



The Western Response to the Refugee: The *Camp* as a Mechanism for the Domination of the Other and the 'Purification' of the Nation State

Bryce Jenkins

ABSTRACT

Tactics used by the Western world to control risks to (inter)national security, primarily through border control and immigration policy, are critiqued as not only being grounded in the dark side of biopolitics, but also the extension of the state of exception. The 'gates' of Fortress Europe and other Western nations have become increasingly difficult to permeate for those deemed the Other. The creation of a hierarchy within foreigners, created to establish those who 'belong' from those who do not, demonstrates the Western world's attempt to uphold the white, predominately Christian demographic. It is argued the use of biopolitics to 'purify' the human race places all individuals within the state of exception, resulting in the globalization of the *camp*.

KEYWORDS: *Immigration, Domination, Biopolitics, Refugee, Camp*

Bryce graduated from Carleton University in 2017 with a Bachelor of Arts Combined Honours in Psychology and Law.

To many the *camp* represents exclusion, domination, and in some circumstances the production of corpses (Arendt, 1979). The state may implement the *camp* as a mechanism to dominate, control and regulate not only the inhabitants of the *camp*, but also the demographics of the state's citizens more generally. Arendt (1979) argues the *camp* is founded in the ideal of total domination and serves as the laboratory in which it is determined that 'everything is possible.' The so called 'experiment' of total domination within the *camp* relies on complete isolation of the inmates from the outside world. Therefore, the *camp* is defined as a space removed from the outside world in which it is possible for perverse 'experiments' to occur. Historically, the *camp* was used for the removal of undesirable populations; in which the state's interests are placed above those who are forced to inhabit the *camp*. The selective targeting of populations considered 'problematic' results in what the state portrays as an 'improved' demographic of the state.

The 'West' commonly refers to nations that originated from European culture and continue to be influenced by Europe. Specifically, these states include Canada, The United States of America, Australia, New Zealand, and European countries themselves (Simonton & Ting, 2010). While these countries have different histories and cultures, the socio-political landscape is relatively similar across these states and the countries' leaders generally respond to global affairs in a parallel manner (Adams, Clark, Ezrow, & Glasgow, 2006; Adams, Haupt, & Stroll, 2009). Much of the Western world associates the presence of refugees with not only terrorism, but also the exploitation of the nation's resources, such that an influx warrants the degradation of legal protections (Fassin, 2012; Steinmetz, 2003). The wake of 9/11 resulted in changes to policy, law, and infrastructure that were deemed necessary to effectively counter the risks associated with refugees, creating a structure in which the *camp* may operate. Responses by Western nations include the further solidification of borders, as witnessed by the creation of the Canadian Air Transport Security Authority and the Canada Border Services Agency. Both organizations are tasked with assessing risk of those seeking entry into Canada (Public Safety Canada, 2015). These structures were claimed to be a response to the imminent threat of national emergency, therefore providing a justification of the domination of refugees.

Post 9/11 (inter)national security has been expanded and reinforced. Much of the Western world is now hyper-focused on controlling risks allegedly posed by unknown populations, often detaining individuals when they seek entry into their territory (Minca, 2015, pp. 78-80). Foucault's conception of biopolitics will be used as a theoretical framework to comprehend how immigration policies are crafted with the intention of maintaining the demographic of the West and allow for the segregation and domination of those who do not belong. Specifically, DNA analyses are argued to be a more intrusive mechanism to determine the Other, separating those who are welcomed into a state from those who do not 'belong.' Those who fail to 'match' the desired demographic are

frequently detained and placed within the *camp*, as such the use of DNA technology is described as a new form of eugenics. Furthermore, it is suggested the West's pursuit of mitigating alleged security risks posed by these populations is largely unfounded. But, instead acts as a covert mechanism to 'improve' the demographics of its own population and to ensure the continuation of Western privilege. Australia's response to the 'refugee crisis' will be examined to demonstrate how biopolitics operates within the modern refugee *camp*. The *camp* is described as a mechanism through which the state dominates and regulates the lives of its inhabitants, resulting in a complete loss of autonomy. Finally, it will be argued that the modern refugee *camp* shares a morbid similarity to the Nazi *camp* witnessed during the Second World War, primarily in regards to their production of death.

