WORKSHOP PROGRAM

Foucault Meets EU Studies

Kiel, 20 March 2015

Since the 1980s, `traditional´ orthodoxies of international politics have growingly been challenged by critical approaches turning commonsensical assumptions, socio-political rationalities and disciplinarian practices into questions. In the aftermath of September 11, critical studies have gained renewed impetus and provided new critical insights into contemporary politics. As they engage hegemonic ontologies, silences and disciplinarian boundaries, Foucauldian tools have become precious allies in the creation of new spaces for critical political interventions in socio-scientific and political discourses.

In spite of audible resistances in `IR´, critical reflexivity is under-performed in the `subfield´ of EU studies, with few but noticeable and highly valuable works standing apart. In spite of the claim of a `constructivist turn´, the field still remains parochial and largely haunted by scholars´ `positivist´ desire to accumulate true and reliable knowledge about the EU´s peculiar nature and functioning, to assess political effectiveness, to control variables and causality in the domain of European integration while imposing a plethora of neologisms but hardly contested grids of intelligibility on what is commonly regarded as a puzzling political object. The research field still remains widely immune to social critique, sticking to institution- and/or state-centric approaches, consequently reproducing *narrow understandings of what politics, power and knowledge are* and what they do. Whereas Foucauldian perspectives direct our attention to the limit(ation)s, discontinuous grounds and historico-political emergences of singular practices and governmentalities, a readiness to interrogate Eurocentric truths, (a)political necessities and familiar practices still seems marginal in the field of EU studies.

We invite cutting-edge contributions problematizing European politics using tools and concepts inspired by Michel Foucault (archeology, genealogy, governmentality, bio/disciplinary/pastoral power, resistance, regimes of truth, surveillance – the list is merely suggestive and non-exhaustive). We are as much interested in more `theoretically´ driven as `empirically´ oriented analyses which aim at „introducing a significant difference in the field of knowledge". No privilege is given to a single political subjectivity or policy field: the interest resides in the many different ways `Europe´ governs itself and others as well as the effects of such practices on liberties and resistances.

In the light of the multiple readings, limits and possibilities of using Foucault, it is this very diversity of critical knowledge and practices we wish to draw together, as working on and at limits is a vital engagement with practices of freedom and relations of power. The workshop aims to give Foucauldian studies greater visibility within and beyond our research fields, to discuss the political challenges and threats to which Foucauldian perspectives are sensitive to and which other approaches or conceptual lenses fail to see and to problematize.

MORNING SESSION: 9 AM – 12.30 PM

9.00 – 9.15 – Welcoming words and introductory remarks – Dirk Nabers/Lucie Chamlian

9.15– 10.45 – Civil Society: Power-Knowledges and Counter-Conducts

"*Government Economy and Biopolitics*" – Michael Dillon

"*European Publics Post-Snowden*" – Marieke De Goede/Valentin Gros/Beste İşleyen

10.45 – 11.00 – Coffee break

11.00 – 12.30 – Complexity and Critique: Rethinking European (Security) Studies

"*C(ritical) Security and Defense Policy: How Security Practices Colonise the Future*" – Lucie Chamlian

"`*Normative Power Europe´ and European Union Police Mission in the Palestinian Authority*" – Beste İşleyen

12.30 – 14.00 – Lunch break

AFTERNOON SESSION: 2 PM – 6.30 PM

14.00 – 15.30 – Border Control: Technologies of Power and Surveillance

"*Could We Speak of a Government of EU Borders? Interest and Limits of Foucauldian Approaches*" –Didier Bigo

"*Migrants, Radar, and the Time-Space of the Situation: EUROSUR and the Genealogy of Bordering in Europe*" – William Walters

15.30 – 16.00 – Coffee break

16.00 – 17.30 – New/Old Economic Topographies?

"*Europe as a Connectivity Effect*" – Luis Lobo-Guerrero

"*Europe as Infrastructure: Networking the Operative Community*" – Sven Opitz/Ute Tellmann

17.30 – 18.30 – Workshop summary and discussion of the publication project

19.30 – Dinner

Location: The workshop will take place at Hotel Steigenberger, Schloßgarten 7, 24103 Kiel
http://de.steigenberger.com/Kiel/Steigenberger-Conti-Hansa

Abstracts

"COULD WE SPEAK OF A GOVERNMENT OF EU BORDERS? INTEREST AND LIMITS OF FOUCALDIAN APPROACHES"
Didier Bigo

I will discuss the practices of border controls in Europe, especially the Mediterranean Sea, and from that empirical locus I will discuss the productivity and limitations of Foucauldian approaches to EU studies by discussing the notions of governmentality of borders, regime of truth and pastoral power through the narrative of protection of migrants, idea of panopticon and ban. I will try to show what they bring to the discussion that was avoided by traditional EU studies, but also the possible limitations of some research if they do not combine a Foucauldian approach with a more sociologically oriented perspective.

