Integration Policy Index 2007a). Anti-discrimination law is not found efficient enough and is enforced through slightly weak mechanisms; for example, the equality body cannot help victims or stand in court on their behalf (Migrant Integration Policy Index 2007a).

Despite the arguments about possible discrimination against ethnic minority groups, the problems about economic integration are largely framed by a cultural discourse in populist debates. As a matter of fact, the culture argument stands out in contemporary debates in Denmark as one of the most dominant themes in political rhetoric. Accordingly, an immigrant is someone who is culturally different. Accepting culture as fixed and bounded in a permanent way also meant stereotyping ethnic groups in parallel to the construction of immigration as a threat to national identity (Wren 2001, pp. 144-145). Ethnicity, in the Danish context today is the parameter that draws
dividing boundaries between cultures, mainly between native Danish and immigrant cultures. Especially in the rhetoric of the Danish People’s Party, the category of ethnicity only marks minorities, while Danes with ethnic majority background appear as a non-ethnic, neutral category (Langvasbraten 2008, p. 43). At the same time, the distinction between asylum seeker, illegal immigrant and immigrant is very much blurred; immigrant may simply refer to all these categories in public and political discourses. Today, the third-country immigration discourse mainly concerns asylum seekers and family immigrants; economic migration appears less and it is mostly in the debates of public sphere with a negative focus on irregular migrants, welfare tourism and the dumping of wages (Stenum 2005, p. 2). In sum, third-country immigrants unquestionably are seen to belong to an unproductive, economically inefficient sector of the population because of their inherent cultural attributes.

4.3 The Danish political structure

Main political players, their ideological orientations, changes in attitudes to immigration and the 2001 elections

Denmark, a parliamentary democracy, got its first parliament in 1849 with the Constitutional Act and became a constitutional monarchy. The present Constitutional Act of Denmark came into effect on June 5th 1953 (Folketinget 2009a). Today, the unicameral Danish parliament, the Folketing, has 179 members (Folketinget 2009a), 175 from Denmark proper and two each from the Faroe Islands and Greenland. Members of the Folketing are elected by a two-tier, six-stage proportional representation for a period of four years. The Danish system of proportional representation is basically a list system of personal voting within the parties’ lists. Denmark has traditionally a high degree of local democracy based upon the
decentralisation of power to elected 98 municipalities and five regional counties (Andreassen and Siim 2007, p. 7).

The voter turnout in Denmark is normally around 80-90 per cent (Folketinget 2008). The voting age is 18; in 1908 women were granted the right to vote in local elections, and finally in 1915 they were also granted the right to vote in national elections (KVINFO 2008). Since 1909 no single party has had a majority of parliamentary seats, and Danish politics is characterised by inter-party compromise (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark 2010). The Social Democratic Party (Socialdemokratiert) (S) has been traditionally the biggest party in Danish politics apart from certain intervals. In every national election from 1924 to 1998, the Social Democrats emerged as the strongest party (Skidmore-Hess 2003, p. 89). From the 1960s to 1982, Denmark had alternating Social Democratic and Liberal minority governments; from 1982 to 1993 three consecutive conservative coalitions were in power (Folketinget 2009b, p. 7). In January 1993, the Social Democratic Party formed a coalition with three small liberal parties and from 1996 until 2001 the government was only composed of the Social Democratic Party and the Social Liberal Party (RV) (Radikale Venstre) (Folketinget 2009b, p. 7).

The election results in 2001 changed the composition of Danish Parliament dramatically by pushing the primary architects of the Danish welfare state, the Social Democratic Party from power. In these elections the Liberal Party (LP) (Venstre) emerged as the largest single party for the first time since 1920 and formed a coalition government with the Conservative People’s Party (CPP) (Det Konservative Folkeparti). Anders Fogh Rasmussen, leader of the Liberal Party (LP) became the prime minister and head of the centre-right coalition. This coalition relied upon the
support of the right-wing anti-immigrant Danish People’s Party (DPP) (Dansk Folkeparti) for a parliamentary majority in the intervening period.

The Liberal Party, which had the election victory in 2001, is historically an agrarian party (Skidmore-Hess 2003, p. 90). Today it is strongly pro-European Union and free market oriented (Skidmore-Hess 2003, p. 90). While it benefitted largely from the anti-immigration discourse, tax reduction is a greater interest for the party. Social Democrats can be regarded as the establishment; their base is found in the public sector and they are pro-EU (Skidmore-Hess 2003, p. 90). During the 2001 election campaign, the Social Democrats have also adopted an anti-immigration campaign, which was unconvincing within the context of the party’s socially liberal ideology (Skidmore-Hess 2003, p. 90). The Danish People’s Party can be considered as part of the radical right-wing populist party family with the fundamental core of ethno-nationalist xenophobia and anti-political establishment populism (Rydgren 2004, pp. 474-475). It is currently the third-biggest party in Denmark and is most strongly identified with its anti-immigrant agenda of Denmark for Danes (Skidmore-Hess 2003, p. 90). The party is anti-EU and pro-welfare state (Skidmore-Hess 2003, p. 90). According to the party rhetoric, Danish culture is under threat both by the EU and by immigration. When we look at the subsequent election results in 2005 and 2007, we see that the political tendencies did not change since 2001 with the same parties coming to power.

---

9 Within the same family, one of the strongest right-wing populist party on the continent, the Progress Party had emerged in the Danish election of 1973 winning 15.9 per cent of the vote.
Table 2: 2001 Election Results - Distribution of Votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venstre (Liberal Party) (V)</td>
<td>31.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialdemokratiet (Social Democratic Party) (S)</td>
<td>29.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dansk Folkeparti (Danish People’s Party) (DF)</td>
<td>12 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialistisk Folkeparti (Socialist People’s Party) (SF)</td>
<td>6.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det Konservative Folkeparti (Conservative Party) (KF)</td>
<td>9.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det Radikale Venstre (Social Liberal Party) (RV)</td>
<td>5.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhedslisten (Unity List) (EL)</td>
<td>2.3 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Inter-Parliamentary Union 2001)

Table 3: 2005 Election Results - Distribution of Votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venstre (Liberal Party) (V)</td>
<td>29.03 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialdemokratiet (Social Democratic Party) (S)</td>
<td>25.84 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dansk Folkeparti (Danish People’s Party) (DF)</td>
<td>13.25 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialistisk Folkeparti (Socialist People’s Party) (SF)</td>
<td>5.99 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det Konservative Folkeparti (Conservative Party) (KF)</td>
<td>10.27 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det Radikale Venstre (Social Liberal Party) (RV)</td>
<td>9.18 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhedslisten (Unity List) (EL)</td>
<td>3.44 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Inter-Parliamentary Union 2005)
Table 4: 2007 Election Results - Distribution of Votes

Venstre (Liberal Party) (V) 26.26 %
Socialdemokratiet (Social Democratic Party) (S) 25.47 %
Dansk Folkeparti (Danish People’s Party) (DF) 13.86 %
Socialistisk Folkeparti (Socialist People’s Party) (SF) 13.04 %
Det Konservative Folkeparti (Conservative Party) (KF) 10.39 %
Det Radikale Venstre (Social Liberal Party) (RV) 5.12 %
Enhedslisten (Unity List) (EL) 2.7 %

(Inter-Parliamentary Union 2007)

In order to understand the atmosphere of the 2001 elections, two prominent issues have to be considered with closer attention: the link between welfare and immigration (Andersen 2003, p. 188). The perception of immigrants as a threat to the Danish welfare system reflects the nature of Danish style egalitarianism when connected to a universalistic form of welfare understanding. This understanding is reinforced by the traditional emphasis on sameness, which constitutes a challenge for the entry of immigrants (Lex, Lindekilde and Mouritsen 2007, p. 5).

In 2001, 20 per cent of the voters mentioned immigration as the most important issue for the politicians to work on; this number was four per cent in 1990, eight per cent in 1994 and 14 per cent in 1998 (Rydgren 2005, p. 11). Although the issue of immigration was nearly as salient during the 1998 election, it was the 2001 election in which critical attitudes prevailed and all immigration-friendly parties except the
Radical Liberals lost voters during the campaign (Andersen 2003, p. 189). Before mentioning the transformation of the attitudes towards immigration in more detail as will be done in the next section, it is important to examine the institutional structure of social rights in terms of the Danish welfare state and citizenship regime to better analyse the kind of impact this negative attitude had on the status of third-country immigrants.

In terms of its citizenship regime, the Danish political institutions have represented a mix of ethnic assimilation in the German tradition and of cultural pluralism of the British and Dutch traditions. Between 1983 and 2002, integration has moved from the pluralist pole towards an increasing emphasis on the assimilation of minorities to ethnic Danish values; among these values, Danish gender equality norms and family values are the most prominent ones (Siim and Borchorst 2008, p. 9). These will be explicitly defined in the next chapter by specifically drawing attention to family reunion. Currently non-Danish citizens can apply for citizenship after seven years of residence in the country. Citizens from Nordic countries need to wait only two years before applying (Andreassen and Siim 2007, p. 13). Denmark prohibits dual citizenship. On a general level, the Danish political discourse expresses a balance between the public and private sphere, as well as between citizens and the state; this has enabled social and political forces to influence politics from below as a result of the cooperation between social democracy, the trade union movement, and voluntary organisations (Siim 2000, p. 21).

The social rights are primarily based on the institution of citizenship through development of the universal welfare state (Siim 2000, p. 122). The Danish welfare system is a tax-financed welfare system in which the state is the tax collector and the citizens take part in the system of rights as a result of the distribution by the state
(Christensen 2004, p. 5); from the legal perspective the focus is the asymmetrical relationship between the individual citizen and the state (Christensen 2004, p. 6). This system’s functioning depends on decentralised networks, the acceptance of freely concluded labour market contracts, and an elastic and malleable flexicurity model in which cultural and identitarian monoculturalism is recognised as the precondition for the functioning of the welfare state (Hedetoft 2006b, p. 5). Accordingly, the Danish welfare regime is based upon strong norms of social equality, but at the same time homogeneity in relation to ethnicity, religion and language (Siim and Borchorst 2008, p. 2). As a result, the implications of the universal welfare regime for immigration politics are contested: on the one hand the strong welfare institutions are perceived as a potential to accept equal, social and political rights for immigrants; on the other hand they tend to pull in the opposite direction towards communitarianism (Siim and Borchorst 2008, p. 8).

This study considers the discursive level of rights and responsibilities in Danish welfare within the realm of identity politics and the politics of belonging. In terms of an institutional and a legal perspective, this is mainly related to the ways the state takes responsibility for social assistance for immigrants and their living conditions; but is also about what it means to be received into Danish society at the conjuncture of rights and recognition. At the same time, it is important to look at the socio-economic developments’ relationship to the legislative responses in the problematisation of immigration. The Danish context is an interesting example for showing how neoliberal reformulations of the national welfare state has emphasised new obligations under a new legitimacy and re-specified the place of the immigrant within the society mostly as incapable of carrying out certain obligations. One good example is the success of the Liberal Party (V) in maintaining a pro-welfare rhetoric,
but at the same time siding with the Danish People’s Party in their anti-immigration rhetoric. In other words, neoliberal rationalities coexist with populist or conservative trends and contribute to the representation of rights as exclusive. Within this trend the welfare cuts and changes in the welfare system were represented to be implemented as precautions against immigrant groups. Through this process, the notion of selective assistance relates to a communitarian conception of society, which will be referred to in the following sections.

4.4 Legal and institutional context of immigration

Overview of the legislation pertaining to regulation of immigration, immigrants’ rights, and their legal status

In Danish Law, the basic law that regulates immigrants’ legal status, is the Aliens Act, other laws which supplement the issue of migration such as the Integration Act, the Active Social Policy Act, the Non-discrimination Act; the Equal Pay Act etc. are connected to this law (Adamo 2007, p. 5). The main criterion on the creation of the legal framework of the Aliens Act is the nationality of immigrants (Adamo 2007, p. 10). The immigrants are specified under three categories based on their country of origin: (1) Nordic Citizens (nationals of Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden), (2) EU citizens and European Economic Area citizens and (3) third-country (foreigners who are not EU/EEA or Nordic citizens coming from a country with a visa requirement) nationals. Accordingly, in terms of their legal status and rights, third-country immigrants are situated at the lowest rank of the hierarchy within the legal framework.

The regulation of foreign workers’ immigration goes back to the 1952 Alien Act, which allowed non-Danish citizens to arrive in Denmark to find a job before applying
for a work permit (Andreassen and Siim 2007, p. 9). This Act was amended in mid-
1960s and in 1970 towards a more restrictive direction, finally allowing entry to those
who had obtained permits before arrival (Andreassen and Siim 2007, p. 10). In 1973,
as a result of the oil crisis, the Parliament passed a freeze on immigration to Denmark
except from Nordic countries or members of the European Economic Community
(Andreassen and Siim 2007, p. 10). In terms of third-country immigrants, immigration
continued through family reunion and asylum.

Immigration laws that regulate arrivals changed several times during the 1980s, 1990s
and 2000s (Andreassen and Siim 2007, p. 10). One of the most important changes was
the Alien’s Act of 1983 which granted residence permits to Convention and de facto
refugees and made family reunification a legal right; giving Denmark a reputation for
providing a very humanitarian approach to refugees (Andreassen and Siim 2007, p. 10).
This liberal change took place under the centre-right government that held power
between 1982 and 1988 (Andreassen and Siim 2007, p. 10). All members of the
Parliament, including the opposition voted in favour of the Act except for 12 members
of the extreme-right wing Progressive Party (Andreassen and Siim 2007, p. 10). The
liberal approach in 1983 has been gradually modified with the changes in 1985, 1992
and 1994. As explained before, the opposition against the restrictive changes today is
not strong. The Social Liberal Party can be considered the most critical towards
immigration policies with a focus on possible human rights violations especially with
regards to family reunification for Danish citizens (Stenum 2005, p. 1). The small left-
wing party the Danish Red-Green Alliance was also critical of the government
making immigration and integration its main focus during the 2005 campaign.
4.5 Cultural arguments in Danish immigration discourse and Danish identity crises over the solidaristic welfare state

For explaining the negative attitude towards third-country immigration, the conceptions of multiculturalism, which are connected to the discourse of national identity, and constructions of the Danish nation-state, have to be considered (Lex, Lindekilde and Mouritsen 2007, p. 3). Denmark, like other Scandinavian countries, is a small nation-state which has traditionally perceived itself to possess a high degree of cultural homogeneity, social trust and political consensualism, and which has cultivated a national image of tolerance and dedication to global humanitarian issues (Hedetoft 2006a, p. 400). The Danish society has generally regarded itself as liberal and tolerant, with a well-developed welfare system that set high values on social equality and social cohesion (Wren 2001, p. 141). The political culture can be explained as a mix of liberalism, social democracy and cultural radicalism, which paved the way for a strong welfare state and a strong civil society (Siim 2007, p. 495). Since World War II, Denmark developed a universalistic welfare state structure based on a high level of public provision which entails a significant level of state regulation (Hedetoft 2006b, p. 402). Denmark represents a mixture of civic and ethnic nationalism in which the birth of the Danish nation is associated with a liberal-nationalist modernisation programme (Lex, Lindekilde and Mouritsen 2007, p. 3). The strong connection between cultural homogeneity and egalitarian democracy and even the Lutheran religion’s strong emphasis on individualism come into the picture in the discourses on integration and multiculturalism; these elements to some extent might put other cultural groups – mainly Islamic – in an unfavourable light (Lex, Lindekilde and Mouritsen 2007, pp. 4-6).
The Danish model of integration can be considered as a mixed model of integration which takes both ethnic and civic values into account, with an assumption that integration can only be achieved through the practice of traditional equality (Hedetoft 2006b, p. 7). In this context, the concept of multiculturalism has been notably absent from the political discourse (Lawler 2007, p. 112). The Social Democrat Prime Minister Poul Nyrup Rasmussen’s 1998 statement is a remarkable one that sum up the general trend: ‘Denmark is not and will never become a multiethnic society’ (Lex, Lindekilde and Mouritsen 2007, p. 7).

In the context of the above discussion, functional/economist discourse of ‘effective integration necessitates limitations on immigration’ came across as a legitimising a prior motive of ‘protecting Danish ethnic identity and surviving the homogenous population’ (Hedetoft 2003). The Liberal-Conservative’s government’s policy proposals which eventually led to a restrictive immigration regime can be seen in the light of the intersection point of these discourses that mixed particularistic demands for national adaptation to a laissez-faire and self-help message of market-oriented individualism (Hedetoft 2003). Within this picture, the intention to curb family immigration and limiting it to those over 24 years old can be interpreted as part of the cultural problematic within the broader context of the political economy.

Parallel to the nation-state discourse, there is enough evidence to suggest that the fundamental shift in attitude towards immigration occurred during the early 1980s a period of relatively severe economic crisis and unemployment (Wren 2001, p. 152). Moreover, this was also a period when changes in welfare structure in relation to the adaptation of neoliberal strategies became prominent: in 1982 the Conservative-lead government started to change welfare structure in Denmark by reforms of privatisation, de-bureaucratisation, and decentralisation to modernise the public sector
The trend which continued up to date indicated a gradual change in the discourse of social protection in Denmark, as a shift from a universal regime towards a performative/clientistic one (Abrahamson 2002, pp. 1-20). This change signalled a transformation of the attitude of the state from ‘what can we do for you’ to the attitude of ‘what can you do for us and yourself’ or a shift from a welfare paradigm to a workfare paradigm (Goli and Rezaei 2005, p. 14). As I have mentioned above, the flexicurity model, which is based on a pro-active labour market policy, can be seen as part of this transformation.

Scholars like Robert Henry Cox (1997, p. 320) argue that these changes seem to be small and the basic principles of social policy may appear to be well protected; however, in longer perspective their cumulative effect will be more dramatic. For Cox, quantitative research of welfare spending fails to capture how these small changes have shifted the categories of eligibility and altered the conception of entitlement on a qualitative level. In terms of the quantitative changes Cox (1997, p. 307) identifies four types of reforms in Denmark: 1) austerity measures (cost saving measures, cost shifting measures for a more selective category of welfare assistance, reduction of take-up rates); 2) actuarial reforms in pension programmes (either by making public pensions more contribution based or by affording members of the workforce greater freedom to create their own pension annuities; 3) Administrative reforms; 4) Efforts to enforce the duties of citizenship.

Within the limits of this research, I will not present a detailed discussion about the transformation of the Danish welfare state. Instead, I find it useful to mention these changes in terms of their cumulative effects on the idea of a new kind of political subject. Later on, I will trace the elements of the new welfare discourse within subjectification of immigrant women by questioning how this new discourse is self-
interpreted by them. In this context, it is important to consider these changes within a broader rights perspective which implies a new ethical subject in the emerging workfare paradigm. For Cox (1997, p. 312), these changes on a broader sense marked a change in the understanding of what a state should provide as social right. For example as part of this transformation, the universal citizenship regime also has been changing in character with the weakening of traditional rights and an emphasis on duties (Abrahamson 2002, pp. 1-20). Hence, immigrants as a more disadvantaged group have become more visible in the midst of the negotiations of the boundaries between these rights and obligations. The reduced state responsibility further stigmatises the unemployed and especially unemployed third-country immigrants.

In the above context, in addition to the ethno-nationalistic welfare state discourse, the immigration rhetoric of right-wing populism was accompanied by a so-called welfare chauvinism that saw immigrants as an opportunistic group who exploited the resources of the welfare state (Rydgren 2004, p. 486). Similar to the cultural discourse over the idea of belonging, immigration has also become a prominent element in the contemporary struggle for the welfare state over the question of who has a legitimate right to welfare provisions (Huysmans 2000, p. 767). Stenum (2005, p. 1) mentions that the narrative of ‘immigrants become too equal’ as connected to the discourse on welfare state and equal rights to social benefits. This is also related to the understanding ‘We have to pay for them being a burden’ (Stenum 2005, p. 1).

The above argument created an emphasis on giving privilege to national citizens in terms of welfare rights which has been perceived also as a strategy to keep immigrants away (Stenum 2005, p. 1). At the same time, the general perception was that welfare benefits would have to be downgraded in order to cope with asylum seekers and the costs of social assistance programs for unemployed immigrants.
(Nielsen and Kesting 2003, p. 381). This is a good example on how the discourse on immigration was used as a strategy for more general changes on welfare state or more macro level policy. Moreover, this situation also explains the mobilisation against immigration by the working class; which traditionally had a left wing orientation. Today new anti-immigration right wing movement comes with strong working class appeals against welfare policies with a conviction that redistribution in fact favours ethnic minorities (Andersen 2006, pp. 11-12). The Danish People’s party’s anti-EU, anti-immigration position has won many traditionally left-wing voters; in fact the founders of the Danish People’s Party who are ex-members of the Progress Party had to change their tunes from an anti-tax rhetoric to a politics of redistribution in their new party to attract a broader constituency (Skidmore-Hess 2003, p. 106). Today the view that influx of immigrants has put stress on the welfare state is very prominent despite the lack of evidence (Campbell and Hall 2006, p. 35). In this perspective, immigration politics in Denmark reflects a very interesting example in analysing the effects of neoliberal rationality.

Today the new welfare discourse in Denmark is characterised by a new, broad consensus, which manifests a distinctively new communitarian conception of community. As I have demonstrated before, the cultural arguments about the ethnically different immigrants present who is fit and desirable and who is unfit to the Danish society. In this context, Danish identity rhetoric is increasingly nurtured from the categories of immigrant and native through the economic and cultural criteria simultaneously. Accordingly, the essential substance of community is shared norms and values and doing paid work is the invariable top norm par excellence. Without fulfilling this norm no one can be part of the community. In this case what puts the Danish welfare system under pressure in terms of immigrants is the principle of a
homogenous society in which the welfare project is mostly perceived as a nationalist one (Loftager 2001, p. 13). This situation points to the complex interrelationship between neoliberal rationality and populist, far-right rhetoric and how they can co-exist within certain dynamics.