The Emergence of Biopolitics

Foucault suggests a shift in modalities of control during the second half of the eighteenth century. Control was no longer established with the intent to suppress life through the threat of death. Instead, Foucault argues power was framed as a positive influence on the population in order to augment a healthy productive population (Foucault, 1990, p. 137). Foucault defines biopolitics as the new mechanism of control that focuses on the whole population in every aspect of life, including the right to "make live and let die" (Foucault, 1997, p. 240). Paradoxically, biopolitics is both the protection and the abandonment of life. The power over life is gained through the subjugation of bodies through regulation (Foucault, 1997, pp. 243-247). To determine if the regulatory mechanisms installed were effective and to target problem areas, the population is put under surveillance in order to establish and maintain its desired characteristics. These include the rates of birth, production, and illness (Foucault, 1997). With this information, the state may manipulate the population and its environment to improve the overall condition of the population (Foucault, 1997, pp. 243-247). Foucault (1997) claims the purpose of this regulatory power is to compensate for random variations within a population (e.g., failures in health and accidents) and to create an optimized state of life. Rozakou (2012) builds upon Foucault's position and explains biopolitics as the ability to care for life itself, through the state's mechanisms to foster, control, and manage it. To ensure the population remains alive and healthy, the state polices the parameters of the population through means of inclusion and exclusion (Foucault, 1990). In this regard, biopolitics is a mechanism that allows for the basic biological features of the human race to become the object of not only political strategy, but also a more general strategy of power (Foucault, 2007, p. 16).

Foucault (1997, p. 258) argues that racism and biopolitics are tightly interconnected; the emergence of biopolitics has allowed the state to inject its racial prejudices into the mechanisms of control and regulation. Foucault (1997) suggests there are two main functions of racism. Firstly, to create a hierarchy within the human race on the basis of biopolitics. Secondly, the pursuit of an

optimized state of life, as governed by the state, legitimates the killing of the 'lesser' of the human race (Foucault, 1997, pp. 254-261). According to Foucault, the removal of the inferior members of society, those labelled as degenerates, results in the purification and improvement of the remainder of the population. The term killing is not exclusive to murder, but also less traditional forms of murder, which may be described as the exposure to factors increasing the risk of death, including expulsion and rejection (Foucault, 1997, p. 256).

Foucault's conception of biopolitics is a strong theoretical tool to analyze immigration policies of the Western world. Through the understanding of the state's ability to manipulate the population, it can be understood how the use of strict immigration policies allows for the grooming of the population's demographic within the state. Further, the combination of racism, religion, and biopolitics provides a framework which allows for the unmasking of the true intentions of the Western response to refugees. Arguably, these policies are the embodiment of Foucault's (1997) less traditional forms of murder (exclusion and rejection), however, the state does not want to give up control over refugees and will not allow death, even when asked for. The conditions of the *camp* as seen through a biopolitical lens will bring to light the morbid relationship between the state and the desire to control those under its domain, with a distinct similarity to the form of biopolitics witnessed in Nazi *camps*.

The State and Exclusion

The state has long been concerned with those who 'belong' and those who do not. Considering this, the exclusion demonstrated by the state shares a perverse commonality with biopolitics, by which they both decide who 'belongs' and is therefore entitled to life. Rozakou (2012) highlights that there is a pivotal moment when an ancient society becomes a nation; the relations between individuals were replaced by the distinction between those who were inside the borders and those who were not. The Peace of Westphalia, which resulted in the solidification of borders, has been credited for creating the division between those who reside within a particular state (Reus-Smit, 1999). The separation of those who 'belong' results in cultural homogenization and ethnocentrism, which in turn identifies difference as a danger (Rozakou, 2012, p. 565). This distinction is prevalent in contemporary interactions between states and outsiders, whom are referred to as the Other. Regarding the European Union (EU), also noted as 'Fortress Europe' (Katz, 2015), a legal distinction has been created between 'residents of the EU' and 'foreigners'. However, this classification system is more complicated than the simple dichotomy laid out above; 'foreigners' are considered problematic, or outsiders (the Other), when they originate from non-Western countries (Fassin, 2012, p. 154). As such, the requirements of entry for those from a Western nation is considerably more relaxed than those from outside the category of Western civilization.