"C(RITICAL) SECURITY AND DEFENSE POLICY: HOW SECURITY PRACTICES COLONISE THE FUTURE"
Lucie Chamlian

National governments, experts and EU representatives constantly rehash that the actuality of our present consists in new dangers, complex threats and global challenges which need specific, appropriate and coherent responses. In this security political context and the renewal of holistic rationalities, it has generally been held that pre-emptive power would be peculiar to US-American security and defense policy rather than of the various external, foreign, security and defence fields of the EU. However, when the future becomes the stake of present governance, when conjectural modes of governing insecurity and uncertainty become more powerful, when preparedness, real-time intelligence and early-warning systems turn into strategic priorities, as we currently see across European security and development policies, one wonders why large parts of academia continue to depict European foreign and security policy as weak. Indeed, when one starts to question what is being governed, in the name of what, on the basis of which assumptions and with which effects, the diagnosis of what is being produced and rendered intelligible significantly differs from „traditional" outcome analysis and policy prescription. It is this politico-academic challenge that the paper, as drawing on Michel Foucault´s critical toolbox, will address.

"EUROPEAN PUBLICS POST-SNOWDEN"
Marieke De Goede/Beste İşleyen/Valentin Gros

In the wake of the revelations of former Booz Allen employee Edward Snowden about the US NSA's large scale analysis of private citizen (social network) data, the EU has positioned itself as critic of US security practices and transatlantic tensions have intensified. While EU Commissioners have asked the US for clarification and EU citizen protection, the NSA itself has pointed to European secret service complicity in these practices. Drawing on Foucauldian notions of discursive formations, this article enquires into the way in which a critical public space is shaped in relation to 'mass surveillance' of private data in Europe, through focusing on the public Hearings that were held before

the LIBE Committee of the European Parliament between September 2013 and January 2014. These Hearings involved a public questioning of a number of important stakeholders in this issue-area, including privacy officers, (former) security services staff, and Commission officials. As such, it offers a wealth of information concerning the details of Snowden's claims, their potential implications for privacy rights, and the way in which the transatlantic debate on these issues is unfolding. Despite the rich information available through these hearings, they have yet to receive academic attention.

This paper analyses the LIBE 'Mass Surveillance' Hearings as a *political* space and site of discursive struggle. Building on notions of material publics, we examine how and to what extent the Hearings enact a material space for public engagement with the Snowden revelations, who was able to appear as a legitimate speaking subject in relation to it and how the limits of public engagement were drawn. Developing Foucauldian notions of the 'dispositif', the paper analyses how different forms of expert knowledge interpellate different veracities concerning the nature of the case and the political issues at stake. We examine how and to what extent these different truth-claims are taken up or rejected by situated political actors. We offer a critical analysis of the diverse depoliticising moves that took place at the Hearings, by understanding the issues as minor lapses of legality or amenable to a technological fix. In conclusion, the paper analyses how the LIBE Hearings enacted particular understandings of 'Europeanness.'

"GOVERNMENT ECONOMY AND BIOPOLITICS"
Michael Dillon

My start point for bringing Foucault's work to bear upon the European Union is the Lecture series The Birth of Biopolitics. It considers whether or not - and if so how - Foucault's genealogy of 'economy' and interrogation of the establishment of a postwar economic order first in and for the Federal Republic of Germany but later also for the EEC has a bearing on the analysis of the EU today. I think it does, but how and why, and in what specific ways, remain to be detailed and discussed. At least 3 candidates of different content do however suggest themselves initially. First, Foucault's insistence that a crisis of economy is a crisis of governance and vice versa. Second, that economy is not a mere realm of market transactions but is itself a specific and distinctive regime of governance. Does either of these two bear on the crisis of economy and governance in the EU today. Of course it does, but precisely how? Third, a minor topic that intrigues me but which I have not much pursued, is that of 'the family'. In his early interrogation of the failures of mercantilism and rise of liberal economy Foucault claims that part of this process witnessed the erasure of the family from economy. The point has to be carefully explored but I am not sure that he is correct. A specific research topic arises here - one on which I am sure a considerable literature exists although I barely not know it. To be frank I am not much interested in whether or not Foucault was correct on this or that point, than I am in how his mode of analysis may be useful. The spirit that always informs my reading of his work is that of 'usage'.

That said, my interest in reflecting on the relevance of Foucault to analysis of the European Union also extends far beyond the preoccupation with economy that is so central to the very conceptualisation institution and practices of the EU. I am currently fascinated by Foucault, the Baroque and the neo-Baroque. Like many contemporary analysts of the baroque, I treat the baroque in Foucauldean terms not as an aesthetic period but as a space of problematisation that was itself a response to the generic crisis in the conduct of conduct that so inspired Foucault's work. Characteristic of the baroque as a space of problematisation was the prioritisation of artifice and spectacle (Thomas Hobbes' classic theorisation of politics government and rule in terms of sovereignty is a case in point). The EU seems curiously without artifice and spectacle. Yet I am convinced that it is saturated by both. I do not know what if any work has been done in this respect:

or from what analytical perspectives any perspective. But I am curious. In the spirit then of an informal seminar I am happy to present on economy in the way indicated - see also the introduction below - and to follow whatever discussion that leads us into. For I do not yet know how to get from Economy to Spectacle. There has to be a way and I would be happy if our discussion helped me to find one.