**Homogeneity and the consensual achievement of liberal Values**

In the above context, it can easily be argued that the unusually strong political mobilisation on the issue of immigration in Denmark since the 1980s has found legitimacy in the unsolved link between welfare and immigration (Andersen 2006, pp. 2-5). At the core of this debate is the perception of the erosion of solidarity caused by immigration (Andersen 2006, pp. 2-5). This is also related to how the ethno-nationalist discourse prevailing on the social and political levels, and within the debates concerns democracy reflected a presupposition of ‘knowledge of democracy as a community of one homogenous, solidaristic people together with knowledge of existence of a homogenous, solidaristic Danish people’ (Haar 2003, p. 28).

As Hedetoft (2000a, pp. 402-403) explains, the perception of a cultural homogeneity supported by the rhetoric of a small nation-state and the ideological presumptions of the Danish welfare state are crucial for understanding the conceptual foundations of immigration in Denmark, which are linked to the sovereignty argument. The Danish public imagination of a homogenous culture together with a solidaristic welfare state has been associated with the problematisation of ethnic minorities and led to a perception of threat from globalisation, the EU and immigration (Wren 2001, p. 148). The current defence of Danish culture can be examined in perceived effects of sovereignty erosion; immigrants are seen as a cultural threat to this politico-cultural
framework which historically ensured flexibility, adaptability and consensualism (Hedetoft 2006a, p. 400).

Denmark is a country that is built around one people . . . Danish Christianity, history, culture, view on democracy and our thoughts about freedom must continue to be the foundation that Denmark rests on. ... We don’t want a Denmark where the Danish become a temporary ethnic minority and where our freedom is pulled away.

(Birthe Rønn Hornbech, cited in Kofman 2005, p. 462)

The above statement by Birthe Rønn Hornbech is explanatory in the sense that it sums up how the discourse of homogeneity is defined as a precondition of consensual democracy or achievement of liberal values, which are necessary for freedom. Within this topic, the concept of freedom is defined as a sovereign claim and takes the form of a decision on the exclusion of other which refers to third-country immigrants. This exclusion is legitimised by a security rhetoric which is mobilised by a cultural discourse in Denmark.

As Waever (1993, cited in Lawler 2007, p. 110) states, what has become discursively securitised in Denmark was the idea of society which was articulated in the language of collective identity. In this view, the securitisation of immigration should be considered in the face of its contemporary repercussions and on an anxiety about weakening of the traditional nation-state. In this environment, the debate on immigration can also be seen as functional in sustaining Danishness in the traditional sense and opt for a homogenous nation within definite borders (Diken 2002). This, in other words, can be interpreted as the sovereign claim to territoriality in a securitised environment. This claim concerns both the biological features of individuals (for example culture also seems to assume some form of biological determinism) and

10 Minister from November 23, 2007, from the Liberal Party, Venstre.
respectively in the regulation of the biological by the state through laws which concern family reunion and so on.

The close association of the ethno-cultural nation with the political-democratic/economic redistributing instruments of the state brings out the political economic dimension to light. In this view, the process of othering is examined as central to the mechanisms of capitalism (Wren 2001, p. 146), with an argument that the problematic discourse of immigration serves the dominant structures of power by justifying exclusion, smoothing over issues on social and economic inequality, and by drawing attention to cultural difference (Wren 2001, p. 144). Hence, this is the point where the culture argument’s legitimacy should be questioned. The arguments on the success of market-oriented political forces as opposed to the arguments about a solidaristic welfare state make an important contribution on deconstructing the exclusionary discourses in the politics of belonging.

4.6 Concluding Remarks

The strict immigration law in Denmark has a direct impact on individual’s lives (Siim and Borchorst 2008, p. 2). As a result of the changes in the immigration regulations, immigrants from the non-EU countries (third-country) are effected dramatically in relation to the obligations they have to fulfil and the restrictions they have to deal with. I will further discuss this in the following chapter, Chapter 5 with regards to identity construction.

The legal changes point towards a broader realm where identities are created and the population is managed and controlled through knowledge claims on belonging. In this context, this chapter put forward a macro perspective on Danish immigration management with an attempt to show which reality claims have been influential in
regulating the population. These reality claims are directly involved in bringing the individual life to the core of political strategies.

I have tried to demonstrate how third-country immigration became a problem of governance at the conjuncture of the culture arguments and welfare state discourse through neoliberal themes. In this analysis, the biopolitical dimension or how biological comes under State’s control has become clearer. Foucault’s (2004, p. 239) explanation of biopolitics as ‘power’s hold over life’ is relevant in the various problematisations about the population of third-country immigrants. As far as the Danish immigration legislation is concerned these problematisations point towards how a binarism is created between native population and individuals originating from non-EU countries. The key points which stand out in relation to the biopolitical management and differential treatment of immigrants can be summarised as:

- Hierarchy of legal status (prioritising Danes, Nordic nationals and EU nationals while excluding and marginalising others); the fact that legal status is determined through nationality implies a primordialistic attitude towards belonging which can be downgraded to a biological determinism which is defined through culture.

- The legal status reinforces and is reinforced by tiered and increasingly restrictive welfare entitlement (resulting in disproportionate distribution in line with a redefinition of the welfare state).

- The legal status also determines basic rights such as marriage rights and questions third-country immigrant’s position as a true subject to law on the same level as native Danish people.
• At a representational level, immigrants are viewed as economically parasitic and culturally anomalous.

• All of the above contributes to the empirical and social marginality of ethno-cultural-legal others.

At the same time, the problematisation of immigration in different stages draws attention to the changes that preceded the 2001 elections within the context of contemporary political economy. According to some researchers the new liberal-conservative government’s coming to power in 2001 marked the beginning of a new era in terms of migration and integration policies which also implied a process of discursive change that is regenerated and reproduced through daily practice (Goli and Rezaei 2005, p. 14). This is related to the negotiation of the boundaries between immigrants’ rights and obligations. It also implies a shift from a welfare paradigm to a workfare paradigm. This transformation can be interpreted as a product of a neoliberal regime of truth, within which (political) subjects are produced more and more according to the norms of the market.

In the following chapter, I will shift my focus on the variable of gender as the most significant factor in Denmark that converged in a regime of truth, which generates, shapes, and reproduces the reality it claims to reveal through manipulation of the population. In this context, I will show how the cultural differences, which are explicitly referred to in this chapter, are largely presented as a problematic of gender equality and how immigrant women are defined as a challenge for the democratic, equal Scandinavian society. Gender is situated at the core of the culture discourses in defining what it means to be Danish. It is also a remarkable example in showing how discourses reinforce action as societal means of production, which also produce subjects and reality (see Jager and Maier 2009, p. 37).
From the above perspective, I will demonstrate that, while gender equality emerges as a pivotal aspect of national identity, the cultural differences become intrinsic to the general discourse of gender equality with regards to third-country immigrant groups. Gender discourse will be analysed also in relation to the idealised self-supporting subject that underpin truth discourses and strategies of intervention in the form of restrictive regulations in immigration laws. Accordingly, I will show how gender is reworked within the complex dynamics of the specific power/knowledge system of third-country immigration in Denmark.

I regard the changes in the immigration legislation as a reference point that contributes to the production of social realities with regards to third-country women. These are reproduced as specific visibilities and identities within the framework of a set of practices on the political and social realm (see Foucault 2000a, p. xxix). With this analysis I will set my focus on modes of subjectification in Chapter 6, through which individuals are brought to work on themselves (Rabinow and Rose 2006, p.197).
Chapter 5

Discourse to Political Action: Gendered Strategies for Intervention

5.1 Introduction

Analysing family reunion as a gendered and racialised category in Danish immigration governance

In the previous chapter, I have presented a broad overview of the truth discourses and knowledge with regards to the representation of Danish immigration by referring to primary discourse topics in relation to the Danish collective identity. I have showed how this representation is related to the binary production of identities within the categories of immigrant and native Danish. In this chapter, I will focus on the changes in the regulations of family reunion, which came with the Aliens Consolidation Act 2002, and on various governmental discourses on gender for further elaborating my argument on the problematisation of immigration with regards to belonging. My substantial aim in this chapter is to examine the ways immigration governance uses strategies of intervention in terms of the categories of gender and ethnicity.

Accordingly, my examination will show how the problem of immigration and immigrant identity became a target of the Danish government and what role governmental strategies – in the form of certain legislative measures or policy initiatives – had in the normalisation of identities. Examining family reunification as a gendered and cultural process will also reveal the ways in which subjects are constituted within Danish immigration governance and respectively within Danish politics of belonging.
Family reunion laws as gendered practices of normalisation

The immigration discourse is complex and multidimensional, and requires an analysis of several facets. As I have clarified before, I specifically refer to family-related immigration as my issue case in this research. The following chapter (Chapter 6) will examine family immigrant women’s subjectification in parallel to the analysis in this chapter.

There are several reasons for examining family reunification. These reasons are about providing a better picture of identity construction in connection to modes of subjection. First of all, as the most common way of immigration from the non-EU countries to Denmark, family-immigration is represented largely through a gender argument. At the same time, it raises central issues in the broader paradoxical dynamics of universalism versus exceptionalism. It draws, for example, attention to a contrast in the integration discourse between the concerns for gender equality in immigrant families and the lack of concern for gender equality for the ethnic Danish majority (Siim and Borchorst 2008, pp. 2-3). According to the dominant political discourse, native Danish women have already achieved gender equality and the problems about gender equality are primarily defined as problems of women belonging to ethnic minorities (Fiig and Siim 2007, p. 13). This understanding legitimises a differential treatment of the native Danish population and immigrant groups, which in turn calls the universalist discourses on rights into question. Accordingly, from a Scandinavian perspective, diversity stands in tension with the values of solidarity and universalism and becomes a challenge to creating more inclusive conceptualisations of solidarity, which can overcome ideals of sameness and unity (Lister 2009, p.218).
Within the above context, while the Aliens Consolidation Act can be seen as a forceful attempt to govern the lives of immigrants in particular and control the Danish population in general, the changes in family related immigration reflect various interpretations of identity, which relate to the bigger picture of the politics of belonging. The issue of family reunification is a good example for revealing these identity constructions and articulations of belonging along binary oppositions of immigrants and native Danes.

In this research family reunion policies are examined as discourses, which are rearticulated by national identity rhetoric and constituted as part of the political economy of immigration. They are conceptualised as practices of normalisation through which belonging is mediated. They are also examples of legal action, which demonstrate how problems about immigration or immigrants achieve their reality with regards to modes of subjectification. By examining these regulations and governmental discourses on gender I show how intertwining discourses of gender and ethnicity contributes to the creation of specific forms of subjectivities which reassert the racial and gendered boundaries between native and immigrant populations. It is important to note here that in this analysis I consider gender both as a relational and analytical category and as a social process; and examine gender relations as unstable and complex processes which are constituted by and through interrelated parts (see Flax 1987, p.628).

The Aliens Consolidation Act 2002 and the changes in family reunion laws

The Liberal–Conservative government’s Aliens Consolidation Act, introduced in May 2002, is considered as the most radical anti-immigration regulation passed by any
Danish government so far. Among the new regulations, I will specifically focus on the following changes:

1) The introduction of a mandatory age of 24 for Danish residents wanting to marry a foreign citizen, which is generally referred to as the 24 years rule.

2) The obligation for the same category of couples to prove their connection to Denmark as stronger than their connection to any other country, which is simply referred to as the attachment clause.

3) The requirement of economic sufficiency for the person residing in Denmark, which is referred to as the collateral clause and the introduction of social cutbacks for temporary resident holders.

4) Changes in the requirements for obtaining a permanent residence permit and in naturalisation, such as the increase in waiting years.

I will examine the above changes in parallel to the problematisation of immigration, within which subjects are constituted through gendered and racialised processes. I will show how a gendered discourse that represented immigrants as culturally anomalous has been influential in justifying the changes in immigration legislation. To back this argument up, I will also give examples from the Government’s Action Plans for Gender Equality. This examination will draw attention to the biopolitical subject of immigration who is gendered and racialised through certain truth discourses which are represented as solutions to the problematisation of immigration in the form of restrictions in legislation. These solutions also constitute truth discourses, which reinforce particular identity claims.

From the above perspective, the following section will discuss Danish family reunification firstly by mentioning the international context for a broader
understanding of a rights perspective as opposed to the politicisation of the issue of family reunification. Later on, I will mainly talk about how the Aliens Consolidation Act 2002 was developed as a strategy to deal with the problem of immigration and what kind of identities this problematisation indicates. At the same time I will also mention how gendered and cultural discourses merge at the background of an economic argument within the dichotomy of native and immigrant in Danish immigration politics. All of this will contribute to an exploration of how the family has been politicised and became a site of identity articulation, and how the activity of governing takes place on the basis of this site.

5.2 Danish family reunification

International context

Family immigration policies are very good examples of the contradiction between liberal principles of universal rights, and fundamental state prerogatives which are upheld in most international legislations (Lahav 1997, p. 349). Although family reunification has been considered as an important matter by certain international organisations, it has never been implemented as an enforceable right on an international level. In international law, there is no legal definition of the family. Certain legal documents, however, define the concept of family member for protecting the rights of migrant workers (International Organization for Migration 2010). The concept of family protection is reinforced by several provisions such as those prohibiting arbitrary interference with family, rules on marriages between people from different states and rules on discrimination (Lahav 1997, p. 355).
The right to found a family is established as one of the fundamental human rights within the framework of the United Nations. Article 16 (1) of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) states that: ‘men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family...’ (International Organization for Migration 2010). The 1966 International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination also guarantees ‘the right to marriage and choice of spouse, without distinction as to race, or colour, or national or ethnic origin’ (Article 5) (Lahav 1997, p. 355).

A right to family reunification has been stated in two human rights treaties: the 1989 UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and the 1990 International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (International Organization for Migration 2010). In 1974 an ILO’s (International Labour Organisation) preliminary report stated that:

Uniting migrant workers with their families living in the countries of origin is recognized to be essential for the migrants’ well being and their social adaptation to the receiving country. Prolonged separation and isolation lead to hardships and stress situations affecting both the migrants and the families left behind and prevent them from leading a normal life. The large numbers of migrant workers cut off from social relations and living on the fringe of the receiving community create many well-known social and psychological problems that, in turn, largely determine community attitudes towards migrant workers.

(International Labour Organization 1999)

Today, family reunification is a highly politicised matter, which usually goes under domestic jurisdiction. In this environment, international human rights instruments remain state-centric and are mostly framed in the context of the relationship between
an individual and his or her own state (Lahav 1997, p. 355). The conditions for family reunification are contingent on an individual’s lawful status in the country concerned, which also means that the determining factor in family reunification today is national immigration law as the sovereign right (Lahav 1997, pp. 360-361). In other words, family reunification is handled within the sphere of territorial sovereignty of the states.

**Consensus in Danish domestic politics**

In Denmark, the politicisation of family reunification seems to go in parallel with the opposition against third-country immigration domestically. Danish family reunification also represents an example of how the state as the dominant law provider can act in implementing restrictive measures that are in contradiction to the liberal rhetoric of individual rights as well as conflicting with values held in the international area.

The Danish family reunion policies are considered as the third most restrictive in the EU according to the Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) (after Cyprus and Austria). In the web page of the Migrant Integration index, it is mentioned with reference to the restrictiveness of the policies, that immigrants must be permanent residents for three years until they receive citizenship, which normally means up to ten years of waiting. While dependent relatives or adult children are only allowed in exceptional cases, refugees are exempt from the rule. (Migrant Integration Policy Index 2007b).

Despite the controversial nature of the family reunion policies, there is more or less a consensus between the political parties on restricting immigration laws for reducing the number of immigrants (Stenum 2005, p. 2). During the election campaign of 2005,
for example, the Social Democrats affirmed that they would not change the current
Government’s immigration policy, except for removing the low *start help provision*
for newcomers (Stenum 2005, p. 2). This provision stipulates a lower amount of
social assistance for temporary permit holders. This will be considered in detail within
section 5.2, under the *Collateral clause* part.

In the above context, the opposition parties have generally supported the changes in
family reunion law, provided that they were not in conflict with Denmark’s
obligations under international conventions (Siim and Skejeie 2008, p. 335).
However, this has not been the case. The new regulations received immense criticism
from various interest groups, from other EU members and from the United Nations
(Gulicova-Grethe and Yahirun 2004, pp. 4-5).

The legislation has been criticised by the Danish Institute for Human Rights (2004)
for the violation of the right to family life (the European Convention of Human
Rights, article 8), by the CEDAW (UN Convention on the elimination of all Forms of
discrimination against women) Committee in 2002, and by the Report of the Council
of Europe’s Commissioner on Human Rights. Following this report, there was a
political debate between the government and the opposition in 2004, where the
opposition demanded that the Integration Law should be in accordance with the rules
335). The Council of Europe’s third report on Denmark as of December 2005
emphasised again that the Nationality Act, the Integration Act and the Aliens’ Act
were modified in a manner which disproportionately restricted the ability of minority
groups to acquire Danish citizenship to benefit from spousal and family reunification
and to have access to social protection on *par* with the rest of the society; moreover,
there was no clear policy in Denmark for ensuring that minority groups have equal
access to employment, housing and education (European Commission on Racism and Intolerance 2006).

It is also notable that Denmark is exempt from the European Commission’s directive on family reunification for third-country nationals.\textsuperscript{11} As a result, from the failed referendum on the Maastricht Treaty in 1992, Denmark obtained opt-outs in four areas, namely economic and monetary union, common defence, justice and home affairs and Union citizenship. Therefore Denmark is allowed to have stricter rules concerning family unification. These opt-outs can also be interpreted as a reflection of the notion of belonging in Danish society and how the Danish identity is perceived within the national understanding of citizenship. Denmark declared in 1992 that ‘union citizenship is a supplement to national citizenship and not a replacement’ (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark 2006). The Amsterdam Treaty of 1997 states that union citizenship will not replace national citizenship, but only supplement it (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark 2006). According to the relevant Treaty provision, ‘no Danish citizen is allowed to avail of any right or fulfill any duty deriving from European citizenship if it conflicts with his/her position as a Danish citizen’ (Fossum 2001, p. 388). Fossum (2001, p. 388) states that this opt-out is clearly motivated by the need to protect Danish identity and the Danish reaction should be interpreted as an assertion of the need to protect national differences rather than a rejection of European integration.

\textsuperscript{11} In order to set the minimal norms for family re-unification a directive on the right of third-country nationals (2003/86/EC) to family reunification also states that the demand for the period of being legally resident in order to bring family members cannot exceed two years and the family reunification can be refused for spouses under 21 years of age (European Commission 2006).
5.3 The Aliens Consolidation Act 2002 as part of a firm but fair immigration policy

In the above context, the Aliens Consolidation Act of 2002 can be seen as a major stepping stone in legitimately framing the immigration problem within the topics of gender and ethnicity, leading the way to further restrictive changes about naturalisation and several other immigration issues in the future. The Danish Government’s explanation in proposing the amendments was:

The rules applicable so far for family reunification build on modern West-European standards for family establishment and have regrettably been exploited for immigration purposes through marriages of convenience and arranged marriages with resulting frequent tragedies for young families.

(Danish Ministry of Integration, cited in Razack 2004, p. 153)

The above statement shows how immigration was represented in the political discourse as a problem within the Danish society, threatening western values. Accordingly, the Aliens Consolidation Act of 2002 mainly aimed at reducing the number of refugees applying for residential status on a humanitarian basis and marriage migrants applying under the family unification process. By doing this, it was represented as a solution to counter the practices of arranged and forced marriages and to restrict the number of aliens in Denmark for the good of the integration of immigrants, who were in the country already (Adamo 2007, p. 15). In his opening speech, Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen asserted in 2003 that it was in fact necessary to have more restrictive immigration laws. He stated that:

Immigration policy was for many years characterised by slackness and lack of consequence. And the damage this has done is grave. About half of immigrants in
Denmark are without work and are on social security payments. There are immense problems concerning integration in Danish society.

(Anders F. Rasmussen, cited in Stenum 2005, p. 3)

Rasmussen’s speech centres on the *useless immigrant* discourse, where an immigrant is securitised by economic knowledge claims. In the following year, when the same issue was still on the agenda, Anders Fogh Rasmussen referred to the Aliens Consolidation Act of 2002 again in his opening speech to the Danish Parliament on 5 October 2004, stating that the policies about immigration were adequate despite their strict nature: ‘Before the last election, we promised to pursue a firm but fair immigration policy. We have done that and we will continue to do so’. Rasmussen’s determination in pursuing a restrictive immigration policy finds explanations on how the gender and culture arguments merge on the basis of an ethical subject with regards to *usefulness*. From a biopolitical perspective, Rasmussen’s position is about how a distinction between immigrant and native is maintained through reinforcement of certain identifications with an emphasis on the necessity of creating docile immigrants through firm regulations. Here we see that a desirable subject is constituted by a combination of economic and cultural criteria. I will explain this more in detail in the following sections.

**Construction of family immigration as a political problem in Denmark**

In Danish public and political debates, family reunification is generally understood as the marriage practice between an individual of ethnic minority origin residing in Denmark and a person who is based abroad. Despite considerable the number of native Danish citizens marrying foreigners, it is mainly framed as the most common way of contemporary third-country immigration to Denmark together with refugee or
asylum channels. In this section I will try explain how the problematisation of family immigration finds an explanation in gender equality through forced or arranged marriages and integration debates. I will examine the changes in the law and give examples from governmental discourses, which point towards the dichotomy of immigrant and native.