Fassin (2012) suggests there are three perceived threats to what is proclaimed as European (or Western) privilege. The first is concentrated on public security. The presence of terrorist attacks undertaken by the Other ultimately provides justification for the tightening of immigration policies (Fassin, 2012, pp. 154-155; Sayad, 2004). Europe and much of the Western world has identified terrorism, specifically in the name of Islam, as one of the largest threats to security (European Network Against Racism, 2016). When the Hungarian government was considering whether it should accept the EU quota of refugees into its borders, concerns of terrorism were commonly cited. Many government figures suggested the country and its citizens would be endangered if they “followed the footsteps of the West [in] accepting higher levels of immigrants because these foreigners bring terror and fear; they are violent” (European Network Against Racism, 2016, p. 10). Similar comments have been made by the former president of Romania, who stated “I think about the problem in terms of national security. Let us not forget that among these people are Sunni, Shia, people who put bombs reciprocally in their country” (European Network Against Racism, 2016, p. 11). Due to populist beliefs regarding the Other, the Muslim demographic has been over-criminalized throughout the past few decades. Specifically, within the UK the rate of incarcerated Muslims increased from eight percent of the prison population in 2002 to 15% of the population in 2016, despite only a four percent increase of the general population (Allen & Watson, 2017). However, despite the association between Islam and terrorism, as strongly supported by the media and politicians, less than one percent of Muslim prisoners are convicted of terrorism-related offences (Lamble, 2013).

Secondly, social security is of great concern to the state, in this regard immigration is portrayed as a visceral threat to social resources; mainly jobs, education, and unemployment benefits (Steinmetz, 2003). In 2011, the Work and Pensions Secretary of the United Kingdom stated that Britain required stricter immigration control in order to prevent “losing another generation to dependency and hopelessness” (Porter, 2011). The Secretary further suggested that even with the growth in economy, British citizens would not be provided the changes they deserve with the flooding of refugees to the UK. These arguments were supported by the claim that 87% of 400,000 recently created jobs were occupied by immigrants (Porter, 2011). The effects of migration on the employment and wages of British citizens was determined to be one of the most important factors in the Brexit referendum, in which the UK ultimately decided to leave the European Union (Currie, 2016). However, after a review of Western nations, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD; 2014) notes that immigrants contribute more in taxes than they receive in benefits. Numerous other economic benefits, including the filling of fast-growing sectors, are suggested by OECD (2014); which in combination suggest that the inclusion of refugees provides no negative consequences, despite what is perpetuated by the media and politicians.

The final area of concern is identity security (Fassin, 2012). Turner (2002) argues the hostility that has been witnessed towards Islam as a religion and the Muslim people highlights the state's desire to allow for the continuation of the white, predominately Christian Europe (pp. 154-155). This sentiment is supported by the statements of the Minister of Interior in Cyprus regarding 300 refugees. In fulfilling its obligation to an agreement with the EU to host a quota of refugees, Cyprus suggested they preferred the refugees be Orthodox Christian (European Network Against Racism, 2016). Specifically, the Minister of Interior stated that this preference was not "an issue of being inhuman or not helping if we are called upon, but to be honest, yes, that's what we would prefer [for the refugees to be Christian]" (European Network Against Racism, 2016, p. 16). These comments mirror those of the Hungarian Prime Minister and other politicians, mainly from Eastern European Member States, who proclaim that it would be easier for Christians to adjust to life in Europe (European Network Against Racism, 2016). These discriminatory statements against refugees on the basis of religion is founded in populist beliefs relating to the unsuitability of the Other in the Western world. However, the integration of the refugees from foreign countries into a hosting nation is largely determined by language barriers and xenophobia on the behalf of the hosting nation (European University Institute, 2017).