"`NORMATIVE POWER EUROPE´ AND EUROPEAN UNION POLICE MISSION IN THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY"
Beste İşleyen

This article applies a governmentality approach to the 'Normative Power Europe' (NPE) concept put forward by Ian Manners. The goal is conceptual in that the article seeks to address three central points of criticism that have been raised in the literature to negate the NPE argument. First, the governmentality approach provides a correction to the 'norms versus interests' debate, which is a central issue of reference in academic attempts to refute the function of norms in European Union engagement with third countries. Through its unique concept of 'rationality', the governmentality goes beyond the argument that norms and interests are by essence exclusive and illustrates thereby the operation of norms in strategies, tactics and programmes of governing. Second, the governmentality approach points at both the positive and negative nature of norms. In this way, a Foucauldian reading of norms circumvents the existing tendency to deny NPE in cases where European Union behavior seems to be contradictory of values. Third, the governmentality perspective looks at micro-practices of norm creation and norm diffusion within everyday practices of governance. In that way, the Foucauldian approach to norms shifts the analysis of European Union action from macro-politics to mundane and system of governance that encompass an assemblage of expert knowledge, administrative calculation and technical interventions. The article concludes by pointing at the implications of as Foucauldian reading of norms in terms of peace and security studies.

"EUROPE AS A CONNECTIVITY EFFECT"
Luis Lobo-Guerrero

As part of the wider Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-t), the European Commission has launched a major infrastructure development initiative entitled Connecting Europe. Its aim is to create eight strategic transportation corridors that will connect a patchwork of existing transportation networks across the Union. With a €50 million budget, the corridors are to be completed by 2020 and consolidated by 2030. The core network will be constituted by 87 maritime and inland ports as major connectivity hubs that will articulate the eight strategic corridors. Drawing on the pivotal role of ports within this network, this paper takes the Connecting Europe project as a site from which to problematise the idea of Europe as a connectivity effect.

Following the idea that the role of ports is to strategise space, a proposition previously developed by the author and which draws on Foucault's understanding of strategy as an art of combinations, it is argued here that ports play a critical role in the performativity of European identity. Building on the idea of challenged boundaries (Shapiro and Alker 1996), such interaction is not solely economic or political. It is instead the result of a strategisation of European space around an old Greek conception of network (Malkin 2012), not as shape, but as organising principle for interaction (Lobo-Guerrero 2012).

"EUROPE AS INFRASTRUCTURE: NETWORKING THE OPERATIVE COMMUNITY"
Sven Opitz/Ute Tellmann

This paper analyzes how infrastructures take part in constituting Europe as a material collectivity. For this purpose, it modifies Bruno Latour's sociology of associations in two respects: In order to theorize the relation between connectivity and collectivity, we propose to take into account the political rationalities that infrastructures embody and the political spatiality that they configure. For elaborating these modifications, the respective works of Michel Foucault and Carl Schmitt are the main reference points. This theoretical perspective is put to a test in exploring the "infra-structuralism" that lies at the core of the European project. After tracing both the operative and imaginary significance of infrastructure policy historically, the analysis concentrates on the most recent initiative to build trans-European energy networks. We demonstrate that the neoliberal configuration of infrastructural collectivity manifests itself in the spatial configuration of a market. Europe's infrastructuralism defines the common as a topological space of corridors and high-voltage lines, which align territorial cohesion with fragmentation.

"MIGRANTS, RADAR, AND THE TIME-SPACE OF THE SITUATION: EUROSUR AND THE GENEALOGY OF BORDERING IN EUROPE"
William Walters

In what ways is the engineering of temporality, and not just spatiality, a factor in emerging practices and strategies of European governance? What role do experts play in temporal engineering and how are their interventions reshaping the terrain of power in Europe? Developing a concept of temporal engineering as a corrective to the teleological tendency embedded within globalization theory's understanding of time (e.g., Castells) this paper will address these questions through a focus on EUROSUR, or the European Border Surveillance System. This is a network of national and European maritime monitoring systems that is presently reshaping the idea of a European Mediterranean frontier. The paper will argue that in order to understand changing temporalities of governance it helps to focus on networks of expertise and technical practices. The paper examines the concept of situational awareness. This is a key concept within the planning of EUROSUR.

Originating in the world of aerial combat, and commonly used in contexts like air traffic control, disaster response, and the management of power grids, situational awareness brings together cognitive psychologists, designers, architects, information scientists and others, all of who seek to combat 'friction' in communication processes, enhance the 'near real time' governance of vital systems, and optimize the dynamic interface between operators and systems. Hence I consider situational awareness a form of live governance. Not only will a focus on the history of situational awareness deepen our understanding of the logics of temporal governance reshaping European border and migration control. It will also contribute to the broader research agenda of a genealogical understanding of governance. That is, an understanding that situates governance in terms of grids of power/knowledge that are never reducible to or contained within a given institutional field, but come from the outside, as it were.