Today, third-country nationals married to Danish nationals (as opposed to other immigrants and refugees) constitute the biggest group of immigrants travelling under family reunification regulations (Gulicova-Grethe and Yahirun 2004, p. 8). Approximately half of these Danish nationals belong to immigrant communities; as a result they are seen as the legitimate targets of the supporters of restrictions on family reunification (Gulicova-Grethe and Yahirun 2004, p. 8). Moreover, in 2001 around half of the family reunification permits involved spouses, one quarter of those were people under the age of 24 (Rosevare and Jorgensen 2004).

Denmark does not represent a dramatically different case in the politicisation of family immigration within the European political setting; however, the changes that occurred in the aftermath of the 2001 elections have been the most controversial compared to other European countries with regards to the identity perspective. The discussions on these changes still continue in the political and public spheres. Bertel Haader, the Minister for Refugees, Immigrants and Integration (2001-2005), clearly pointed out ethnic divisions when he talked about the target group of the changing legislation: ‘Everybody knows that it is not about Americans. But unfortunately we must not discriminate. We shall require the same from all. And I mean unfortunately’ (Jyllands-Posten, 17 April 2003, cited in Goli and Rezaei 2005, p. 19).

In fact family reunification was already a politicised issue before 2002. In 1997, Thorkild Simonsen, the Social Democratic Minister of the Interior, introduced a new
immigration and integration law which demanded that a person who resides in
Denmark and wishes to unite with a spouse should have lived in Denmark for at least
six years and a spouse residing in Denmark needed to be able to financially support
his/her incoming spouse and provide adequate housing for both of them (Andreassen
and Siim 2007, p. 11). In 2000, the coalition of Social Democrats and Liberal Centre
adopted new rules for family reunion to prevent forced marriages between young
Danish and foreign citizens by enforcing the attachment rule, which required that
couples must have an attachment to Denmark at least as strong as that to any other
country and an obligation for the person living in Denmark to have a home of a
reasonable size (Siim and Skjeie 2008, p. 335).

Despite the prior restrictive trend I argue that the Aliens Consolidation Act of 2002
has been the most powerful tool in rearticulating how and why certain measures had
to be adapted in terms of problematising immigration within the field of family
reunification, and as well in the transformation of family related immigration from a
rights-based framework towards a highly politicised matter. In this context, it has
constricted the lives of individuals in various ways and has contributed to the reality
of immigration and consequently to the identity of the immigrant. In this perspective,
the changes in the Aliens Consolidation Act opened a new rhetorical space of
legitimisation concerning the problematic identities. Below I will discuss how the
changes in question can be linked to problematic identities.

The 24 years rule, the attachment clause and forced marriages

The 2002 changes dramatically tightened the family reunification rules. Before
discussing how politics of normalisation take place in terms of politics of belonging
and identity articulation, I will have a closer look at what was achieved in the new
package for immigration in 2002. In the following part, I will mention the changes starting with the 24 years rule as the regulation that was considered as the most controversial. According to this regulation, Danish residents were no longer permitted to bring in a foreign spouse under the age of 24. Article 9 states that upon application a residence permit may be issued to:

(i) an alien over the age of 24 who cohabits at a shared residence, either in marriage or in regular cohabitation of prolonged duration, with a person permanently resident in Denmark over the age of 24 who:

(a) is a Danish national;

(b) is a national of one of the other Nordic countries;

(c) is issued with a residence permit under section 7 or 8; 12 or

(d) has held permanent residence permit for Denmark for more than the last 3 years.

(Aliens Consolidation Act 2002)

The Danish government’s main argument for introducing this clause was to prevent marriages of coercion on the assumption that these marriages prevented the integration of immigrants. As part of the same argument about integration, the new government redefined the attachment clause, this time asserting that the couple’s aggregate attachment to Denmark had to be more than their attachment to any other country. Section 7 of Article 9 states that:

(7) Unless exceptional reasons make it inappropriate, a residence permit under subsection (1) (i) 13 can only be issued if the spouses’ or the cohabitants’ aggregate

\[\text{12} \text{This applies to refugees and asylum seekers who have obtained the right to a residence permit upon application.}\]

\[\text{13} \text{Applies to marriages with foreign nationals.}\]
ties with Denmark are stronger than the spouses’ or the cohabitants’ ties with any other country.

(Aliens Consolidation Act 2002)

In 2003, the attachment clause was changed because a large number of ethnic Danes with foreign partners were caught in the rule (Andreassen and Siim 2007, p. 11). From 2003 onwards, a person who had lived in Denmark for more than 28 years could unify with a spouse regardless of their connection to Denmark (Andreassen and Siim 2007, p. 11). The criteria for the assessment of attachment are worth mentioning and are stated as follows:

1) How long you and your spouse have lived in Denmark

2) Whether one or both of you have family or other acquaintances in Denmark

3) Whether one or both of you have custody of or visiting rights to a child under the age of 18 living in Denmark

4) Whether one or both of you have completed an educational programme in Denmark, or have a solid connection to the Danish labour market

5) How well you and your spouse/partner speak Danish

6) The extent of both of your ties to any other country, including whether any or both of you have made extended visits to that country

7) Whether you have children or other family members in any other country

(The Danish Immigration Service 2010)

The attachment requirement is closely related to the discussions on arranged and forced marriages. The explanation was that this regulation was seen as necessary for cases when a resident young girl is forced to travel to the spouse’s country of origin to establish a family and wait there until both spouses reach the age of 24, after which
the couple returns back to Denmark (Udvalget for Udlændinge- og Integrationspolitik 2002). In these cases, the attachment requirement could mean that a future application for family reunification would be refused, although the minimum age requirement is met (Udvalget for Udlændinge- og Integrationspolitik 2002).

In the official web page of the Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs it is stated that with regards to family reunion one of the aims of the requirements for both parties to be over 24 years of age and have greater affiliation to Denmark than to any other country is ‘to protect very young people from being forced into marriage against their will, and to ensure the best possible basis for the integration process’ (Danish Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration 2006).

The 24 years bar for marriage is described at times as a fixed and objective age limit; however, there is no specific explanation as to why this number is 24 but not 23 or 25. The general understanding is that the older you are, the better you can resist the pressure from the family. Bertel Haader made a more concrete explanation when he was answering the questions of the Integration Committee of the Parliament in 2002:

> The proposed age limit of 24 years in relation to family reunification is determined based on the assumption that young people aged 18 to 24 years old normally go through a significant personal development - among other things in relation to their education - which can contribute to making them capable of liberating themselves from a potential pressure from the family or others to enter a marriage against their own will.

(Udvalget for Udlændinge- og Integrationspolitik 2002)

In the above perspective, the government’s argument was also related to education in the sense that people of the age of 24 would have finished their studies - or, from another perspective, marriage would not replace an education any more. Although it
is impossible to reach a solid judgement looking at the data about family immigration, this restriction might have had positive effects in preventing the importing of very young girls to Denmark for the purpose of marriage and encouraging them to continue their education to some extent. However, it remains dubious that the age bar will have a direct effect on preventing forced marriages altogether, or will reinforce the integration and emancipation of individuals. After the change in the legislation, many individuals who aim to unite with their spouses from non-EU countries chose to move to Sweden, where the legislation is more flexible, until they acquire permanent residence permits. It can be argued that changing the legislation has affected those who could not afford to live in Sweden in more dramatic ways.

When we consider the civil legislation in Denmark, the contradictions become clearer: as opposed to the restrictive and protective approach towards immigrants, the legal age of marriage in Denmark is 18, or, with a letter of approval from the Queen, 16 (Dustin 2006, p. 7). As a result, the strategy for family reunion is not only discriminatory against minority groups in its attempt to reduce the number of immigrants through family reunion; it also contributes to a duality within the population in terms of rights and equal treatment. This situation is in contradiction with the idea of universality. The attachment clause is controversial in the same way (Dustin 2006, p. 7): it does not apply if one of the parties has held Danish citizenship for more than 28 years (The Danish Immigration Service 2010). This clause represents, like the others, highly selective criteria for family reunion unless the person is an *ethnic* Danish citizen.

The 24 years rule in particular invites a discussion about immigrants’ agency on their freedom in choosing a partner. Moreover, it contributes to the problematisation of *forced/arranged marriages* as an issue of non-western communities. It is stated in the
legislation that if there is doubt that one or both parties consented to marriage, permission will not be given. This clause almost sets forth an expectation that marriages within immigrant communities are likely to be forced marriages. This understanding might put certain individuals in a position to prove they are not engaged in this kind of practice. Section 8 of Article 9 of the Aliens Consolidation Act stipulates that:

(8) Unless exceptional reasons conclusively make it appropriate, a residence permit under subsection (1) (i) cannot be issued if it must be considered doubtful that the marriage was contracted or the cohabitation was established at both parties’ desire.

(Aliens Consolidation Act 2002)

On a rhetorical level, the changes in the legislation communicates a wish to counter the practices of arranged and forced marriages by restricting the number of aliens in Denmark and by emphasising ‘better integration of immigrants, who are already in the country’ (Adamo 2007, p. 15). The emphasis on the link between forced marriages and immigration, however, forms a basis for the argument that family reunion exacerbates problems of integration (Razack 2004, p. 153). In this environment, the restrictive approach and punitive integration policies are easily justified (Siim and Skjeie 2008, p. 327). However, the integration argument is not supported by statistics on the number of forced marriages, but rather by surveys about marriage patterns of immigrant groups living in Europe (Razack 2004, p. 153). For example, the Danish government’s argument for the need to reform the family reunification policy depended on the fact that in 47 per cent of the marriages within immigrant groups one of the spouses was not a Danish resident and came from abroad; this pattern which did not change from 1994 to 1999 added more emphasis to the debate that integration is more difficult for families where one spouse comes from outside Denmark (Razack
The Ministry for Refugee, Immigration and Integration did not have exact figures about forced marriages and accepted that it was very difficult to get an accurate picture of forced marriages and the specific age group that suffers from coercion (Udvalget for Udlændinge- og Integrationspolitik 2002). In this perspective, the 24 years age limit was based on the assumptions about individuals’ increasing capacities to resist to their families as they grew older, rather than on concrete facts about forced marriages. In this context, the Aliens Consolidation Act of 2002, can be seen more as a strategy to tackle this problematic sector by minimising it (Gulicova-Grethe and Yahirun 2004, p. 4); however, its effects on individuals who choose to come to Denmark to establish a family are controversial with their limiting effects on their freedom in various ways.

The collateral clause

According to the Aliens Consolidation Act, the collateral clause stated that spouses were not allowed to join their partners in Denmark unless the couple has a sufficiently large income. Accordingly, Section 4 of Article 9 maintained that:

(4) Unless exceptional reasons conclusively make it inappropriate, it must be made a condition for a residence permit under subsection (1) (i) that the person living in Denmark who has undertaken to maintain the applicant provides a financial security of DKK 50,000 to cover any future public expenses for assistance granted to the applicant under the Act on an Active Social Policy or the Integration Act, cf. Subsection (14)…

(Aliens Consolidation Act 2002)

This amount is subject to change and will be adjusted every year. For 2010, the regulation stipulates that the person residing in Denmark has to guarantee 62,231
DKK (The Danish Immigration Service 2010) (circa 8,400 EUR) for covering the future expenses to support the spouse or partner (Gulicova-Grethe and Yahirun 2004, p. 10). This guarantee will be valid for seven years from the date when the residence permit was issued and might not be revocable, only to be released in case of the approval of a permanent residence permit and in the absence of any expenses which the municipality may have had covered (The Danish Immigration Service 2010).

Besides, the resident party has to prove that s/he is able to support him/herself and the spouse at the same time; this means that s/he must not have received public assistance under the terms of the Active Social Policy Act or Integration Act for at least 12 months prior to the application being processed by the Immigration Service (The Danish Immigration Service 2010).

Before the Aliens Consolidation Act 2002, third country nationals with permanent residence in Denmark were entitled to equal treatment with respect to social security and benefits related to employment and pensions, disability benefits etc. These were usually granted to non-nationals on the basis of minimum residence requirements or international agreements (Groenendijk, Guild and Barzilay 2000, p. 27). The Act challenged the principle of universality by adopting an introductory grant, which was lower than the amount given to people on social assistance, and non-citizens only gain the right to full and equal social benefits after seven years of residence in Denmark (Lister, Williams and Anttonen 2007, p. 86). In this context, family reunion can be seen as a good example for showing how the differentiation of legal rights determines an immigrant’s position while at the same time reinforcing a tiered and restrictive welfare entitlement system.

The establishment of restrictive grants can be seen as a change in the attitude of the state. The state now refuses to take the same responsibility as before for newcomers:
immigrants are expected to have the capacity to financially survive either by themselves or by the help of their spouses. Welfare cuts with regards to third-country immigrants therefore also point towards a certain form of familialisation and reinforcement of the family in diverse ways, with the state seizing some its responsibility for the welfare. In other words, it is now more up to the resident partner to look after her/his partner who is a newcomer. This understanding in fact contradicts the individualistic Danish view of family. Moreover, the social cutbacks might also be problematic in terms of the financial inequality between the native Danish population and immigrant groups in general, especially since integrating into the job market for newcomers might be a more lengthy and difficult process.

It can easily be argued that the legal framework can indirectly make marriage immigrants dependent on their spouses; moreover, if they choose to end their relationships they come face to face with losing their temporary residence permits (Gulicova-Grethe and Yahirun 2004, p. 11). In sum, family reunion policies point out to a problematic of self-reliance and dependency with regards to third-country immigrants by maintaining a discursive choice on behalf of the state and policy makers. This choice is about the question of upon whom the immigrant shall be dependent – on the spouse or the state – rather than whether or not s/he is dependent and in what ways can be emancipated. The desirable immigrant in this understanding is a self-supporting one, and the state takes the role of encouraging the immigrant to act as an active economic individual. Accordingly encouraging a pro-active immigrant subject family is used as a discursive medium to set forth the necessary expectations.
**Application for permanent residence permit and naturalisation**

Under the family reunion legislation, immigrants granted temporary residence permits are allowed to reside in Denmark for one year (Gulicova-Grethe and Yahirun 2004, p. 11). Extensions depend on the alien’s residency, whether or not she has left the country for a significant period of time. These temporary permits give marriage migrants unequal access to social security benefits but equal rights to employment, education, etc. (Gulicova-Grethe and Yahirun 2004, p. 11).

According to Article 11, Section 3, permanent-residence permits would be granted after seven years of residence, instead of three:

(3) A permanent residence permit is issued upon application to an alien who has lived lawfully in Denmark for more than the last 7 years…

(Aliens Consolidation Act 2002)

This means a longer period for naturalisation and obtaining Danish citizenship. Apart from the lengthy period of waiting, the application for permanent residence became more difficult with the introduction of a language test in which applicants for Danish nationality had to demonstrate the linguistic ability of a 14-year-old native (Roemer and van der Straeten 2006, p. 253). Article 11, Section 9 stipulates that issuing a permanent residence permit depends on the fact that the alien:

(ii) has passed a test in Danish language approved by the Minister for Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs, cf. Subsection (10)

(Aliens Consolidation Act 2002)

On 8 December 2005, the parties in government, the Liberal Party, the Conservative People’s party and the Danish People’s party entered into an Agreement on Nationality by issuing new guidelines for naturalisation (Danish Ministry of Refugee,
Immigration and Integration 2008). Under the new guidelines, the proof of skills in Danish language and the citizenship test, which concerned knowledge of Danish society, culture and history, became tighter. Denmark does not allow dual nationality and it is a condition that the applicant for citizenship renounces his or her present citizenship.

**From a legal framework to subjectivity**

In the above context it can easily be argued that, as a result of the controversial discursive framework, the regulation of the rules on family reunification of third-country nationals have become more complex and are subject to change very frequently, and that the restrictions have resulted in reducing the number of persons granted family reunification almost by half between 2002 and 2003 (Adamo 2008, p. 15). At the same time, these conditions create complexity and ambiguity by promoting individual assessments of each case within a non-transparent and unpredictable administrative practice (Adamo 2007, p. 16). Within this framework, the new legislation was successful in reducing both the number of applications and the number of positive decisions for family immigration. In the below chart, the decreasing trend in the number of applications together with the number of positive and negative decisions each year are revealed starting from the year 2001. As can be seen here, the number of the positive applications decreased in parallel to the reduced number of applications.

Moreover up to 2003, a growing number of immigrants applied to become Danish citizens; however, after the Aliens Consolidation Act there has been a dramatic reduction in this number due to the changing requirements (Goli and Rezaei 2005, p. 10).
Table 5: Figures on Family Reunification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications for family reunification</td>
<td>15370</td>
<td>11250</td>
<td>6520</td>
<td>5796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive decisions on family reunification</td>
<td>10950</td>
<td>8151</td>
<td>4791</td>
<td>3835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative decisions on family reunification</td>
<td>3286</td>
<td>3531</td>
<td>3745</td>
<td>2816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Stenum 2005, p. 3)

I argue that the changes in family reunification law transform *family* to a site where immigrant identities are reconstructed as opposed to Danish ones. In this change, the *family* as an apolitical space is politicised. Family immigration governance, on the other hand, functions within the logic of political economy while at the same time claiming to be apolitical. In this context, discourses on forced/arranged marriages and integration reveal the conflicting distinction between judicio-legal mechanisms of sovereignty and humanitarianism. The arguments on forced marriages, which are framed within the age bar debates, for example, show how the state can act as an *ethical* entrepreneur through the political interference in human life. In this context, the Aliens Consolidation Act 2002 can be seen as the underlying legal site, which brings a legacy to the social stratification of rights by maintaining that certain groups of individuals deserve less in terms of obtaining certain rights and autonomy because they merit less.

Different aspects of family reunification constitute an empirical field for the subjectivity formation within relationships between the governed and the governing. Here, the private sphere such as the family becomes a site of production of desired
subjects for the ideal society. This society is also presented with neoliberal ideals, such as selective assistance within a communitarian conception or the promotion of a self-supporting individual. These regulations can also be considered as the embodiment of an interference with individual lives by the political power, even though they contradict with the underlying liberal principle of universalism (Mitchell 2006a, p. 95), which surface the political ideology in Denmark.

According to the above understanding, family reunification laws also point to the state’s engagement in the regulation of private life, which is also a contradiction to the public and private split of liberalism (Mitchell 2006a, p. 95). This perspective is again about the biopolitical dimension, which is important in analysing the duality between liberal and illiberal interpretation of individual rights and how it is normalised. I argue that family reunion policies contradict the universalist idea of the liberal principle of individual rights.

The politicisation of the family in the case of immigrant groups calls into question how they are maintained as less deserving. I argue that the immigrant in question is a biopolitical subject whose livelihood becomes a political tool. In this perspective, family reunion policies are examples for showing how power in governance might control its subjects through certain truth discourses whose limits are set within an increasingly neoliberal logic. The immigrant also becomes an object which stands at the opposite pole of clean-cut Danishness and contributes to the articulation of the Danish identity (Diken 2002).

In the context of the discussion about ethical subjects the political rationality of neoliberalism needs to be reconsidered. In understanding identity construction, I focus on neoliberalism as a form of rule, which engineers the politics of belonging through certain strategies. While the neoliberal state promotes the free transit of commodities
from one area of the world to another, it simultaneously cuts social protections and abandons its responsibility for those subjects who are considered to be undeserving. (Giorgi and Pinkus 2006, p. 99). This also means that the effects of neo-liberalism are felt on different levels as a result of this split between deserving and less deserving subjects. In this perspective, understanding the definition of insiders/outsiders in Danish society largely depends on a neoliberal problematisation of belonging.

5.4 Danish identity and gendered other

Gendered discourses on forced/arranged marriages and integration with the Danish labour market

This study examines gender as one of the most important aspects in the consideration of the biopolitical intervention through the processes of sex/gender and race construction (Mitchell 2006a, p. 97). In order to understand how restrictions on family reunification in Denmark were justified to reduce the possible number of family immigrants, it is important to focus on the variable of gender. Family immigration is already associated with female immigrants whose contribution is generally represented negatively. Female immigrants are seen as introducing forced or arranged marriages or patriarchal relations in Western societies (Yuval-Davies, Anthias and Kofman 2005, p. 519). In the Danish context, this representation seems to be more acute where gender equality is constructed as a Danish value as embedded in the foundations of Danish democracy (Siim and Borchorst 2008, p. 17).

Accordingly, the variable of gender is essential in understanding how immigrant versus native Danish identity is articulated. In this section, I will try to show how gender plays the main role in the creation of knowledge of immigrant identity as a result of which controversial restrictions such as the 24 years rule can be
implemented. In this perspective, I argue that gender is the enabling visibility in the
governmentality of third-country immigration in Denmark that normalises the duality
between liberal and illiberal practices within the realm of biopolitics. While the
Danish society has largely managed to impose gender-neutral laws in its civil
legislation, putting great emphasis on the liberal interpretation of individual rights, a
gendered discourse gives direction to the implementation of immigration legislation.
The changes in the family reunion laws point towards immigrant groups’ inability to
integrate, and mainly found explanations in forced marriages and subsequently third-
country immigrant women’s low participation in the labour market. At the same time,
some of the characteristics of the Danish welfare regime further legitimise the clash
between understandings of equality by Danish and minority groups. For example, the
Danish welfare regime is based on a strong dual-breadwinner model, which is
founded upon women’s waged work and has been characterised by a high degree of
social equality, a strong tradition for participatory democracy, voluntary associations
and grass root organisation (Siim and Borchorst 2008, p. 7). In this context, the gap in
unemployment rates between native and immigrant groups is a source of
problematisation for immigrant women’s capacity to achieve the same standard of
gender equality as native Danish women. In this view, the low labour market
participation of third-country immigrant women is perceived as a threat to the basis of
the Danish welfare state and consequently to consensual democracy.