Biopolitics and the Global Expansion of the *Camp*

Arendt (1979) argues that Nazism brought the hyper-domination of populations to the European theatre. Previously colonialism of the 'savages' was focused on African and Aboriginal populations, in which sovereignty was established through the displacement and genocide of Indigenous populations (Murdocca, 2014). The Nazis were explicit in giving credit to the US colonial model in providing inspiration to the mechanism they used in creating a biological hierarchy within the European population (Minca, 2015). Furthermore, the Nazis reflected on how colonial powers systematically used the creation of biological hierarchy to de-humanize the 'savages', allowing their exploitation and murder without a sense of remorse (Minca, 2015, p. 78). This sentiment is present in contemporary discourse concerning refugees, in which the media and politicians refer to refugees as 'human garbage' and 'cockroaches' (European Network Against Racism, 2016). In this sense, the *camp* is viewed as the laboratory in which biopolitics transforms members of a population into mere numbers of living bodies (Minca, 2015).

The extent of de-humanization that occurs in the *camp* protrudes further than this; it is so extreme that the inhabitants no longer exist in the realm of humanity and are considered animals (Arendt, 1979; Minca, 2015, p. 78). There are numerous processes in which the Other is de-humanized both within the refugee and Nazi *camp*, including cramped conditions, the removal of legal protections, and the loss of autonomy. The loss of human qualities becomes most salient when considering that

the *camp* anonymizes death (Arendt, 1979). The inability to determine if an inmate is dead or alive is argued to remove death as the marker of a fulfilled life; further, death is argued as the “seal on the fact that... [the inmate] never really existed” (Arendt, 1979, p. 452). The removal of the recognition of death is comparable to that of when an animal, secluded from society, dies without society’s recognition that they existed in the first place. This sentiment is supported by Arendt (1979) who suggests the conditions of the *camp* allow for the creation of mechanisms that treat people as if “they had never existed and to make them disappear in the literal sense of the word” (p. 442).

Despite the horrors witnessed in the *camp* during the Second World War; almost immediately Western Europe began funding large scale refugee *camps* (Dunn, 2015; Zalashik & Davidovitch, 2006). While the creation of these camps was a necessary response to the mass populations of refugees, they are not without criticism. Strategically, these *camps* were located in developing nations to ensure the Other would not enter Western territory. This trend has continued, the union of the Western world and the proliferation of military mechanisms used for border control and surveillance has led to a new strategy of migration policies, mainly concerned with the ‘global health’ (Minca, 2015, p. 76). Considering this, the post 9/11 world may be viewed as the global expansion of biopolitics, resulting in the concerted effort of the Western nations to control and segregate the Other with the aid of technological advances. Modern states use biopolitics when regulating who may enter their country, and arguably their social fabric. The so-called ‘gates’ of Fortress Europe and other Western nations have become increasingly difficult to open. Airports and other access points to the state have clamped down on border control, with the use of technology like biometric identification, the state has gone as far as requiring DNA testing to provide verification that an individual does not belong to the realm of the Other (Byravan, 2006; Taitz, Weekers, & Mosca, 2002).

Many Western nations, including much of the EU, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, utilize DNA technology for verification of familial relations when applying for reunification (Taitz, Weekers, & Mosca, 2002). However, there is a double standard in the requirement for family recognition between native citizens and the Other, suggesting the targeting of specific populations. The biological knowledge gained through DNA analysis allows for the exclusion of citizenship rights and access to territory for refugees who fail to ‘match’ with the homogenous population of the nation (Heinemann & Lemke, 2014). In Germany for example, parental testing for immigrants belonging to the category of the Other, is justified on the basis that official documents from these countries, specifically Central and Southeast Asia and Africa, are less valid than those from a recognized nation such as Canada or another country within the EU (Heinemann & Lemke, 2014, pp. 494-5). Implicitly, much like the quality of the documents originating from these nations, the Western world suggests the ‘breed’ of human from these areas are less worthy. Interestingly, the only circumstance in which German natives

are required to provide DNA documentation for family reunification is when a biological relation is necessary when a spouse or child resides in a blacklisted country (Heinemann & Lemke, 2014).