In 2004, native Danish women’s unemployment rates were seven per cent, whereas
men’s were six per cent (Andreassen and Siim 2007, p. 17). Immigrants from non-
western countries had the highest rates with 14.7 per cent for men and 16.5 per cent
for women (Andreassen and Siim 2007, p. 17). Most of all, the changing welfare
rhetoric also contributed to the cultural argument with regards to gender: ‘the
restructuring of the welfare state towards a new active line in labour market and social policy has also raised new questions about the integration of immigrant women with different religious and ethnic backgrounds’ (Siim 2000, p. 147). Hence, immigrant women’s low participation in the labour market has found an explanation in the culture argument; at the same time it has become one of the aspects that is emphasised in the integration discussion in terms of the social policies that became more individualised.

In this section, I will focus on the arguments on forced/arranged marriages, welfare cuts and integration. These topics constitute the basis of the restrictions that came with the Aliens Consolidation Act 2002. I assert that gender is the underlying variable in the production of truth about the dichotomy of the native and immigrant identity in these arguments. Hence, the next section will be an analysis of the role gender plays in the creation of a particular rhetoric, which legitimises restrictive measures on immigration. To do this, I will mainly look at the governmental rhetoric through certain political statements and the Government’s Action Plans on Gender Equality.

**Representation of the gendered other in the governmental rhetoric**

The Danish discourse on gender equality represents a link between the assumptions about the lack of capability of immigrant groups to maintain Western equality standards and the construction of ethnic minority identity as the cultural other. In terms of its gender equality policies, Denmark highly prioritised the situation of ethnic minorities, representing a conflict between minority cultural traditions and Danish equality norms (Langvasbraten 2008, p. 32). At the same time ‘a high-profiled ideal of gender equality has certainly been an important ingredient in the construction of a homogenous Scandinavian-ness’ (Langvasbraten 2008, p. 33).
Karen Jespersen, Minister for Welfare and Minister for Gender Equality (2007-2009) from the Liberal Party asserted the connection between Danishness and gender equality in one of her speeches by referring to what kind of threat immigration might pose to Denmark:

I think immigration is a benefit for society. But you have to be very cautious in dealing with it, to keep your basic values. Most Danes favour immigration, but refuse to surrender the achievements of their society. We will keep the equality of men and women and freedom of speech.

(Karen Jespersen, cited in Tagliabue 2007)

The above understanding not only reinforces a primordialistic view of culture and ethnic identity by referring to gender equality as a basic value exclusively of Danes, it also reflects a consideration of immigrant groups as a homogenous group who, overall, share the same illiberal, non-democratic values under the non-western label. In this framework, what generally defines immigrant women is their victimisation by the values/traditions of their patriarchal culture; a representation, which harbours the dichotomy of native and immigrant. Similarly in a 2005 debate, MP Louise Frevert from the DPP stated ‘the ethnic women are in many cases left in the lurch by men. They do not have a social life, nor a working life, and thereby no opportunity to get an education and/or an occupation’ (cited in Langvasbraten 2008, p. 43). This understanding forms the basis of the official Danish approach towards the policies for emancipating immigrant women; however, with an emphasis on restrictive or punitive policies rather than on preventive measures or dialogue. In 2007, Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen’s opening speech of the Parliament shows how problematisation of gender is reflected in governmental rhetoric as the new inequality in Danish society:
We will improve equality between women and men. Equal opportunities between men and women contribute to creating strong cohesion. Yet, not everybody in Denmark benefits from gender equality. Some immigrant women do not have contact with the surrounding society. They do not know their rights, and they do not determine their own existence. The lacking gender equality for many immigrant women is part of the new inequality. The government will launch an overall effort to further gender equality between women and men with immigrant background.

(Rasmussen 2007)

An important example for analysing the problematisation of identities that are represented in a clash between western and non-western standards is the Government’s Action Plans for Gender Equality. Within the context of this argument, these plans can also be mentioned as important discursive fields in terms of emancipation strategies, which are reinforced by the equality discourse.

The Gender Equality Reports and Action Plans are submitted once a year to the Parliament since 2001. Except for the 2001 Plan, the Liberal-Conservative coalition government has produced all action plans (Langvasbraten 2008, p. 41). During and just after the period of the legislation change in Denmark (2002, 2003 and 2004), three main issues appear in the problematisation of immigration in relation to gender equality:

1) Gender equality is represented as a Danish value, whereas immigrant groups should learn how to achieve the same standard.

2) Labour market participation of ethnic minority women is stressed for better integration; attainment of high gender equality standards will solve the problems about labour market participation completely.
3) Forced/arranged marriage is a cultural problem of minority cultures, which result from patriarchal nature of their culture

More importantly, in each action plan the integration of ethnic minority women is examined in separate headings. In this way, ethnic minority status is delimited within its own scope and with challenges, which are specifically attributed to its own status (Langvasbraten 2008, p. 41).

Gender equality is one of the democratic values on which we build on our society, and respect for the individual must be in focus. The advantages of cultural diversity must be rendered visible, but the need to base the initiatives on fundamental principles like gender equality and self-determination for individuals must also be clear.

(Danish Ministry of Gender Equality 2004, p. 4)

The above statement shows how gender equality is represented as an essentially Danish value as opposed to cultural diversity. ‘Women and men who settle in Denmark must come to understand gender equality as an essential aspect of Danish society and as an underlying value’ (Danish Ministry of Gender Equality 2003, p. 5). This statement again is based on the assumption that foreigners/settlers from other cultures would not have achieved the high quality of gender equality as Danes and that they face challenges adapting to it. In the 2005 Report and 2006 Perspective and Action Plan, the view on gender equality was explicitly defined as a culture problem emphasising young people with non-Danish cultural backgrounds, which furthermore polarised the native and minority cultures putting gender equality at the forefront.

Young Danes face challenges in breaking out of rigid gender roles, but young people with non-Danish backgrounds undoubtedly face even stronger challenges. These arise
in the charged zone between two cultures that may have contrasting expectations and demands.

(Danish Ministry of Gender Equality 2006)

The emphasis on how immigration can be utilised by the labour market highlights cost-benefit calculations in the problematisation of immigration in which the immigrant subject as an economic actor is impeded by her culture. This problematisation is also considered as an educational issue. The Government’s Action Plan set the special priority fields of action for 2003 as education and the labour market perspective for integration.

Education and labour market attachment are essential in an integration process. In these areas, attention must centre on diversity as a resource. The labour market will benefit from a diverse working force and from the efficient utilisation of a wide spectrum of human resources.

(Danish Ministry of Gender Equality 2003)

In the above statement there is an emphasis on the political economy of immigration through which immigrant subjects are problematised with regards to their adaptability to the labour market. In this view, education is also seen as a means to produce useful subjects who will participate efficiently in the Danish economy. Overall, we can argue that the idea of integration is here delimited by the idea of creating economic subjects by educating them. This view can also be interpreted as an understanding of the immigrant as a subject in need of rehabilitation of normalisation for society’s needs.

The unemployment rate for women with minority backgrounds is especially high, and the group’s relation to the labour market requires special attention. This issue is a
joint responsibility requiring the efforts of the women themselves, politicians and companies.

(Danish Ministry of Gender Equality 2003)

At the same time the Government’s Action Plans’ emphasis on the link between integration and the labour market participation is co-articulated with the construction of a cultural problem. Here, the economic argument simultaneously develops with the debates on forced/arranged marriages. From this perspective, the discursive link between the two topics implies that labour market participation levels are to be blamed on forced marriages:

Special attention has been focused on the gender equality aspects of being subjected to forced marriages. Girls in particular are at risk of facing restrictions and being retained in traditional gender roles. Thus, they often lose their labour market attachment and have trouble in maintaining relations to the work life and association life.

(Danish Ministry of Gender Equality 2004).

In this context, cultural diversity becomes the main problematic in tackling inequalities, which cause low participation in labour market. At the same time, repression of women is also problematised through certain practices such as forced or arranged marriages.

But cultural diversity must never be an excuse for gender discrimination. We cannot allow degrading actions or force exercised under the cloak of culture or tradition. We therefore need to respond firmly to circumcision and forced marriages. Forced marriages are illegal and often lead to conflict-ridden and even violent marriages.

(Danish Ministry of Gender Equality 2003)
In this statement culture is the dividing line between the Danish/Western women who have more freedom, autonomy and equality and those ethnic minority/immigrant/non-Western women who are suppressed through practices such as forced marriages.

In cooperation with the Ministry of Integration, a special action for the period of 2003-2005 especially targeted at forced-marriages, semi-forced marriages and arranged marriages (Danish Ministry of Gender Equality 2004, p. 10). This plan included 21 initiatives which focused on preventing forced marriages and unfortunate family reunifications based on arranged marriages in order to improve integration and increase gender equality (Danish Ministry of Gender Equality 2004, p. 10). One of the suggested aims was ‘improving focus on marital problems of young people from ethnic minorities in Denmark’ (Danish Ministry of Gender Equality 2004, p. 10). The Action Plan defined arranged marriages as a tradition that has been brought to Denmark, where ‘the choice of a marriage partner becomes a collective concern rather than a personal decision’ (Gulicova-Grethe and Yahirun 2004, p. 9). Forced marriages, on the other hand, occur when one or both parties are subjected to coercion in terms of their decisions to get married (Gulicova-Grethe and Yahirun 2004, p. 9).

In the Danish discourse, the separation between forced and arranged marriages has been problematic in a number of ways (Dustin 2006, p. 5). First of all, the discourse ignores the diversity in forms of arranged marriage, while at the same time idealising ‘normal’ Danish families in an unrealistic way (Dustin 2006, p. 5). This way it contributes to generalising all women as victims of their culture (Dustin 2006, p. 5). It is also suggested that there is a lack of clarity of differences or similarities between forced marriages and arranged marriages across Europe, which affects the aims or targets of policy initiatives (Dustin 2006, p. 5). This is not a different case in Denmark, where the issues of forced marriages and honour-related violence became
the subject of public concern especially from the 1990s onwards (Lister, Williams and Anttonen 2007, p. 92). As a result, the Action Plan against forced marriage was especially problematic because it did not only intend to prevent only forced marriages but also arranged marriages where coercion might not necessarily exist (Lister, Williams and Anttonen 2007, p. 92).

5.5 Concluding remarks

In this chapter, by examining the family reunion policies, I put forward Danish immigration rhetoric as a societal discourse that led to particular political actions in the form of family reunion regulations. My aim for looking at the family reunion regulations has been to show how individual immigrants become a variable of the political economy of immigration within gendered biopolitics, and to analyse this situation for reaching a deeper understanding of the implications of the restrictive transformation of the legislation.

I specifically focused on gender in order to show how culture and gender arguments intersect in the normalisation of identities in Denmark. From a broader perspective I consider gender as a variable, which legitimises the real inequalities and hierarchies; accordingly, while racism can take the form of cultural superiority, sexism goes hand in hand with racist ideology and serves the same ends as racism (Wallerstein 1990, p. 44). In the case of Muslim groups, for example, the fact that the rights of women in third-countries are not as developed as in Western countries can be a justification for the kind of racism which argues that Muslims are not culturally capable of recognising the same universal principles in gender relations that are practised in the western world and generally oppress women (Wallerstein 1990, p. 44).
Thus, those at the lower end of the scale are easily identifiable by what may then be termed cultural criteria … culture now becomes the explanation of the cause. Blacks and women are paid less because they work less hard, merit less. And they work less hard because there is something, if not in their biology at least in their culture, which teaches them values, which conflict with the universal work ethos.

(Wallerstein 1990, p. 46)

I have also discussed that family reunion regulations point towards exceptionalism. In the Danish context, they are prominent examples in showing how the duality between the liberal interpretation of individual rights in the case of the native Danish population and the illiberal version in the case of third-country immigrants are justified and put into practice through the construction of a culturally anomalous other. As normalising activities, these are also the ways of the politicisation of life, and at the same time, indicators of the rationalities of the Danish state, which motivate both political and individual behaviour, alongside and in relation to new forms of contemporary government (Mitchell 2006b, p. 390). From this perspective, family reunion regulations are important practices, which control the deployment of immigrants within Danish society, in terms of their adaptability to the individualized economic activities such as integration in the labour market, and at the same time as docile individuals who will not create a threat to the homogenous Danish structure that is assumed to be characterised by equality and consensual democracy.

In the above perspective the differentiation between liberal values of non-intervention in native Danish family structure and strict government regulation of immigrant families in relation to gender equality (Siim and Borchorst 2008, p. 19) is justified within the discursive field of political economy. The construction of third-country immigrant women versus native Danish women in public imaginaries within a
binarism and the constant interpretation of immigrant identities through the lens of gender seems to contribute to a large extent to truth production. This situation is also related to the Danish welfare structuring. While social and family policies are based upon individual rights and are gender neutral in Denmark, third-country immigrants reflect an exception, in whose cases welfare regulations have become highly gendered by the application of anti-liberal principles (Siim and Borchorst 2008, p. 15).

As part of the formulation of a Foucauldian power and knowledge relationship with regards to the management of immigration, I will argue in the next chapter what kind of biopolitical subjects exist in relation to the discursive field of belonging put forward in this chapter. I will reveal complementary and contradictory interpretations by Turkish immigrant women in the view of the gendered biopolitical practice of immigration. While this chapter analysed what topics became relevant in the problematisation of immigration that justified restrictive changes, in the following chapter I will try to show how these topics are understood by subjects of these restrictive changes and how subjects position themselves within the context of Danish immigration governance.
Chapter 6

Narratives of belonging by immigrant women

6.1 Introduction

Explicating subject-making within the framework of governmentality

Having discussed the truth discourses and legislative changes as strategies for intervention I will examine modes of subjectification as part of the governmentality framework. Accordingly this chapter explores how Turkish family immigrant women reflect on the idea of belonging in Danish society. By using selected narrative segments and by presenting immigrant women’s interpretations on several themes through these narratives I will try to demonstrate how they normalise governmental discourses on topics of belonging and identity by resisting, negotiating and reworking them.

I am mainly interested in seeing how they practice their agencies under the dominant images of an ethical subject in Denmark through their self-positioning. For doing this I will refer to an analysis in which I look at subjectivity that is defined as both dependence upon dominant power structures and othering, and also as self-fashioning by using one’s agency (Brodwin 2003, p.396). From this perspective, narratives will be explanatory in examining how immigrant women interpret collective representations of identity with regards to native Danish and immigrant within the framework of a Foucauldian governmentality.

Previously in Chapter 2, I have conceptualised belonging as the relationship between personal identity and a collective identity, or in other words as a notion about one’s
self-positioning that is comparable to one’s perception of the aims or values of a given collective (Jones and Kryzanowski 2008, p.44). This link between personal and collective levels with regards to the concept of belonging will be analysed in this chapter as the link that brings relations of power that inform both domination and freedom into focus. From this perspective, by examining how interviewees discursively locate themselves within narratives I will be explicating their subjection. In doing so, I will trace technologies of governmentality of immigration in subject-making which are understood both in forms of control and in subjects’ consciousness or self-knowledge that tie them to their own identity (Foucault 2000b, p.331).

In Chapters 4 and 5 I have demonstrated what kind of representations dominated Danish immigration politics about a desirable immigrant who is seen as fit in Danish society. By giving examples from the legislation changes and governmental discourses I wanted to show how these representations were gendered and racialised through cultural discourses and reflected a binarism between native and immigrant. In this chapter, I will analyse interpretations of Turkish immigrant women in parallel to the macro representations that have been explained in the previous chapters. The linking of micro narratives to macro narratives will show how and in what ways personal experiences can be analysed in connection to dominant power structures in society. At the same time, subjective narrations about belonging will build a more subtle picture about the interconnectedness between the private and the political sphere within the realm of immigration governance. In this perspective, while I analyse immigration governance as a site of self-making I will look at how the subject is constituted within the discourse through narratives in resisting or negotiating dominant discourses on belonging.
Framing the interview data

I am examining a set of discourses by Turkish immigrant women, through primary data obtained in interviews. I am conducting a discourse analysis of their narratives in order to reveal the ways in which they become subjects in their interpretations of specific content issues. In this analysis discourses are broken down to themes for better reflecting various ways of problematisation of immigration in Danish politics. I look at narratives not as expressions of practices, but also as performances through which they re-articulate their identity and belonging (De Certeau, Jameson and Lovitt 1980, p.36).

Interviews were constituted of open-ended questions in relation to the problematisation of immigration. Through particular themes, I wanted to cover various processes of subjectification in the Danish society. Accordingly, I focus on narratives about ‘citizenship’, ‘economic individuality’, ‘integration’, ‘gender equality’, ‘arranged marriages’, 'the 24 years rule’ and ‘future expectations’. All these themes relate to belonging in different ways. At the same time, they are connected to broader representations in immigrant women’s subjectification in Danish society. As such, they are content areas in which immigrant women become subjects through power relations within the technologies of governmentality of immigration in Denmark.

By using focusing on these content areas I examine in what ways biopolitics constitute individuals as subjects of the governmentality of immigration. While I use immigration as a discursive site of self-making, I acknowledge the possibility of various other content areas. However, within the limits of this research and in the view of the ethical subject within hegemonic representations, I specifically chose the above themes. In Chapters 4 and 5, I discussed how homogeneity and cultural
cohesion is understood to be the foundations of equality as an essential value of Scandinavian society. From a discursive point of view on belonging, an ethno-cultural construction of national identity is presented in parallel to the political-economic re-distributing instruments of the state. I also showed in Chapter 4 how a transformation from welfare to workfare affected the idea of belonging in Danish society. In this context, by asking immigrant women about their self-understandings of citizenship, economic-entrepreneur individual, integration into Danish society and gender, my aim has been to examine their interpretation of belonging and identity within the dividing lines of native and immigrant represented by governmental discourses. I consider belonging as a process of self-making. Accordingly self-interpretations by immigrant women reflect how they articulate/construct their identities as subjects and agents.

Narratives within a governmentality analysis contribute to a rediscovery of experiences of immigrant women. As performances of identity, they are to be examined with the consideration that no social or personal relations escape permeation of power (Deveaux 1994, p.233). My main aim in analyzing the interviews through the particular themes above is to bring them as close as possible to macro discourses, which communicate a gendered and ethno cultural collective representation of immigrants. By asking open-ended questions about these selected themes I wanted to encourage interviewees to reflect on relevant topics of belonging in these collective representations by also giving them enough freedom for interpreting their own reflections and enabling them to put forward their subjective interpretations.

Using an open ended questionnaire meant that not all the respondents talked about the same issues and gave importance to similar topics. It was often the case that some themes were left out or ignored by some of the respondents while they were central
for others. While some of the respondents expressed in detail work related issues with regards to belonging; for example others mainly talked about everyday lived experiences and gave limited attention to the work aspect. In this perspective I selected narrative segments which emerged as significant in interviews.

It is important to mention here that this analysis does not presuppose a mono-causality between macro and micro narratives. As I have clarified in my methodology chapter, this examination can be seen more as an attempt to challenge the assumed homogeneity with regards to the idea of subject in immigration discourses by showing diverse and heterogeneous ways of self-interpretations. From this perspective, the rest of this chapter will constitute an empirical argument with regards to the theoretical perspectives offered in Chapter 3, which conceptualises subject in anti-essentialist ways when examining it within an interconnectedness between political power. Overall, this is an investigation about how the subject is located within the governmentality of immigration and how particular discursive contexts contribute to subject-making.

6.2 Narratives of citizenship

In this section, I will refer to expressions of citizenship by revealing how citizenship is communicated by immigrant women in their mediated discussions. I examine citizenship as part of a discursive construction of belonging which helps to understand how immigrant women locate themselves as legitimate subjects in relation to hegemonic discourses in Denmark which more and more emphasise ethnic assimilation in relation to the citizenship system. As a notion that represents and embodies a connection between the individual and society in various ways,
citizenship becomes an important tool in the interpretations of immigrant women with regards to their formal relationship to the Danish state.

Citizenship can be conceptualised as a process of becoming recognised subjects through practices of inclusion and membership (Cossman 2007, p. 2). Expressions about lived experience of citizenship point towards how immigrant women claim their (legal) right to stay in Denmark and, in doing this, what kind of an ethical and political subjectivity they emphasise. In this perspective, while citizenship can be seen as a topic which constitutes an aspect of discursive construction of ethnic or cultural identity, it is also an important legal and socio-political category, which immigrant women inhabit in terms of their subjectification. The subjectivity of the immigrant in Denmark is an outcome of a gendered and racial process, which is reflected in various ways by immigrant women when they rework their ideas of belonging at an everyday level. From a biopolitical perspective, this also relates to the experiential aspect of legal belonging and how biopower renders life governable at the level of individual’s everyday experiences. In immigrant women’s narratives different interpretations of citizenship point towards subject-making and what kind of identities are produced as micro-level practices.

In the above understanding, my first question on citizenship was a general one, about immigrant women’s subjective interpretation of citizenship (e.g. ‘what does citizenship mean to you?’). My analysis focuses on how immigrant women interpret the hegemonic discourse in Denmark that is embedded within an ethno-nationalist understanding of citizenship and to what extent they construct different realities of belonging within counter-discourses as they normalise their identities. As part of an analysis of ethical and political subjectivity in relation to neoliberal discourses I will
proceed in the following section by looking at immigrant women’s economic positioning in relation to identity construction.

A technocratic interpretation of citizenship

During the interviews, one interesting aspect was how a majority of the respondents framed citizenship within a technocratic understanding. They described citizenship as a tool for avoiding troublesome bureaucracy from the perspective of pragmatics of mobility. For them citizenship was important mainly to acquire certain rights, either when they were travelling within the EU or in their daily lives in Denmark.

‘I feel Turkish and to some extent German too’

In the following narrative Suzan talks about how unimportant it is for her to be a (Danish) citizen in terms of making her feel belong in Denmark. She equates Danish citizenship with a Danish passport by almost reducing it to a commodity that gives her certain freedoms or rights in her everyday life:

Suzan: In fact, I have to tell you that it (being a citizen) means nothing. For example I have acquired Danish citizenship, but being a Turkish citizen or a Danish citizen means nothing to me…. In fact I have chosen Danish citizenship only for obtaining the passport… And that was not to have problems at the borders… and of course for obtaining some rights for example: I don’t know- maybe for buying or selling a house, but even for those kinds of things it is not so important anymore. In terms of feelings, I don’t feel anything anyway.

An interesting aspect of Suzan’s narrative is how she presents her belonging from a multi-dimensional perspective. When asked if she sees herself as Danish as a result of her citizenship status, she expresses multiple forms of identity as both Turkish and German, thereby making it clear that she does not feel Danish, despite the fact that she
has been living in Denmark longer than in the other two countries. In her narrative she resists Danishness, while at the same time belonging for her becomes a more complex idea than how it is represented within the hegemonic political discourse.

Suzan: Of course I do not see myself as Danish. I see myself as Turkish and to some extent I feel German too because I was born in Germany and studied elementary school there. I am still under the influence of that place. We returned back to Turkey when I was 11. I lived in Turkey for six or seven years, then I got married and came here.

Suzan’s interpretation can be seen as an example of how Danishness is constructed as opposed to her multiple identities, which are in coalition, in the context of her subjectification in Denmark. In the above narrative she describes her reaction to her experience of living in Denmark as a marriage immigrant by mentioning her prior experiences as an immigrant in Germany and in her home country Turkey. In the context of her narrative about citizenship, there is an unsettlement about her positionality in Denmark which becomes evident when she talks about how she is attached to Germany and Turkey in terms of her feelings of belonging. This unsettlement is presented by a resistance against Danishness when she firmly clarifies that she ‘of course’ does not feel Danish and when she divorces citizenship from the idea of belonging.

‘Nothing changes if you are a Danish citizen’
In another narrative, Neriman expresses citizenship mainly as a practical tool and a technocratic detail through her feelings of otherness and perceived racial subjectivity. While she describes Danish citizenship as empowering in terms of freedom of movement within the EU; she mainly positions herself through her status as an immigrant and as a result of which she is discriminated. It is also notable that, unlike
Suzan, Neriman is still a Turkish citizen; however, her scepticism towards citizenship reflects a similar interpretation: ‘citizenship is important only for practical reasons’.

Neriman: I am a Turkish citizen. Being a citizen … it does not mean belonging: my husband says no matter which citizenship you have you have to be a world citizen, this world is everyone’s. That is why it does not matter… The biggest advantage of being a Danish citizen would be not have to get a visa within the EU. Otherwise nothing changes if you are a Danish citizen or not because discrimination continues anyway.

Neriman’s interpretation of citizenship reflects how she understands her subjectivity as an immigrant in Danish society. She states that even though she was a Danish citizen she would not be treated as equal to a native Danish. Her narrative about citizenship is about her lived experience of marginality. At the same time she emphasises a different subjectivity than the representations within dominant discourses when she explains why citizenship does not matter: ‘this world is everyone’s’. Through this representation she suggests a different possibility of belonging which is not dependent on an ethno-cultural identity.

‘The reason why they rejected my first application…’
During the interviews, another important aspect about the interpretation of Danish citizenship in terms of the practicality of obtaining Danish passport was how this practicality was expressed through a discursive construction of an ‘immigrant narrative’ which was presented from the perspective of the ‘foreigner self’ as opposed to the Danish other. Below is one of the clearest examples of these narratives about how Turkishness is presented in a dichotomy with Danishness. Burcu here states that she acquired a Danish passport merely for practical reasons. Although she is not asked
about the process of how she acquired her Danish citizenship, she recounts her story of how she applied for the first time for Danish passport.

Burcu: Being a citizen is of course important, at least when you are travelling around you do not have to wait at the borders and you can pass immediately. I have a right to live anywhere; well otherwise I would not care about it. When I first applied for citizenship they asked me why I wanted to be a Danish citizen. I told them that I wanted to carry only one identity card in my pocket. At the time I was carrying four different documents. Because of this answer they rejected my application, then I wrote a letter to the Ministry and asked them if I had to tell bad things about Turkey in order not to be rejected and for obtaining Danish citizenship. After that letter, they right away sent me my Danish passport.

Burcu in her narrative (re)constructs her loyalty to her home country and her national/cultural identity by expressing her reaction to Danish authorities. Afterwards, when I asked her if she felt Turkish or Danish she stated that: ‘I have to tell you that I feel Turkish, I don’t feel Danish at all. I never felt Danish.’

In this example, explaining citizenship as a technical detail implies a feeling of otherness and a subtle resistance that one will not become culturally Danish even when one has a Danish citizenship. In this perspective, the idea of having the freedom of choice in deciding where one lives, opportunity and flexibility to travel freely precedes the idea of belonging as an emotional attachment in reflecting upon Danish citizenship. At the same time, expressions of citizenship become strategic discourses through which the self is expressed against the other.
An ethno-cultural interpretation of citizenship

‘Being Danish is more like a fear’

During the interviews the positioning of the self as an immigrant foreigner was expressed within different interpretations of citizenship. In the below narrative, Cemile’s subjective understanding of citizenship relates directly to her discursive construction of the self which is expressed through her Turkish national identity and her emotional attachments to Turkey. Her interpretation of citizenship is more ethnocultural rather than a technocratic one. Respectively, her understanding of belonging is shaped by her emotional attachments which are embedded in nostalgic feelings of her home, Turkey.

*Cemile:* Being a citizen … it feels as if I will give up my Turkishness, that place [Turkey] is more important, maybe it is because my family is there [she mentions her mother, father etc. as her family]. Being Danish is more like a fear than happiness… it is as if why do I give up my Turkishness? Maybe the reason is that they do not have double citizenship. For the moment, if they would offer me Danish citizenship, I would not accept it…For example, what if I die and there is no grave for me in Turkey anymore…When you are far from home, you give importance to these kind of things.

*Cemile’s* narrative above also points towards how she positions herself within an immigrant status which renders vulnerability and fear of losing identity. Afterwards she paradoxically states that she definitely plans to live in Denmark and continue her life there with her family. This reflects a contestation between her emotional/lived experience and her expression of legal belonging. On the one hand she expresses her awareness about the advantages of being a Danish citizen and living in Denmark which is accompanied by a desire to settle in Denmark for long term; yet she is not
quite ready to give up her Turkish passport, which provides her a material attachment to Turkey.

A civic interpretation

‘Citizenship is a legal tool’

One of the interviewees, Fulya, mentions citizenship within a civic context and mainly as a legal tool. In her narrative she talks about citizenship neither as a form of emotional attachment nor purely as a practical detail; instead she refers to it within a discursive framework of rights and responsibilities which balance each other.

Fulya: Being a citizen of a country means having certain rights and responsibilities. These rights and responsibilities, they have to balance each other. Citizenship is a legal tool within the framework of these rights and responsibilities… The requirement of being a citizen is to abide by the laws of the country in which you live…

Fulya’s narrative here is different than above narratives which reflect a discursive struggle of subjectivity as respondents position themselves against normativity of hegemonic discourses by referring to technocratic or ethno-cultural interpretations of citizenship. By placing emphasis on law and legality perspective Fulya takes a counter-position against Danish hegemonic discourses. Her expression can be seen more as a non-subjective interpretation, through which she attempts to place herself outside normalising effects of dominant discourses that construct a dichotomy between native Danes and immigrants.
Reproduction of subjectivity within a free discursive space

The above narratives point towards a variety of different positionings and emphases by immigrant women in their discursive constructions of citizenship. They also show how immigrant women employ certain identity strategies by resisting or accepting particular aspects of citizenship in their subjective interpretations. For example, some of the interpretations indicate a certain level of negotiation of Turkish identity within the Danish context. For those who expresses citizenship as a technocratic detail, Danish citizenship is defined as a tool for making life easier; being Turkish, on the other hand, reflects a deeper emotional attachment. Others come up with explanations within a rights or responsibilities framework, or a legal interpretation of belonging, which includes both rights and responsibilities.

Governmentality determines the conditions within which individuals are able to freely conduct themselves (Hamann 2009, p.55). When immigrant women interpret citizenship, their oppositional positions can be recognised as forms of resistance or critical responses to forms of governmentality and specifically administrative techniques of subjectification that shape individuals in terms of their free conduct (Hamann 2009, p.55) within immigration governance. At the same time, their narratives show how citizenship can be negotiated within a relational context of the self versus collective identity. Overall, it could be argued that diverse interpretations by immigrant women point towards a context dependent nature of subjective identities within discursive constructions of citizenship and these show how immigrant women (re)locate themselves within a particular Danish context. For example none of the respondents places emphases on political participation with regards to their democratic rights despite its dominance within the indigenous Danish discourse. As I have mentioned in Chapter 4, the Danish citizenship model gives
utmost importance to citizen participation which is defined as political consensualism. Rather than mentioning this aspect immigrant women’s narratives depict their subjective positions within various frameworks of ethnic versus civic constructions. This might point towards how particular identity strategies are deployed and some others are left out by immigrant women in relation to governmental discourses. In this perspective, even though citizenship as a status is based on the idea of free and equal individuals, the way individuals exercise their rights in relation to their citizenship shows irregularities and these different ways are not necessarily compatible with each other.

6.3 Narratives of economic individuality

In this thesis immigrant women are analysed as biopolitical subjects of power and knowledge relationships within Danish immigration. The biopolitical aspect of governance is about an aim to produce a specific social order through certain kind of subjects (Hamann 2009, p.50). From this perspective, I am especially interested in examining how biopolitics constitutes immigrant women’s subjectivity in economic terms (Hamann 2009, p.53). With this aim I look at the effects of governmental technologies at the level of everyday life through neoliberal ‘conduct of conduct’ (Hamann 2009, p.37).

In the above perspective, I will trace immigrant women’s self-reflections in terms of a shift from a welfare paradigm to a workfare paradigm in understanding how they express the idea of an autonomous, entrepreneur subject, which dominates Danish political discourses as part of a neoliberal rationality. In order to analyse the extend to which immigrant women subjectively deploy themselves with ‘the neoliberal subject’ I asked them general questions about work (e.g. How important is work for you when
you consider your place within the Danish society? Why is it important/not important?). Accordingly, by examining their responses I will look at women’s acceptance or rejection of the values projected by law when they practice their agencies and if certain aspects of the neoliberal discourse are evident in their subjective constructions.

A gendered and ethno-cultural interpretation as opposed to economic/entrepreneur citizen

The discursive space of work and economic activity provides examples about women’s subjectification within biopolitics of immigration. This can be seen in the following narrative. When Suzan tells about her motivation to work, she primarily positions herself through her immigrant status as a result of which she is disciplined in a different way than a neoliberal subject. Her interpretation shows how an ethno-cultural and gendered aspect of belonging in Denmark prevails economic individuality and interpretations of work through a discourse of entrepreneur subject.

‘I wanted to break the idea of Turkish women as cleaners’

Suzan: When I was studying in high school, we were told we should be useful for our country and the nation. Here, I have the same idea. The reason I studied here was rooted in this idea of becoming useful to the society in which I live. And there was another reason: at the time there were ideas about Turkish women being stupid and unable to do anything were very common, such as about all Turkish women who are working as cleaners. I don’t know… I wanted to break that… it is as if (saying) we are here too. I started studying with such a reaction.

Suzan’s narrative suggests a normative view by which she expresses work as a duty of every responsible individual, but not necessarily as a tool through which one promotes herself as a citizen or an ethical entrepreneur subject. In this perspective, her
expression does not reflect a direct connection to a neoliberal subject who embraces the market as the criterion for her self-governance. On the contrary, she states that the reason why she studied to become a teacher was to resist a certain type of subjectivity in Denmark: ‘Turkish women who can only work as cleaners’. Her assertion of work is embedded in being accepted within Danish society, with an ideal of a respectable job. In her statement she also suggests that *being a cleaner* as a Turkish immigrant woman implies lack of autonomy or skills. This understanding hints at a connection between the hegemonic discourses about immigrant women in Denmark as victimised by their culture as a result of which they end up being left uneducated. Suzan’s rejection of being regarded as such can be read in her expressions about work and belonging. Here, gender becomes a central component in practicing her agency by resisting against a certain kind of subjectification and at the same time legitimises her subject position in her interpretation of work.

**Interpreting class downward mobility in the legitimisation of one’s position as a spouse**

‘*You have to start from scratch…*’

One of the interviewees, *Ebru*, expressed her experience of class downward mobility in relation to work and her subjective positioning. In the following narrative *Ebru* acknowledges that work is a fundamental part of being a recognisable subject in Denmark; however, she does not directly express her subject position as neither the inheritor nor the producer of capital that is created through work. Instead, *Ebru* expresses work as obligation in order to become a citizen.

*Ebru*: I have been working in a cleaning company for two years and going to a language school for one year. For me it does not mean much to become a Danish citizen. For the ones who are uneducated and come from low standards this place is a
heaven. I had good standards in Turkey, both socially and financially. I was working as a teacher in Turkey. I think it is very difficult to come here after a certain age if you are educated. You have to start from scratch… The state thinks that by working and going to a language course one will be integrated. I do not agree with this.

Ebru refers to citizenship when talking about work and expresses citizenship as a practical necessity, a tool that will provide her with more opportunities and make her life in Denmark easier. She expresses the necessity of ‘working’ for acquiring Danish citizenship. In the narrative below, she further negotiates her position within disciplinary practices of the state with regards to her immigrant status. Here Ebru states that she postponed having another child in order to comply with the obligations of being recognised as a legitimate subject. This expression hints at how she discursively constructs her subject position as a non-citizen immigrant woman, which is a status that restricts certain freedoms, but also as an experience which will empower her eventually.

Ebru: I will be worthy for the state only after seven years. Just for being able to go to the language school and to be able to continue to work I cannot have a second child. I could have done it in this way: not cared about the state, because the state does not care about me. I have not behaved like that in order to establish a life. Because here the laws are strict but if you are a proper citizen all the doors will be opened for you.

In Ebru’s expressions, work is also used to legitimise her position as a spouse. In doing this she mainly defines her subject position through her family and her relationship with her husband rather than through work: ‘I feel Turkish with all my being, but at the same time I see myself as Danish too. I have been fighting to stay here only for my husband since the day I arrived here. I tried to learn how to live in Denmark.’ Here, Ebru constructs hybrid identities with regards to the topic of work
and her belonging in Denmark as an immigrant and a wife. In her narrative there are different emphases about her self-positioning within Denmark as a legitimate subject who does her best to be accepted as a deserving immigrant. Within these expressions she also subjectively locates herself through her disadvantaged immigrant status which renders her less agency for using her qualifications which she acquired in Turkey.

No tangible link between work and belonging

In the following narrative, Su refers to integration within the context of being recognised as a legitimate subject and states that she sees no direct connection between integration and working: ‘Finding a job has nothing to do with integration. For example, if you are very rich you might not have to work. But of course it is important to know about the society and be a part of it’. Another respondent’s Ayla’s expression is similar, while she at the same time expresses an awareness about Danish governmental discourses on deserving subject as an economic individual.

Ayla: Even if I don’t say that it is necessary to work to be a citizen, the state (already) says so… I don’t believe in the distinction between good citizen and bad citizen though. However, everyone, if they have the opportunity, should be able to work.

In the view of the above narratives, immigrant women communicate the idea of work in diverse ways, different from the idea of self-entrepreneur citizen of governmental discourses. These discussions reveal different dynamics about their gendered subjectification within self-defined discursive spaces where they have renegotiated their legitimate positions as family immigrants in Denmark. It is important to note that especially the ones who have arrived in Denmark after 2002 expressed awareness of the state policies, which encourage newcomers to participate in the labour market
during the interviews. However, the notion of self-supporting individual as one of the fundamental Danish values did not seem to have gained currency as a legitimate construction in the expressions of immigrant women. At the same time, the interviewees did not express the idea of being integrated through employment, or integration and work, which are popular topics in Danish official discourses. When asked in what perspectives work or being employed mattered, none of the respondents acknowledged work as a necessity for being accepted to Danish society. Some narratives, on the other hand showed how they were disciplined towards finding a job and being included in the labour market through different representations of immigrant women in Danish discourses. It is important here to note that none of the respondents interpreted work as empowering as it is represented in hegemonic discourses in Denmark especially with regards to gender equality. This might point towards different opportunity structures with regards immigrants and native Danes.

Overall these narratives point towards how immigrant women constructed their self with regards to the economic/entrepreneur individual. At the same time, they are about the division between desirable and undesirable immigrant subjects, not only through dividing practices of creating productive and unproductive individuals with reference to economic criteria, but also with reference to an understanding of autonomy that shapes individuals’ capacities. In this perspective, neoliberal subjectification in terms of immigrant identities is reflected in complex and incompatible narratives which points towards divergent positions of immigrant women.
6.4 Narratives of integration

Integration and subjectivity

This section will be about how immigrant women situate themselves as opposed to the integration discourses in Denmark in order to examine their discursive constructions of subjectivity with regards to commonality and diversity arguments in Danish discourses. As I have revealed in the previous section, immigrant women interpreted the idea of work in relation to divergent narratives about their self-defined positions in Denmark. In this perspective, I was especially interested in examining more how they would position themselves within more general articulations of integration in Danish society.

From a general perspective, the academic discourse about integration is linked to the idea of the nation-state as a distinct society, a unified, organic, and bounded entity, which alone can encompass and hold together the diversity and divisions of people sharing this same territory (Favell 2001). Within the scope of this research, integration is a useful topic in analysing forms of subjectivity elaborated as a response to governmental discourses of belonging in Denmark. As I have also mentioned in Chapter 5, integration is problematised in Denmark mainly in economic terms with regards to integration to labour market and is represented with regards to cultural adaptability of individuals. In this perspective the idea that ‘Denmark will never be a multicultural society’ is supported by both economic and cultural claims in governmental discourses. The integration debate in Denmark is mostly about self-supporting, economic individuals who will develop a sense of belonging to the common values of Denmark, which are seen as fundamental characteristics of Danish
identity. Accordingly, in parallel to the economic discourse there is a strong emphasis on culture and a communitarian perception of society.

In the official web page, *New to Denmark*, the aim of the adaptation of Integration Act 1999 is stated as ‘to ensure that newly-arrived refugees and immigrants can make most of their capacities on equal footing with other citizens of Denmark’ (The Danish Immigration Service 2006). This act, as the first attempt to form coherent legislation concerning immigrants and refugees stressed the importance of equality (*full citizenship*), economic independence (*labour market participation*) and the need to be familiar with ‘the fundamental norms and values of the Danish society’ (*cultural knowledge and assimilation*) (Kristensen 2007, p. 54). In spite of this threefold aim, Danish integration policy has a clear focus on labour market participation, economic independence, proficiency in Danish and knowledge of the Danish culture (Kristensen 2007, p. 54).

In 2006 the government introduced an integration law ‘Declaration on integration and active residency in Danish society’ (The Danish Immigration Service 2010a). From July 2006 immigrants became obliged to sign an *Integration Contract* (Kristensen 2007, p. 54). This law also targeted unemployed immigrants and emphasised again familiarity with Danish language, Danish culture and Danish society. In this contract, while the immigrant or refugee in question has to declare that he or she will learn the Danish language and fundamental values of Danish society, he or she also agrees to be a self-supporting individual through employment.

In order to reach a broader understanding about immigrant women’s positioning with regards to the above discursive framework I asked them for a general interpretation of integration (e.g. what is integration with the society for you?). I analyse narrations of immigrant women on integration as expressions in terms of their adaptation to the
sense of Danishness and Danish national identity promoted by governmental discourses and at the same time about their possible resistance, which will be reflected in their counter-hegemonic subject positions as opposed to governmental representations. Narrations of integration can provide more nuanced insights to the ways in which governmental strategies of identity are related to how immigrant women become and are made subjects of immigration governance. In this view it is useful to investigate how immigrant women (re)define and (re)negotiate or resist certain identities when they discursively locate themselves within narratives of integration as both objects and subjects of political power.

‘It is more important how the other side defines this concept’

In the following narrative, Su describes integration as adapting to a particular environment. She expresses that one’s self-positioning in a particular environment depends more on how the other side recognises you and what is expected from you.

Su: I think being integrated means adapting to your environment, not being assimilated. But it is more important how the other side defines this concept and what is expected from you. If you can assert your individuality in your social environment you can be integrated.

In her narrative Su’s use of passive voice (‘what is expected from you’) and how she refers to ‘the other side’ conveys how she positions herself as to the integration discourse in Danish context. Here it is significant that she expresses her ontological self by a division between us and them. It is also notable that Su’s narrative depicts a loss of agency and a possibility of empowerment at the same time. On the one hand, she recognises that in adapting in (the Danish) environment she does not have much autonomy, but she also discursively represents herself with a potential to resist or
challenge (the more powerful Danish side) what is expected from her by asserting her own individuality.

In terms of the expressions of *us* and *them*, the topic of integration points towards how subjectivity of immigrant women were bounded by a binarism between native Danish and immigrant Turkish. In this context, culture and assimilation were common topics of discussion through which respondents discursively formulated their belonging and negotiated their identity against the Danish *other*. In these expressions, some immigrant women exposed negative evaluations of how integration is understood in a Danish context as assimilation. These expressions could be understood in the view of an emphasis on ethnic assimilation in governmental discourses.

*I have never been assimilated in Denmark*

In the following narrative, Melis defines integration through her rejection of being assimilated in Denmark. In her statement she uses the discourse of labour market integration for expressing her own interpretation of integration.

*Melis:* I have never been assimilated in Denmark. For the Danish, being integrated and assimilated are the same things. Being like them is doing things like going to the disco or eating pork. However, what is important in this country should be to have a job, to work, to be useful to the society and to pay your tax. Integration is misunderstood here.

By mentioning *going to disco* and *eating pork*, Melis below subverts hegemonic discursive constructions of culture and integration which are associated with immigrant groups’ lack of ability to integrate in Denmark. Interestingly she makes a similar comment about the neoliberal subjectivity and integration with reference to having a job, but also by avoiding to set an emphasis on culture. In this context (as opposed to Danish governmental discourses which underline labour market
integration as part of a cultural problematic) she expresses that in Denmark, having a job and paying your taxes comes secondary to cultural assimilation. In doing this she clearly challenges the meaning of integration in Danish governmental discourses. However, it is also interesting that in discursively highlighting cultural practices within the context of a negative evaluation Melis at the same time contradictorily reveals how her subjectivity is also bounded by similar practices of culture.

*We cannot raise our children as Danish do*

The contradictory discursive constructions of integration with regards to self-understanding of immigrant women revealed an ambivalence about the binarism between Danishness and Turkishness. These constructions contained various aspects of hybrid identities which seemed to be significant in subjective positioning of immigrant women in their expressions of belonging. In the passage below, Cemile defines the oppositional relationship between assimilation and integration within ambiguous expressions of religion and nationality. At the same time she negotiates her position within Danish society with regards to her interactions with native Danes.

*Cemile*: Being integrated means adaptation. My opinion is that we are Turkish and we have to live as Turkish as much as we could. Of course, the Danish here have festivals, birthdays… We must not withdraw ourselves and stay home, just because we are Muslims, but at the same time we must not forget that we are Turkish. Actually the important thing is to maintain both sides… At the end of the day, we are not Danish and we cannot raise our children as Danish. But of course we are living here so we will learn the language and their traditions. …

The above narrative can be seen as Cemile’s subjective negotiation about how she positions herself in Danish society as an immigrant woman, who predominantly describes her subjectivity through her role as a mother and her multiple identities. It
seems that while she accepts the necessity of learning the Danish language and traditions, she at the same time (re)articulates her identity as a Turkish origin Muslim immigrant. In her narrative, the binarism between immigrant and native Danish identities is evident; at the same time she seems to embrace the constructions of Muslim and Turkish in a somewhat ambivalent manner by drawing attention to these constructions as part of her experiential belonging and identity as an immigrant in Denmark without really clarifying what they really mean in terms of otherness. For example she fails to explain fully what it means to raise a child as a Turkish mother, or similarly she talks of birthdays within the same context as religious festivals.

Integration as a problematic concept

‘Integration…This is the question I hate most’
Some of the respondents expressed integration as a problematic concept with negative connotations. In these interpretations, immigrant women expressed integration within discussions of equality, or as a problematic of equal treatment. These interpretations also hinted at representations about the culturally different immigrant who is seen as unfit in Danish society.

One of the respondents Deniz states in her narrative that: ‘Being integrated… this is the question I hate most. I think a person should be considered as integrated whether or not she can get integrated. It should be enough that she is a human being’. Deniz in her narrative represents a discursive struggle for subjectivity by expressing opposition to how dominant Danish discourses of integration construct unfit immigrant subjects. When she is articulating her subjective understanding of integration, she conveys the integration discourse as a site of normalisation where criteria of belonging with regards to fit and unfit subjects are designated.
A similar interpretation below reflects how a binarism with regards to culture takes place between natives and immigrants. In the following narrative, Suzan’s negative evaluation of integration shows how she positions herself as culturally different and as opposed to native Danish through an interpretation of the cultural argument within dominant discourses. Similar to Deniz’s narrative, Suzan also reflects her negative take on the integration discussion.

*Suzan*: Integration… this is a topic, which has always been popular since we came here… This is discussed in terms of being assimilated and being integrated. Sometimes our culture is ignored and looked down upon, just like what happened in this cartoon crisis. When we show a reaction we are told that we are not adaptable, but they have freedom of speech and they have a right to say anything. I don’t think this has anything to do with adaptation. I don’t want to lose the essence of my identity when I adapt.

During the interviews, immigrant women developed different interpretations of integration, referring to this notion as a discursive tool of self-making in evaluating the hegemonic discourses in Danish society with regards to immigrant identity. Their interpretations point towards significant topics of discussion with regards to identity articulations in their subjective positioning generally about practical issues in everyday life which they used to express and differentiate the *self* from the *other*.

### 6.5 Narratives of gender

In this section I will analyse the expressions of immigrant women about how they interpret gender equality as they rearticulate their self-positioning in Denmark. As I have tried to demonstrate in the previous chapters, gender equality is exclusively defined as a Danish value in governmental discourses. In this chapter I will examine
how gender equality is constructed in self-interpretations of immigrant women and to what extent it constitutes their subject positioning in terms of how they inhabit their immigrant status.

In the interviews, I asked immigrant women about their opinions about gender relations within the Turkish community and what they thought about gender equality in a general perspective (e.g. Do you think there is gender equality within (Turkish) immigrant community?). Afterwards I also asked about their opinions on arranged marriages and on the 24 years rule, as primary topics which constituted a gendered discourse of belonging in Danish governmental discourses (e.g. What do you think of arranged marriages, do you think 24 years rule is bad or useful?). These questions reveal what role a gendered identity has in the development of immigrant women’s subjectivity.

**Practicing agency within patriarchal bargains**

The way immigrant women communicate gender is important in the sense that it creates a discursive space for de-essentialising gendered constructions of identity and shows how these identities are discursively positioned within a combination of effects and possibilities (Rozmarin 2005, p.3). Here, it is important to note how freedom is an integral part of the description of social reality in terms of effects, in which it designates practices that challenge the regularity of power (Rozmarin 2005, p.4). Within this free discursive space, I refer to the concept of *patriarchal bargaining* by Deniz Kandiyoti (1988, p. 275) who defines it as women’s various tactics and strategies within a set of patriarchal constraints in their daily lives. For Kandiyoti, patriarchal bargaining is not a fixed concept; while patriarchal bargains are susceptible to historical transformations, they may also show variations according to
class, caste and ethnicity (Kandiyoti 1988, p. 275). Patriarchal bargains play an important role in women’s gendered subjectivity and determine the nature of gender ideology in different contexts (Kandiyoti 1988, p. 275). This concept is useful in examining various self-interpretations of Turkish immigrant women in terms of internalising, rejecting or negotiating certain gendered governmental discourses.

By applying this concept to this analysis of the expressions of Turkish immigrant women, I do not mainly focus on patriarchal constraints as stemming from within their communities, I also assume the state’s role in diffusing its power as a patriarchal force in terms of applying and legitimising the family reunion regulations such as the 24 years rule in contributing to women’s subjectification within a biopolitical space. From this perspective, expressions of gender equality and arranged marriages point towards how immigrant women understand normative female subjectivity imposed by governmental strategies and how they position themselves through certain identity tactics or strategies as female family immigrants.

**Gender equality**

*‘We are not less equal’*

In Deniz’s narrative below, her expressions of gender equality reflects a form of criticism towards gender relations within the immigrant community by which she distances herself from the unequal other (other immigrant). Accordingly, her narrative is about self-defining spaces of identity between the discursively constructed cultural spaces of native Danish where she clearly acknowledges the boundaries between herself and the native Danish and simultaneously between herself and unequal immigrants.
Deniz: There could be ones who are not equal; we have to take this reality into consideration. But there are also those [referring to the Danish] who look equal from the outside, but they are not. There are so many Turkish women here, some of us got divorced, and some of us got remarried… We [the strong women] are forgotten here and there are those who take action for saving the poor women. Unfortunately, the ones who seemed to like me a lot in the past when I was weak and had lots of problems, they are not with me any more, now that I am happy and at a better place. In short, we are not equal [with Danish women], that bothers me a lot. They want to see us as weak, show us as weak, but I don’t understand which one of us is weak here … I mean that if you look around those Turkish women who look incapacitated can almost lead the ministers here. My mother has never been out of her village, at least never bought a kilo of sugar in her entire life, I think she lives a much more equal life than the ones here and she does not understand why I work so hard.

The above statement can be read as a response to the dominant image of an immigrant woman who lacks agency. Deniz resists this representation by mentioning some Turkish women’s divorce practices and at the same time by questioning the change of attitude towards her by the native Danish when she felt empowered. She expresses herself as a woman who is preferred as a victim of unequal gender relations by the native Danish. In her story it is also possible to trace different interpretations of empowerment in relation to patriarchal bargains. Deniz states that many Turkish women in fact can show Danish women what equality means, and gives an example about her mother. Here Deniz implies that her mother is more equal than many Danish women even though she did not have economic independence. By referring to not having been out of her village once, Deniz states that her mother never had to be integrated into the labour market and financially support herself. This expression points towards how the male-bread winner model is interpreted differently than the
dual-bread winner from an equality perspective. For Deniz being able to work or being employed does not necessarily mean being emancipated. Overall, this narrative is about how Deniz employs certain strategies in terms of representing herself in discursive construction of her subjectivity with regards to dominant gender equality discourses. By doing she challenges the Danish normality.

‘The immigrant community is patriarchal, but the Danish are not that equal either’
In the following narrative, Neriman agrees that immigrant culture is patriarchal but escapes normalisation by suggesting that every individual case might be different. In this expression she distances herself from specific practices of inequality within immigrant communities. By talking about her husband she represents herself as equal. At the same time she defines gender equality as a problem of the private sphere (mostly referring to sharing the housework). In her expression, the binary of Danish and immigrant is also present. The fact that she references to the Danish normality via TV shows also indicates her limited contact with the native Danish population.

Neriman: Gender equality can be understood differently from one person to another. Our culture is patriarchal but the criticisms of the Danish are superficial and shallow. For example, my husband and I are equal at home and I know families where there is gender equality. The Danish have their problems too; we see so many stories on TV.

‘Danish are too equal’
Cemile: Gender equality is a relative thing. When I look at Danish men for example, they do not seem to be like real men; they have no influence, nothing. Our upbringing is different, when the man comes home it is normal for me to cook for him; but Danish see this as being suppressed. To tell you the truth, they are too equal… In Turkey, the women are not oppressed; here they are oppressed more. In Turkey, the husband comes from work and later they go out together. The first thing you hear from a man here when he comes from work is that he worked. But he has only worked
for eight hours… In Turkey the people work for twelve hours. Since I came here, I have been expecting to walk hand in hand with my husband. In Turkey, walking hand-in hand or arm-in arm is normal. Here, people are like robots. Financially you have everything you can buy or wear, but you have to do the exact same things every day. If we did not have holidays we would be dead.

*Cemile* communicates her gender roles by positioning herself differently from Danish women. She also uses gender equality as a concept in explaining her perception of differences between Danish men and Turkish men. It is interesting that she expresses a clear idea about Danish men, even though she has a very limited contact with native Danish. The way she communicates what she considers as manly also exhibits the discursively constructed norms, which constitute gender specific behaviour. Her perception of differences between Turkish men in Denmark and Turkish men in Turkey, on the other hand can also be read as her attempt to create a self-defining space between Turkish and Danish social spaces. For *Cemile*, men are disciplined differently in Denmark than in Turkey and they are reluctant to show behaviours that she expects from a spouse. Accordingly, the Danish social space is expressed through a lack of a romantic image of a husband and wife relationship, which is equated with a satisfactory life that she idealises. *Cemile’s* expression of gender equality is constituted of different themes, which are entangled within her sense of belonging. These can be summarised as: self-positioning through gender-specific discourses within boundaries of marriage practice and a sense of transformation or change in negotiating her identity as a result of her displacement with reference to her sense of gender.
‘Danish are worse off than us’

Zeynep expresses below that gender equality problems are exaggerated by native Danish who in reality seems to be in worse situations than immigrant women.

Zeynep: They [Danish] do not directly say anything about gender equality to us, but they are deep inside sarcastic about it… But they don’t bother me, because most of the Danes are in a worse situation than us, even though they have all kinds of social rights. I watch their programs on TV and I see that they are worse than us. But they are not as visible as our people. They do not discuss their own problems on Danish TV to that extent, they mention it just roughly. If there is a matter concerning us, they go further into it so much that the whole world hears about it eventually.

The construction of nonautonomous immigrant woman is challenged by Zeynep, who positions herself as ‘more’ equal than Danish women. She expresses that her understanding is based on TV shows, which again indicates limited contact with the native Danish population. Here, while Zeynep resists normative female subjectivity of Danish women, she refers to similar ethnic/racial boundaries of the hegemonic discourses. She also draws attention to the lack of social rights for immigrants when she makes this comparison and sees the origins for her lack of agency in her immigrant status instead of in her gender.

Throughout the interviews I have observed that the discussions on gender equality were generally delimited within a discursive space which has become a ground for contestation of identities by immigrant women over the dichotomy of Turkish (self) and Danish (other). These debates transformed themselves into a topic of identity politics wherein women negotiated and identified their positions as opposed to the native Danish groups. The views on gender equality were also indicative of how they constructed their knowledge about Danish identity and what kind of resources they resorted in their understanding of Danishness.
In the above context, the interviewees communicated different interpretations of gender equality. Their narratives drew attention to how Turkish immigrant women position themselves differently than in dominant discourses. In their statements, none of the interviewees raised gender equality issues in the same way as projected by the Danish governmental discourse, such as by mentioning arranged or forced marriages and labour market integration. In the following sections, I will try to demonstrate how arranged marriages, and the 24 years rule are interpreted in order to further examine how these discourses constitute immigrant women’s expressions of belonging.

Narratives of arranged marriages

Turkish immigrant women’s interpretations of arranged marriages are useful in understanding how they reflect dominant discourses in Danish politics as well as their subjective positioning within their communities. In the view of hegemonic discourses about arranged marriages it is interesting to examine if immigrant women constitute themselves as emancipated or not, since hegemonic discussions about arranged marriages point towards representations of immigrant women who are not autonomous enough to make their own decisions to marry and who are forced by their families to choose a specific partner.

Arranged marriage is a problematic issue since it may show diverse patterns of practice. As a very commonly discussed topic in Danish governmental discourse, arranged marriages can be generalised as a type of marriage initiated by the families of the couple. However, the boundaries of arranged or family initiated and couple initiated marriages are less clear (Hortascu 2007, p. 103). For example while arranged marriages may involve premarital dating after being introduced through families and couples may enjoy a higher degree of autonomy than generally imagined, as a result
of a high degree of (financial) interdependence within the family, couple initiated marriages may also be characterised by family intervention through practices such as contribution to marital expenses (Hortascu 2007, pp. 103-104). At the same time, while arranged marriages are about the decision of families and the choice of mate is by no means a personal matter, to what extent they involve the full consent of both partners or not is a different problematic (Kandiyoti 1987, p. 325). In other words an arranged marriage does not have to be a forced one.

In the interviews, this general obscurity about arranged marriages was carried on to the interpretations of immigrant women. Expressions by different interviewees about arranged marriages were sometimes in contestation with each other, mainly because of the difficulty in defining an arranged marriage as a uniform practice. As a result of this it was even more interesting to observe how immigrant women employed divergent identity strategies in their interpretation of arranged marriages.

‘An arranged marriage is not so anomalous in a Danish context’
In the following narrative Deniz refers to how arranged practices are used rhetorically by the media or politicians to justify cultural boundaries. Her expression can be seen as a negotiation of her subject position, as opposed to the supposedly ‘equal’ Danes. By giving examples from marriage practices of native Danish people with Russians or Thais, she challenges the idealistic/normative understanding of marriages of the native Danish and mentions about high divorce rates amongst them.

_Deniz_: I think it is the same story like Islam. Whenever media or politicians want to use it for particular aims, they bring it up. In my opinion they abuse the situation. How did Joachim [referring to the Danish Prince Joachim] get married? He had several lovers; his mother liked none of them. Eventually he found someone whom nobody knew about so that there would be no gossip. It is the same thing. Others find
Russians from the internet, and some go to Thailand. Are these different things? If it is about happy marriage by the way, I don’t understand why so many of them get a divorce at the end of the day.

It seems that Deniz does not acknowledge the idea that arranged marriages are necessarily against individual freedom, for her marriage practices naturally represent certain dilemmas against a certain form of individuality and total freedom. Arranged marriages do not constitute an anomaly in her interpretation.

‘Danish authorities have a point’

From a different perspective, Neriman below interprets arranged marriages in connection to forced marriages. By expressing that her marriage was a semi-arranged marriage she positions herself outside the realm of forced marriages. She states that Danish are right in focusing on arranged marriages.

Neriman: Danish authorities have a point in arranged marriages. It is ridiculous to force someone into marriage. Those marriages do not last for long, maximum six months maybe. Mine was a semi-arranged marriage, which means that we did not flirt with my spouse prior to our marriage, but nobody forced me into marrying. I was introduced him through acquaintances, but I married him with my own will.

Neriman describes her subjective understanding of an arranged marriage by a self-examination in the above narrative, also to some extent in accord with normality in Danish discourses. Her interpretation is a good example of how Neriman positions and produces herself as an agent through a particular standpoint informed by her subjectivity within societal norms as opposed to the immigrant community in Denmark. At the same time she brings up the issue of ‘flirting’ to define and differentiate an arrange marriage between a semi-arranged marriage. Although I am not focusing on sexuality among female immigrants in Denmark, it is important to
mention here how boundaries of sexuality and especially specific practices of sexuality play a role in immigrant women’s interpretations about arranged marriages. In the following narrative Su depicts a more direct interpretation of sexuality in a similar way when she explains how she thinks an arranged marriage is different than the practices in Denmark.

‘They sleep with their lovers before marriage’

Su: The difference is that they (Danes) sleep with their lovers prior to marriage, they have experience, which is why arranged marriages are different. When we talk about arranged marriages we are talking about a family’s decision.

In Su’s expression arranged marriages point towards discursive construction of immigrant women’s positioning in terms of their sexuality. Su’s comparison is rooted in her perception of sexually informed and experienced Danish women versus sexually naive and inexperienced Turkish women. Her expression is also a good example of how knowledge about the Danish as the other is constructed through a certain knowledge of sexuality. At the same time it is interesting that, while she mentions how an arranged marriage is about family’s decision, she gives the example of sexually experienced Danes within an oppositional discourse.

‘Arranged marriages increase the options for young people’
The following narrative is a different take on arranged marriages, which focuses on the factors that lead to decisions to marry someone from their country of origin. In this narrative arranged marriage is interpreted as a practice which does not limit the freedom of individuals but on the contrary empowers them. Suzan interprets arranged marriage as a useful practice because of the difficulties of meeting a possible partner in Denmark.
In an arranged marriage, that person [one of the parties of the marriage] does not get married before seeing his or her possible spouse. If she does not like him she does not get married. There are not any other options here (than an arranged marriage) because you have difficulties in finding a partner anyway. I can understand why they bring in spouses; because here, some are in gangs, some never get married. There is no environment to meet someone. In Turkey, there are different surroundings. You can meet someone at school, or at your work place and then you can get to know each other. Here, it is different. I am really sorry for the young people here.

In the above interpretation Suzan clearly differentiates arranged marriages from forced ones. For her, a family initiated marriage is not necessarily against the freedom of personal choice. On the contrary, she suggests the advantages of arranged marriages by pointing out to difficulties in finding a partner in Denmark for someone from immigrant community. By this interpretation she manages to avoid the Danish normalising discourse, which represents arranged marriages as a threat to freedom and emancipation. Suzan subverts this representation by drawing attention to the disadvantageous social environment for young immigrant people in Denmark, which might indicate a certain form of isolation or marginality.

The interpretations of arranged marriages differed from each other. Some of the immigrant women defined arranged marriages as barriers to freedom synonymously to forced marriages; some others considered them as useful for the young and single (Turkish origin) people living in Denmark. Even though all of the interviewees had marriages either through initiatives of their relatives, or people from their close environment, none of them considered themselves as forced to marry their husbands.
At the same time they never mentioned arranged marriages as a gendered practice. It is also noteworthy to mention that the respondents were not generally interpreting arranged marriages as a problem of personal choice and individuality versus collective decisions. On the contrary, they had a tendency to question the rationale behind the individualistic image of marriages in a Danish context as different from arranged marriage practices. This can be read as an attempt to legitimise their subject positions in Danish context against the common assumptions about their own marriages by challenging normality in dominant discourses. At the same time arranged marriages were referred by some of the respondents as a site of self-understanding and self-regulation through sexual practices and boundaries of sexuality.

Overall, immigrant women’s interpretations showed how their subjectifications were both self-made and also depended on the Danish discourses with reference to their communities and their individual positioning. These interpretations generally drew attention to how they questioned and re (produced) normality within a Danish context through their subjective positioning. In this context, the discussions about arranged marriages provided a site for immigrant women to rearticulate their subjective identity in relation to hegemonic truth discourses within immigration governance.

**Narratives of the 24 years rule and family reunion**

After describing their self-understandings of arranged marriages I asked immigrant women about their opinions on the 24 years rule. Their interpretations of this are especially important as they exemplify antagonistic power relations in a more direct fashion and reveal power’s legitimacy from the perspective of the subject (see Foucault 1982, p.778).
During the interviews some of the respondents mainly interpreted the 24 years rule as a legitimate outcome, which became necessary as a result of forced marriages within the immigrant community in Denmark. Their narratives are interesting examples about the intentional but non-subjective nature of power, which implies a disjunction between their discursive action’s intention and its actual effect (Heller 1996, p.87). In these narratives, immigrant women recognise the tactical necessity of 24 years rule and are motivated by its goal of preventing forced marriages; however they inevitably contribute to its function of normalisation of belonging which claims who is fit/deserving and who is unfit/undeserving (Heller 1996, p.87).

‘The system has been abused’
The following narrative by Melis is an example of how she takes on the governmental discourse on welfare and immigration.

Melis: In fact I can understand the reasons for these changes. For example, my neighbour from Somalia brought her sister’s children to Denmark as if they were hers. The system has been abused like this. Plus, the ones who come here do not work and they have no use to the state. So I think the changes are just to some extent.

In this narrative, the gap between the tactical goal of preventing forced marriages and its strategic function in the normalisation of identities are expressed through contradictory statements about the outcome of the regulations. Melis describes immigrants mainly through governmental discourses by mentioning how they abuse the economic system however, at the same time she contradictorily thinks family reunification legislation in fact harms gender equality.

Melis: In fact family reunification legislation harms gender equality. The families are divided because of this. For example, someone I know here has two children in Denmark and one child with his wife in Turkey. What can they do? It is not like they
will get a divorce because of this. For men it is easier to move to Sweden. Women are the ones who have to bear the circumstances; because it is more difficult for them, most of the time they have limited resources. Of course the legislation change was for the forced marriages, but it is not known if it helps. These things happen out of my circles.

It is interesting how different immigrant groups are othered in Melis’ interpretation of goals of the 24 years rule. For her even though the legislation harms certain individuals and especially women, Melis interprets it as inevitable. She also divorces herself from normalising effects of this legislation by saying that ‘these things happen out of my circles’. Here Melis clearly states she is not one of those ‘problematic immigrants’. This can be explained from the perspective of transfer of racial otherness from one group to another (Ong 1996, p. 742). In other words, narratives of immigrant women show how they differentiate themselves from each other, by referring to the criteria such as desirable, or less desirable within the broader context of a bipolar construction of immigrant and native in the Danish setting. This shows how othering continues within immigrant communities along the lines of ethnicity, nationality etc. in a similar fashion to the binary constructions of identity in Denmark. In this context, some groups might discursively position themselves culturally superior to others.

‘… even the boys were forced’
In the following narrative Burcu mainly refers to the Kurdish community as the group that is mainly responsible for these practices. Her narrative is a more clear example of

---

14 Ong talks about the transfer of racial otherness among Southeast Asian Refugees arriving in USA by showing how different minority groups such as Vietnamese or Cambodians differentiate themselves in a similar fashion as in the historical example of blacks and whites after Emancipation. She explains this as the blackening of less desirable immigrants, which are seen at the bottom of cultural and economic ranking.
cultural otherness that is defined along the lines of ethnicity within the immigrant community.

*Burcu*: They have implemented the 24 years rule after Turkish girls made complaints at the municipality, especially the Kurdish, not only girls in their case even the boys were forced. Nowadays nobody can bring a bride or a groom from Turkey, they all have to get married to someone from Denmark.

‘Not a necessarily bad regulation for some immigrants; but the rest is affected badly’

Below *Suzan* mentions that this rule in fact was not necessarily a bad thing in preventing certain immigrant families from bringing in young girls by specifically referring to families from Sivas, a central eastern city in Turkey from which a large number of Kurdish immigrants in Denmark originate. At the same time she expresses concerns for others who are more educated.

*Suzan*: The restrictions have been good for some families for example it might have been useful for (preventing) some families from the Sivas region. But they always find a solution. This time they move to Sweden, you know, it is easy to commute from there. For example, they rent an apartment there and they bring a 17/18-year-old girl. There is a certain period, one or two years. Then they get the citizenship there and come back to Denmark. For these people it does not make a difference. But some cannot find a spouse here; and they are affected badly. It is really difficult here to find a spouse. For some it is better to bring someone from Turkey, someone who is more educated [than the possible spouses in Denmark].

This narrative conveys Suzan’s subjective positioning by a transfer of *otherness* and at the same time how she discursively locates herself through a non subjective use of governmental discourse on the necessity of the regulation. Here *Suzan* interprets the regulation as she puts the focus on immigrant groups and describes how certain
families in fact created a necessity for the implementation of this rule. She also acknowledges that there will not be much use of this regulation. However, even though she identifies certain harmful effects, she still subjectively defines the regulation from a perspective which recognises it as legitimate. In her expression the focus is again on the other problematic immigrant who is inherently abusive and anomalous.

‘Family reunion regulations will cause more problems in the future’
Contrary to the above narratives, Fulya avoids the normalising influence of the dominant Danish discourse by reflecting on how individuals are subjectified either through state policies or through the practices of arranged marriages.

*Fulya:* The 24 years rule does not really have much effect on arranged marriages. If individuals cannot be assertive towards their families, nothing will change. Generally they move to Malmo [Sweden], or the number of the married couples who live apart increase. Now there are so many divided families, but women are not empowered. A woman who cannot get her husband to Denmark becomes a single mother. This situation will cause more problems in the future. When that child will not be able to be integrated in Denmark, authorities will start questioning again.

*Fulya* also gives the example of the royal family in Denmark by challenging the normative character of Danish identity discourse on arranged marriages and the 24 years rule.

*Fulya:* It [the 24 years rule] is bad because after this rule the parents are not the decision-makers, it is the state who decides for the individual. The state’s role should not be to control people, but to help people reach a certain level of consciousness. The royal family controls the prince too, for example the person whom he will marry must be protestant and fertile. It is generally humiliating for the women. At the end of the day nobody has limitless freedom in this. Instead of the 24 years rule, there should be
alternative education programs. The new generation should not be brought up by being taught to be passive and obedient or by being controlled in such a way by the state.

In order to give meaning to the different and sometimes contradictory discourses of immigrant women on arranged marriages and the 24 years rule, and to understand how they differentiate themselves from other immigrants it is important to consider how a subject position incorporates both a conceptual repertoire and a location for the individual who is within the structure of rights for those that use that repertoire (Davies and Harre 2003, p. 262). By taking up a particular position, a person will see the world from the vantage point of that position and in terms of the particular images, metaphors or story lines which are made relevant within the particular discursive practice in which they are positioned (Davies and Harre 2003, p. 262). As agents immigrant women’s self-understanding of the 24 years regulation explains their positioning in terms of discursive construction of self-defined spaces in Denmark. These narratives are explanatory about how they employ certain identity strategies by either resisting or contributing to the normalisation of belonging within governmental discourses. In terms of the 24 years rule, while their expressions of the unfit immigrant reflects a sense of negotiation of Danish norms, they can also be read as justifications of their positions as subjects who deserve to belong in Denmark. Similarly, these narratives are explanatory in understanding how they avoid a certain normalisation just as in the example of Fulya’s narrative.

The statements on gender equality, arranged marriages and the 24 years rule can be seen not only as immigrant women’s rationally deducted positions as members of an immigrant community in Denmark; but also as the ways in which they give meaning to their identity and belonging within particular contexts. Accordingly, they are
examples of how different subjects interpret problematisations in various different ways. In this context, immigrant women negotiate their own criteria of inclusion and exclusion by also constructing cultural and social boundaries in similar ways as in Danish discursive practices in which they are already positioned.

It is important to stress that I am not attempting to show that family immigration is not without problems when it comes to gender; on the contrary I acknowledge that there might be complex cases within this pattern, which put parties in troublesome situations. My aim here is rather to challenge the homogenous construction of identities in studying the effects of governmental power. Accordingly, the production of specific subjectivities is a more complicated and uneven process in which identities should be treated as fluid. In this perspective, I am questioning specific representations of identities in the governmental discourses. In this section, by giving different examples of interpretations of immigrant women, I also want to reveal that, each individual case with regards to family immigration can show differences, which necessitates the reconsideration of context, and which ends up in specific self-positioning.

6.6 Narratives of future

Expectations of future life constitute an important link to the sense of belonging and subjectivity. During the interviews I asked immigrant women about their future plans (e.g. What are your plans for the next 10 years?/Do you plan to live in Denmark?). From a discursive point of view, thinking about the future requires a reproduction of the ways by which immigrant women come to understand their positions in the Danish society. These interpretations draw attention to how they interpret their status in terms of future opportunities as well as their broader attitude to socio-political or
legal categories they inhabit. The factors which shape immigrant women’s ideas about the future show how immigrant women sense their belongingness in their understanding of subject positions when they discuss staying in Denmark or leaving for their home country by also revealing their different conceptualisation of identity in the light of certain freedoms or restrictions. In this perspective, narratives of future also reveal varying interpretations about multiple or hybrid identities of immigrant women about their belongingness in Denmark when they subjectively engage with those freedoms, opportunities or restrictions.

“As long as they have the same opportunities…”
In the following narrative, motherhood becomes a sources of legitimisation of belonging in Denmark in terms of future plans. Suzan describes a sense of rootedness in Denmark as a result of having established a family life is described mainly through her role as a mother. Suzan expresses a desire to go back to Turkey in the future, but states that difficult economic and political situation there makes it impossible for her family to start over in Turkey.

Suzan: When I came here I was 18, and now I am 36. I have been in Denmark for 18 years and I am surprised when I think of these 18 years. When I was 18 if somebody had asked me about the next ten years, I would have shuddered; now I shudder too, because you get older. … I am sorry that I spent my life here, where will I find myself in the next ten years? I wish we could go back to Turkey but I have a son who is 14, he definitely does not want that. I can take the five year-old that would not be a problem. … I wish we won’t be here after 10 years but it seems we will be, as long as there are the same opportunities. You know the situation in Turkey and the government, things are not going right. I hope it will get better and the people there will survive the situation. But I think it is difficult for them to survive.
In the above narrative, Suzan depicts herself as unhappy with her prospect of staying in Denmark in future, but she also sees no other options for herself. Through this representation she reduces her agency in relation to her choice in staying in Denmark and presents the self as bounded by responsibilities towards her son/family and by the conditions in Turkey. As a result she almost reflects a feeling of being stuck in Denmark. In her narrative, her status as an immigrant renders her helpless to make certain life choices. Here she sets her positionality through an obligation to stay in Denmark rather than through freedom.

‘My husband grew up here’
Suzan’s narrative acknowledges better economic/social conditions in Denmark when she thinks about future choices. In some narratives, a sense of rootedness is expressed directly through family and attachment because of an established life. Zeynep, for example, explains: “In future I will be here, I do not think I can go anywhere else, because my husband grew up here…” Zeynep here expresses her choices for future through the position of her husband, who would prefer to stay in Denmark, his country of birth. She also describes her agency as minimal by expressing her future plans through her ties to her husband. In another narrative, Neriman expresses her future situation through her daughter: ‘I have a daughter and at the moment I am living here. For the next fifteen years I am planning to stay. It would be unfair for my daughter if I go back to Turkey when she is still studying here, because she is used to living here’.

These two interviewees describe the ties that bind them to Denmark within the realm of their families. Their roles as family immigrants provide a discursive space to posit themselves in pacified positions, which reveal links between their subjective positions
as long-term immigrants in Denmark and their mediation of belongingness to their homeland.

Different structures in Turkey and Denmark are presented through counter-hegemonic positions. While better conditions are recognised as reasons for staying in Denmark, they are at the same time subverted in describing the desirability of going back to Turkey. For example in the below narrative Burcu describes her longing to return back to Turkey and why it is not possible at the moment.

_Burcu:_ To tell you the truth I have no desire to spend one more day here, yet the conditions do not allow. I want to return back tomorrow but we (me and my husband) have some plans to fulfil. We don’t and we won’t have any financial worries if we go back. The only reason we are here is the health security, nothing else.

Burcu’s narrative can be seen as a subtle resistance through which idealised Danishness in hegemonic discourses is challenged with an expression of longing to return back to Turkey as soon as possible. From a discursive point of view, _being in Denmark_ is not about freedoms and opportunities but it is about an obligation because of better life conditions.

In the narratives about the future immigrant women generally referred to motherhood, and relationships with spouses in order to express their future presence in Denmark. None of the women expressed other realms of their lives such as career, friendship or social environment as factors that made them feel attached to Denmark. In these expressions there was a sense of having no other option than staying in Denmark. Immigrant women mentioned better economic opportunities and the health service as reasons for their reasons of staying in Denmark. In the following narrative Cemile describes her future desires when she contemplates on the next 10 years. Her
subjective positioning in Denmark is described through her family; yet unlike the above respondents she does not express a longing for returning back to Turkey.

*Cemile:* Future... at the moment I am focused on learning Danish, since I just got my temporary residence permit. In the next 10 years I picture myself as having my second child, my husband behaving exactly as I want and my parents have seen here, where I live...

*Cemile’s* narrative is bounded by her family: her husband, child and her parents. She seems to express her future through them but at the same time she makes it clear that she plans to live in Denmark in the coming years. Yet in her narrative Denmark is non-existent as a distinctive discursive space of belonging. She does not express her subjective interpretation of future with regards to her legitimate position as a member of Danish social setting. However, as a family immigrant she also reveals how she is disciplined by immigration policies towards learning Danish to acquire her right to stay permanently in Denmark.

### 6.7 Concluding remarks

In this chapter I showed particular intertwining discourses of gender and ethnicity with regards to the content areas of citizenship, economic positionality, integration, gender equality, arranged marriages, the 24 years rule and future expectations. My main aim has been exploring different forms of subjectivities that are taken up by immigrant women in Denmark within governmental technologies of immigration. From a theoretical perspective, while I assume that subjectivities are products of power, I also assert that subject positions can never be fixed in a closed system of differences; they are constructed by a diversity of discourses among which there is no necessary relation (Mouffe 1999, p.372). On an empirical level this theoretical
perspective is about an examination of family immigrant women’s divergent, contingent and ambivalent subjectivities. Accordingly, it can be seen a response to Danish immigration law which constitutes immigrant women mainly without subjectivity and as nonautonomous victims of their environment.

While biopolitics seeks to maintain a distinction between immigrant and native, it constitutes immigrant women’s subjectification in terms of how they feel empowered and dominated in specific contexts (Deveaux 1994, p. 233). This is about the creation of individuality and subjectivity which does not only depend on an institutional power (Foucault 1982, p.778), but also on practices of self-creation (Rozmarin 2005, p.5). In this chapter I wanted to stress by revealing a performative aspect of individuality through narratives how the creation of subjectivities might be contradictory or complementary to governmental discourses, or how subject positions might be incompatible with each other within the broader framework of governmentality. In the view of the examination in this chapter, it would be inaccurate to conclude fixed boundaries drawn between immigrant women’s subjection and the Danish governmental discourses of belonging. On the contrary, the way immigrant women internalise the problematisation of immigration differ from each other in varying degrees.
Chapter 7

Conclusions and suggestions for further work

7.1 Initial problem which inspired this thesis: the problem with immigration today

This research is based on a general observation about the socio-political trend in immigration governance across the European Union towards a restrictive direction. This restrictive direction can be examined in parallel to the constitution of immigration as a mainstream policy problem, which creates a dual understanding of identities in the categories of outsiders and insiders. Recently this duality has become more relevant as a result of the rise of nationalist-populist parties and an increase of a racist discourse in more subtle and diffuse forms which use mainstream nationalist discourses rather than overtly neo-fascist discourses (Kryzanowski and Wodak 2009, p.1).

Together with the construction of insiders and outsiders, immigration has turned into one of the greatest security concerns of the 21st century (Buonfino 2004, p.23), even to the point of undermining rights, equality perspectives or other social considerations. The politicisation of immigration as a security issue is furthering monolithic conceptions of belonging between insiders and outsiders within a terrain of un-fixity (Buonfino 2004, p.25) and producing binary oppositions of native and non-EU populations. In this process certain groups are depicted as security threats to society from economic, social or financial perspectives and are excluded as immigration policies are becoming more and more restrictive across Europe as a means of immigration control. The restrictive laws create exclusionary effects for the
individuals outside the countries and marginalise immigrant groups who are already in these countries.

My main inspiration in further examining immigration politics in this research can be summarised as a result of the above picture which draws attention to an increasingly conservative trend that has further repercussions on identities. I assert that immigration politics first and foremost has to be investigated as a discursive site of identity which aims at the population in various ways, transforming individuals to subjects as a result of which *insiders* can be defined as opposed to *outsiders*. This points towards an individual and state relationship about how individuals are shaped and controlled in terms of their subjectification by power in governance.

Within this restrictive trend Denmark is a remarkable case in immigration politics. As a country which is moving towards a rather conservative direction in terms of its immigration governance, it is an interesting example, not only because of the controversial nature of the politicisation of immigration, but also with its claim in sustaining its egalitarian system and social democratic model by adopting an open market economy and neoliberal policies. As a result, Denmark is one of the most paradoxical political and social environments in terms of its relationship with (non-EU) immigrant groups. Especially after the Danish parliamentary elections of 2001, which were followed by radical legal changes, the general restrictive trend has become a more visible example of the boundaries of belonging in Denmark. In Chapters 4 and 5 I discussed certain repercussions of immigration politics on identity articulation with regards to the binary construction of a Danish national identity and immigrant groups’ identity within categories of culture and ethnicity. These categories contributed to a particular truth about immigrant identities that enabled practices of normalisation. Accordingly, the changes on immigration legislation that
brought in new rules for both newcomers to Denmark and non-national residents were worthwhile to examine in terms of the creation of insiders and outsiders, a discursive process in which immigrants are generally referred to as ethnic minorities who are constituting the culturally other.

In this research I have chosen Denmark as a single case study for examining immigration governance with regards to non-EU immigration by specifically referring to family reunion. With this examination I drew attention to immigration as a discursive site of identity articulation within a broader framework of political economy in order to critically analyse how population is governed or controlled on the basis of identity articulations.

7.2 My main contribution to analyses of immigration politics

In parallel to the securitisation of immigration there has been an increasing interest in the presence of non-EU immigrant groups in European society in the academic literature. These scholarly debates concern the reconciliation of diversity with a focus on difference. In Chapter 1 I have mentioned some of the prominent arguments within these academic debates by referring to multiculturalist/communitarian approaches versus liberal/individualistic ones. From a discursive point of view, my argument has been that these debates further stigmatise identities and reproduce them within fixed boundaries of certain social constructions such as culture, religion or ethnicity.

In this study I argue for a broader framework of analysis for better understanding the dynamics of immigration politics which is from the perspective of power relations. By doing this I turn the focus from ‘immigrants as othered groups’ to a more substantial level of ‘state and individual relationship’ and refer to a more complicated understanding of identity governance that also incorporates a political economy
perspective. Accordingly, I examine the construction of particular identities as products of power relations within the political economy of immigration; and not with reference to fixed boundaries such as culture or ethnicity.

In the above perspective this research has focused on immigration governance as a site of identity articulation which designates boundaries of belonging. By referring to the concept of belonging as the key analytical concept, it explored the securitised nature of immigration in Denmark and examined its impact in the creation of gendered and racialised identities with a discussion about the Aliens Consolidation Act 2002 as a milestone in Danish immigration governance. Within the framework of the Aliens Consolidation Act 2002, I especially referred to family reunion for examining how the state adapts legal and political responses in the form of governmental policies and strategies to emerging diversity within the population that create gendered and racialised identities. Through this examination this study was designed to challenge mainstream analyses of diversity in immigration studies that focus on taken for granted identities and problematisations by adapting a multi-faceted perspective and with a focus on immigration governance from the perspective of immigrant subjects.

The main aim in conducting this research has been to critically examine the interplay between governmental policies and strategies and the self-positionality of subjects. In order to examine immigration politics in Denmark I have explored how immigrant women experienced and rearticulated their position in society, also when they were reinterpreting hegemonic discourses of belonging and difference. By using Foucault’s conceptualisation of power and his framework of governmentality, I stressed a biopolitical perspective in examining how immigration is used as a discursive tool in the management of the populations in which individuals are made subjects. Subject is
especially important when thinking about power’s legitimacy (Foucault 1982, p. 778). I argued that Foucault’s conceptualisation of subject that is constituted by biopolitics in scientific and economic terms (Hamann 2009, p.53) is useful for deconstructing binary oppositions of identity which represent immigrant women as passive entities without agency in hegemonic Danish discourses. While from a broader point of view the theoretical perspectives employed in this thesis draw attention to how immigration governance takes place through mechanisms of problematisation, truth construction and subject making; I specifically emphasise immigrant women’s subjectification that concerns how they feel empowered or dominated in specific contexts (see Deveaux 1994, p. 223).

In the above perspective I argue that challenging the fixed boundaries of identity by focusing on the under-researched area of immigrant women’s subjectification is a novel feature of this research. Furthermore, using a Foucauldian power analysis within the framework of governmentality is a useful and sophisticated way of approaching specific problematisations for provoking the taken for granted reality about immigrant identities. This approach allows a deeper investigation when examining the ways immigration as a problem of the population achieves its reality by enabling practices of normalisation such as legislation changes whose legacy can also be examined at the level of subjects.

7.3 Applying the governmentality approach from a feminist perspective

As I have clarified above, the method of this research is about linking personal experiences to hegemonic power structures in a society. I use immigrant women’s subjective positions in order to explore the tension between the two. In Chapter 6, I have revealed contradictory and complementary narratives of immigrant women for
showing in which ways they reinterpret dominant Danish discourses about identity and immigration. This method is based on Foucault’s theory of biopolitics which explains the effects of governmental practices on subjects. I refer to biopolitics within a governmentality framework in order to grasp a broader understanding of the individual state relationship or, in other words, how individuals are made subjects within dominant power structures.

Gender is a central variable in the objectifying of immigrants’ lives in Danish immigration governance. Immigrant women are generally represented without agency in hegemonic discourses. By basing this study on their experiential aspect of belonging, immigrant women are given voice as determinants of their own lives. At the same time I have argued that Foucault’s theory of power and his understanding – where there is power there is resistance (Foucault 1979, p.95) – together with his account of subjectivity are especially useful for examining and deconstructing gendered and racialised identities. Accordingly, immigrant women’s re-interpretations of a right subject of hegemonic discourses are also the ways in which they practice their agency while at the same time being dominated by these discourses.

7.4 Answering the research questions

Below I will go back to the initial research questions to reveal the practical implications of the governmentality perspective of biopower. Accordingly, I will explain briefly what kind of an analysis I put forward in relation to the empirical data and theoretical perspective. I have based my framework on Rabinow and Rose’s (2006, p. 197) analysis of the biopolitical governmentality of immigration. The elements put forward in this framework were important for operationalising the theoretical perspective of biopower with regards to my empirical data. These elements
– the truth discourses, strategies for intervention upon collective existence, modes of subjectification\textsuperscript{15} – also constitute the basis of the analysis of my research questions.

- \textit{Research question 1}: How has immigration been problematised in Denmark with regards to identity construction and designated insiders and outsiders?

This question finds an answer in thinking about the kind of truth discourses about an ideal society with regards to identity construction that inform insiders and outsiders on the basis of a particular political rationality (Rabinow and Rose 2006, p.197). As I have stated in Chapter 2, in relation to the truth discourses of identity that were presented in governmental discourses this refers to how the dichotomy of immigrant versus native Danish becomes a reality in Danish immigration governance, allowing for new legislative regulations. This reality is first of all related to the Danish national identity rhetoric that is constituted as part of the political economy of immigration. In terms of national identity rhetoric I show that homogeneity, (cultural) consensus and equality are primary discursive topics which form the basis for articulation of identities within a dichotomy between native and immigrant.

In my first empirical chapter, Chapter 4, I have explored how an ethno-cultural construction of a national identity is represented in parallel to the re-distributing elements of the state as the basis of space of knowledge about binary production of identities. As such I have discussed how knowledge claims about identities are intrinsically related to a political economy perspective by which third-country immigration is identified as a problem of population at the conjuncture of culture arguments and welfare state discourse.

In this thesis I discus that a neoliberal political rationality further exacerbates the tension between diversity and communality and pushes towards inequality among

\textsuperscript{15} I have mentioned this framework in detail in Chapter 2, Section 2.4.
different groups and towards control of the population. The truth discourses which represent immigrants as economically parasitic and culturally anomalous are constructed on the basis of an increasingly neoliberal rationality that contributes to the empirical and social marginality of ethno-cultural-legal others. In this context, the struggle over the welfare state that opts to maintain social democratic distributing instruments of the state seems to deepen binary oppositions of identity between native Danish and third-country immigrant.

At the same time the new regulations of immigration law are understood as forms of intervention upon collective identity, which are justified on the basis of a particular problematisation of immigration. As a result, the changes in law are explanatory about how the reality of immigration is constructed in Denmark. In Chapter 5, I gave the example of the Aliens Consolidation Act in order to further discuss how specific problematisations achieve their reality within hegemonic discourses.

- **Research question 2**: How is the Aliens Consolidation Act justified, while it at the same time specifies the identities of immigrants and native Danish?

To analyse the Aliens Consolidation Act I mainly referred to family reunification as a discursive process which shows how the variables of gender and ethnicity converge in a regime of truth, reproducing and regenerating the reality of belonging by the manipulation of the population within a dichotomy of (third-country) immigrants and native Danes. As I have clarified in Chapter 5 I analyse family reunification as a site of normalisation of identities. In other words, by examining certain family reunification regulations that are significantly related to the assumptions of the dichotomy between native and immigrant, I show how belonging is mediated by legal action as a result of a particular problematisation of immigration.
Family reunion laws also show how the biopolitical subject of immigration is gendered and racialised through certain truth discourses. From this perspective in my empirical examination of family reunion regulations I discussed how these changes are justified by gendered and racialised knowledge claims and how they are related to the production of a neoliberal reality through a gendered process. In this perspective the culturally anomalous immigrant finds explanation in the discursive link between the 24 years bar for marriage and forced or arranged marriages. This link also represents immigrants without agency, with the assumption that the older immigrants are, the easier they are able to resist their families. Accordingly, third-country immigrants are depicted as victims of their culture, which is characterised by patriarchy.

I found it necessary to further examine the variable of gender in Danish hegemonic discourses in order to reveal its link with the justification of legislative regulations. At the same time gender is especially important to consider as a social relation that enters into and partially constitutes all social relations and activities (Flax 1987, p.630). I have specifically focused on gender in Section 5.4 of Chapter 5 by discussing it in terms of the discursive aspects of forced/arranged marriages, welfare cuts and integration by mainly referring to governmental discourses such as Gender Equality Plans. Here I argue that gender has been the underlying variable in the production of a truth about immigrant identities and a subtle topic with regards to the justification of new immigration legislation. For example once gender equality is constructed as an essentially Danish value, labour market integration is also made a problem of immigrant groups. The idea – they do not want to integrate (into the labour market), because immigrant women are not allowed to work – makes it easier for the state to seize responsibility for immigrant groups’ economic welfare.
The Collateral clause is a good example of unequal treatment in terms of social benefits as a result of the state’s refusal to take responsibility for the newcomers. The tiered and restrictive welfare system that differentiates native and immigrant populations is justified by the idea that immigrants should be integrating into the labour market and must also prove that they are self-supporting and active economic individuals in order to prove that they deserve to live in Denmark. Social cutbacks are legitimated with an economic knowledge that forces immigrants to comply with market-based principles – even more so than native Danish people.

In the above perspective the treatment of immigrants clearly shows a neoliberal way of thinking, which is applied to them to a larger extent than to the native Danish population. This results in marginalisation of third-country immigrants, who are controlled in different ways than the rest of the population. Although Denmark is usually seen as one of the prime examples of social democracy, this shows that neoliberal patterns of thought can have uneven effects in terms of state policies, in this case, for example, legitimising the idea that ‘the welfare state cannot be for everyone’.

Similarly, the idea of integration becomes delimited by the idea of creating economic subjects who are in need of being educated towards labour market participation. Integration is defined as an adaptability problem of immigrants in the Danish economy. This problem is constructed by the topic of cultural difference which implies gender inequality. As a result immigrant groups have to be disciplined towards living up to the essential norms of the Danish society by being taught how to comply with the society’s and (accordingly) the market’s needs.

In the above perspective by looking at family reunion regulations and governmental discourses it can be understood how diversity comes into conflict with homogeneity through the problematisation of immigrants as unfit in Danish society who cannot
adjust themselves to the values of Denmark. In this context the rules for family reunification are tightened for maintaining the solidarity and sameness by preventing immigrants coming to Denmark. The changes in applying for a permanent residence permit or citizenship can be seen as clear examples of how complex and difficult it has become for third-country immigrants to be accepted in Denmark. Language or civic tests for instance can be seen within a broader cultural construction of identities.

Overall, the Aliens Consolidation Act 2002 can be seen as the underlying legal site, which further legitimises the social stratification of rights by maintaining that certain groups of individuals deserve less in terms of obtaining certain rights or they do not have enough autonomy simply because they merit less as a result of their cultural backgrounds. From this perspective, family reunion regulations can be understood as means to politicise life. In other words, family becomes a tool to control and manipulate the population. These regulations are also indicators of the rationalities of the Danish state, which motivate both political and individual behaviour so that the state can act as an ethical entrepreneur through political interference in human life by designating who can be accepted in Denmark and who should be excluded. From a broader discursive point of view this empirical analysis draws attention to Danish immigration governance as a gendered biopolitical category, which is specified in terms of culture. Although differences are purely marked as differences of culture, a deeper look reveals that they can easily be translated into differences of race or ethnicity. In other words, this shows that cultural determinism does not operate differently from biological determinism; on the contrary, they both intersect and intertwine in similar ways.

In this thesis I argue against the duality and differential treatment, which are underpinned by a gendered and cultural argument and which have negative effects
exacerbating stigmatisation within the population. I also hold that an 
acknowledgement of gender inequalities or problems like forced marriages on a more 
individual basis rather than with an emphasis on cultural explanations can be an 
alternative approach to the accommodation of diversity. One of my main aims in 
focusing on the subjectification of immigrant women can be explained within this 
perspective. It is important to reveal the ways in which individuals are subjectified in 
relation to truth discourses of immigration for overcoming the approaches that 
conceptualise identity as fixed within deterministic boundaries.

- **Research question 3**: What role does the Danish problematisation of 
immigration have on the identities of third-country immigrant women?

This question is related to the ways in which third-country immigrant women 
challenge, accept or rework the identity claims within binary categories of native and 
immigrant. In the view of the truth discourses which I have examined in Chapters 4 
and 5, I examine modes of subjection through which immigrant women are brought to 
work on themselves (Rabinow and Rose 2006, p.197). In order to answer this question 
I examine what kind of subjectivities are deployed by immigrant women in their 
narratives.

In my examination I have used the primary data obtained during my field research in 
Denmark via open-ended interviews. On the basis of these interviews, I put forward a 
narrative analysis about immigrant women’s interpretation of truth about belonging in 
Denmark in Chapter 6. I have used narrative segments for the analysis. These are 
related to primary topics in governmental discourses that emerged as significant from 
my previous empirical examinations in Chapters 4 and 5. Accordingly, I asked 
immigrant women questions about their feelings of identity and belonging in relation 
to certain themes which can be seen as main content issues in the governmentality of
immigration in Denmark. These issues are ‘citizenship’, ‘economic activity and work’, ‘integration’, ‘gender equality’, ‘arranged marriages’, the ‘24 years rule’, and ‘future expectations’. I refer to these content issues as discursive sites of self-making, which reveal in what ways individuals are constituted as subjects by biopolitics within the governmentality of immigration.

By referring to a Foucauldian conceptualisation of subject I have mainly focused on immigrant women’s subjectification when examining how they self-realise their belonging. Accordingly, I have studied the effects of the restrictive changes as the possible ways in which immigrant women practice their agencies under the dominant images of an ethical subject in Denmark. From a broader perspective this examination relates to how immigrant women are brought to work on themselves in relation to the truth discourses on the desirable subject in Denmark, which is represented in governmental discourses of immigration.

Immigrant women’s narratives draw attention to how their interpretation of the above themes can be complimentary or contradictory with regards to hegemonic discourses of Danish identity and immigration. From this perspective revealing these narratives was especially important in order to challenge certain assumptions about their subjectivity and their positionality in Danish society. More importantly, these narratives can be seen as examples of how oppositional positions can be recognised as forms of resistance and critical responses to forms of governmentality and specifically administrative techniques of subjectification that shape individuals in terms of their free conduct (Hamann 2009, p.55). In this understanding I approached immigrant women as individuals with agency.

The first section of the narrative analysis concerned the issue of citizenship. The narratives about citizenship reflected various expressions about immigrant women’s
lived experience of citizenship and showed how immigrant women situated themselves as free subjects within the ethno-cultural understanding of citizenship in Danish governmental discourses. Immigrant women’s interpretations about citizenship show how biopower renders life governable at the level of subjects with regards to a broad discursive site of identity articulation where immigrant women express their positioning in terms of certain rights or obligations as well as their emotional attachments. Overall, their narrations are explanatory about how they interpret their subjective self versus a collective identity within a relational context.

The next topic about how immigrant women’s subjectivity is constituted in biopolitics is their economic/market positioning. In the interviews labour market integration was interpreted in diverse ways by immigrant women, different from the idea of a self-entrepreneur immigrant subject of governmental discourses. Immigrant women’s different positionings also drew attention to their own understanding of an ethical and political subjectivity as opposed to the idea of the neoliberal subject. In this context I used the topic of work within narrative analysis in order to show in what ways immigrant women’s expressions differed from the idealistic understanding of labour market participation in hegemonic discourses, which emphasise the ethical subject who is not dependent on the welfare state. Their interpretations of work were especially interesting in revealing how their subjective belonging in Denmark with regards to work was contradictory with hegemonic discourses that emphasised the empowering aspect of work and how immigrant women expressed the opportunity structures in Denmark in different ways.

Narratives of integration are linked to the idea of economically active immigrants in hegemonic discourses. Upon immigrant women’s divergent and contradictory narratives about the economic/neoliberal subject, their interpretations of integration
are worth examining. These narratives draw attention to a more experiential aspect of immigrant women’s belonging by which they generally refer to everyday life practices that are expressed within self-defined cultural boundaries, such as eating pork or religious practices. At the same time they show how immigrant women define self (us – Turkish immigrants) from other (them – Danish) by divergent and various practical examples. More importantly, some of the immigrant women’s expressions show how they resist the idea of integration by putting forward their own interpretation of belonging in their narratives.

Narratives of gender equality, arranged marriages and the 24 years rule can be considered within a discursive terrain of gendered identities in relation to immigrant women’s subjectivity. Immigrant women’s subjective interpretations on these topics point towards how they re-articulate and reproduce normality within the Danish context. Through these themes they rework their own positions in society as subjects of equality discourses and changes in immigration regulations. These three topics constitute a very interesting aspect of this study, as interpretations of immigrant women point towards a variety of responses that can be evaluated from different perspectives about their self-positioning in Danish society. Immigrant women’s different interpretations show possibilities for negotiating their identities. At the same time these narratives are important in understanding what kind of tactics and identity strategies can be employed by immigrant women when they rework normative female subjectivity which is imposed by governmental representations.

In the last section of Chapter 6, I have referred to immigrant women’s narratives of the future. These narratives explore the sense of belonging of immigrant women from a broader perspective and can help to reveal issues which were not necessarily brought up within the context of the previous responses. Thinking about future
necessitates both an immediate and a longer term consideration about one’s self-positioning. Accordingly, the immigrant women’s self-understandings of future reveal the ways in which they subjectively engage with empowering or restrictive aspects of their position in Denmark, as well as their reconsideration of certain opportunity structures in this society and their emotional attachments which shape their longer term plans or ideas about the future.

7.5 Broader implications of this work and further suggestions

In this study I wanted to bring subject and power relationship into focus by critically analysing the transformation of immigration governance in Denmark. For this examination I referred to Foucault’s elaboration of power, biopower and his governmentality framework. In his work, Foucault (1982, p. 779) drew attention to a new economy of power relationships for investigating the link between rationalisation and power. He suggested an analysis of power relations through the antagonism of strategies rather than from the point of its internal rationality (Foucault 1982, p.780). In this research examining immigrant women’s subjective understanding of belonging in Danish society meant disassociating power from its rationality. Accordingly, my aim has been to depict how power applied itself to everyday life and made individuals subjects (Foucault 1982, p.781). This can be seen as a challenge towards identity claims within governmental discourses. At the same time the tension and relationship between immigrant women’s narratives of identity and hegemonic discourses exemplifies how power operates within an ensemble of actions and is more than a zero-sum game (Foucault 1982, p.786). In order to reveal the state-individual relationship within Foucault’s power paradigm, this study is designed as an examination of the biopolitics of immigration, which considers how a political
economy perspective is embedded within a social reality that is constructed on the basis of a certain rationality (Lemke 2001, p.203).

In the above perspective, as I have clarified before, this research’s novelty can be seen in the examination of subjectification of immigrant women from the perspective of their belonging in examining the transformation of immigration legislation in Denmark. This examination also draws attention to certain normative aspects and political implications when we are thinking about questions such as: “How should immigration be problematised and reconstructed in order to distinguish its normative impact on the politics of belonging and enhance equality values in society?”, or, “How can we restructure the ways, through which political action interacts with its subjects, in order to better evaluate the policy outcomes?”. As such, from a broader point of view, this research can be seen as a challenge to taken for granted truths in the politics of everyday life. There are, however, certain points which I think can be further developed within the context of this research. I will mention below certain empirical and theoretical aspects, which can contribute to this study from different dimensions in further examinations.

First of all from a purely empirical perspective an improvement to this study can be made by bringing in the voices of men who arrive in Denmark by family reunification. I have made it clear that it would be wrong to consider family related immigration only as female immigration and there is a remarkable population of imported husbands from Turkey in Denmark. However, within the limits of this thesis I have chosen to examine the situation of women for providing deeper insights to biopolitics of immigration in Denmark in order to understand how gendered constructions play a role in rendering immigration governable. Here I looked at immigrant women’s self-interpretations in the face of a gendered problematisation of
immigration, especially because it became obvious throughout this research that the
gender was the central variable in the problematisation of third-country immigrants in
Denmark. I have clarified how gender was used as a visibility in the construction of a
truth about third-country immigration in Chapter 5. Accordingly, the construction of a
specific truth about immigration in Denmark points towards various ways of
differentiation between native Danish population and third-country immigrant
population, which eventually legitimises legislative action. From this perspective, all
the specific themes (such as citizenship, arranged marriages and the 24 year-old rule
etc.) are comprised of a gendered data which are later used to investigate immigrant
women’s own understandings of the situation. As a result, women as a focus in this
study provide important insights to the governmentality of immigration in Denmark.

In a similar framework of analysis the self-positioning of men as opposed to
immigrant women can also provide interesting perspectives for a further study. This
would of course necessitate substantial changes in the content issues of this research
because of the context-specific gendering of male immigrants. For example, while
immigrant women’s self-positioning with regards to their victimisation is mentioned
in this study, with a similar approach immigrant men’s self-interpretations as the
dominant partners in family reunion in the Danish political discourse can be important
in analysing their positioning in society. Here an interesting perspective can be
immigrant men’s self-understanding as unequal/equal partners; or, from a general
perspective, how they rework specific gender roles attributed to them within macro
discourses and interpret legislation changes. In short, it is important to acknowledge
here that gendering of immigrant women cannot be thought of separately than
gendering of immigrant men.
Similarly, within the same framework of governmentality, different issues such as citizenship or gender equality can be examined as the sole focus for a further examination with regards to immigration studies.

There could be other contributions for further studies within the context of this research from theoretical perspectives. In Chapter 1, I referred to universalism versus exceptionalism which is constituted at the interconnectivity of rights and belonging as one of the key paradoxical dynamics of this research. I described this paradox in the Danish context as the paradox of liberal egalitarian universalism versus conservative xenophobic immigration securitisation. While it was important to pinpoint this paradox, it was not the central point of analysis for this thesis. This paradox can be further enhanced from the perspective of the problematic of biopolitical construction of outsiders at the liberal and authoritarian divide for understanding the restrictions of democracy and egalitarian principles.

While a biopolitical investigation of immigration governance addresses a political domain where life becomes the core of governmental technologies, Agamben’s (1998) biopolitical paradigm offers a different and useful perspective in examining the division between outsiders and insiders. Agamben’s view on biopolitics and the state of exception addresses a different domain of examination, but can nevertheless contribute to a further study of politics of exclusion with its ethical elements. Especially his ideas on the connection of human life to sovereign power can be used in this context to explain the paradoxical changes in terms of immigration legislation.

In ‘Homo Sacer and Bare Life’, Agamben explains the transformation from a liberal rule to an authoritarian one and vice versa by the intrusion of biological space into politics. According to his idea, the more there is an intersection between the two, the more obscure the liberal/authoritarian division becomes. Building on Foucault’s
biopolitics and Carl Schmitt’s idea of the ‘state of exception’, Agamben (1998, p.127) elaborates the restrictions of democracy and social exclusion through the division between the state of exception and the state of normality. This division can be interpreted from the perspective of the legitimisation of certain practices for social outsiders who are demoted to ‘bare life’, a depoliticised form of life. This implies the constitution of the outsider/abnormal/deviant as exempt from the norm. In this perspective, it can be interesting to question the role of biological life in politics in Denmark by incorporating Agamben’s work into the study. In further elaborating the distinction between deserving and undeserving subjects, Agamben's argument on the relationship between life and law can be taken into account for examining how biopower can exclude and restrict its subjects and can undermine their existence (Agamben 1998, p.131). In this perspective, Agamben's interpretation of biopolitics is inspiring in understanding the fusion between life and law in the normalisation of identities.

Another emphasis of this study is that the discursive construction of the immigration regime in Denmark shows that governance of belonging does not necessarily have to be examined as a post-liberal outcome. In fact, the analysis of immigration politics also necessitates a consideration of the logic of the traditional understanding of the liberal project of belonging within the nation-state. This approach necessitates a reconsideration of tenets of liberalism from a human rights and equality perspective with regards to political sovereignty. This consideration can be applied to different groups which are excluded as a result of being constructed as abnormal. While an examination of the immigration issue in the Western world today shows that the state still continues to have a considerable role in the governance of belonging, it is important to develop further understandings of othering in different contexts by
applying multi-disciplinary approaches such as feminism, postcolonialism or orientalism. From this perspective, this study’s emphasis on power-subject relationship can be seen as a starting point in terms of building a critical perspective on identity politics.

A final point which has to be made is about the uneasy and complex relationship between the majority and minority groups in the European social setting today; and how this necessitates expanding the theoretical perspectives, while acknowledging contemporary forms of political economic life in which political power operates by linking the various and complex domains of practice (Larner 2000, p.20). In this research I also drew attention to the complexity of power relations within a certain political form, yet producing uneven and complicated effects on individuals. Within this understanding this research is not an end in itself, but rather can be considered as a starting point for a critical ground upon which a different range of research possibilities should be considered.
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