The framing of these requirements is the pursuit of (inter)national security, however, these policies are the dovetailing of biopolitics, racism, and religion. This is highlighted by the selective targeting of individuals when they attempt to enter the EU or a Western nation. Specifically, the Other is subjected to additional biotechnologies aimed at the control and regulation of the population. It is only those who potentially belong to the Other that must prove they are from the same national community. Meanwhile, the standards for entry for individuals from the Western world are infinitely more relaxed than those applied to the potential Other (Byravan, 2006; Taitz, Weekers, & Mosca, 2002). The use of DNA technology to establish the characteristics of a potential Other demonstrates the concept of 'genetic citizenship' which may determine the accessibility to a nation's territory and social resources (Heinemann & Lemke, 2014, p. 489). The exclusion of the Other is based not only on physical characteristics, but also biological markers. The reliance on more invasive measures to determine who 'belongs' allows for the development and maintenance of homogenous populations within a nation. Furthermore, DNA technology represents a more precise instrument available to the state for determining who is accepted and who is exposed to death. Heinemann and Lemke (2014) succinctly summarize this by explaining that the use of biological markers for the determination of citizenship may encompass racialized politics and eugenic projects (pp. 490-1). Finally, DNA technology may be portrayed as a new form of eugenics, as only those who are 'genetic citizens' are granted the safety of the nation's protections, while the Other is forced into the *camp*.

Domination of the Other Through the *Camp*

The Greek response to the 'refugee crisis' perfectly demonstrates the domination of 'guests' (the Other) if granted access to the nation's territory. In an attempt to secure safety and stability, many refugees are making the perilous journey from Turkey to the Greek islands, wishing to flow deeper into the EU from there (Topak, 2014). However, an agreement between the EU and Turkey designed to stop the flow of refugees has trapped more than 50,000 refugees in Greece (Margaronis, 2016). The Greek government has tactically placed *camps* on remote islands to isolate these 'problematic' populations, effectively turning the islands into open air prisons (Agence France-Presse, 2017). These *camps* are marked with poor living conditions, including overcrowding and a lack of food, information, and sanitation (Margaronis, 2016). The lack of essential necessities is not unique to *camps* within Greece, and instead is a common element in refugee *camps*.

The establishment of spaces in which biopolitics saliently operates to dominate the Other has become the norm. One such example is the Australian government's isolation of Afghan refugees

on the island of Nauru, in which it appears legal protections are not recognized. In many aspects being contained within the penal system would be more beneficial to refugees than in the *camp*; as in the former there are numerous safeguards for those convicted of breaking the law. Unlike those who are imprisoned through the criminal justice system, those forced into the *camp* have been confined without trial and for an indefinite period of time (Arendt, 1979). Further suggesting that prison exemplifies an improvement for those within the *camp* is the lack of judicial oversight organizations as seen in the Australian detention facilities (Zannettino, 2012). Arendt (1979) argues refugees would benefit from committing crime if prison was the consequence, as it would improve the legal position of the individual, as prisoners are awarded more legal protections than refugees.

Australia's response to the influx of refugees resulted in policy changes allowing for the transfer of all refugees, referred to as 'boat people', to processing centres in Manus Island in Papua New Guinea and Nauru (Warbrooke, 2014; Zannettino, 2012). Those who are not recognized as legitimate refugees are to be returned to their home country or remain in detention for an indefinite period (Warbrooke, 2014). In 2004, numerous legal challenges to the mandatory detention system were brought to the High Court, which held that intolerable conditions of the *camp* did not negate the legitimacy of the detention itself (Zannettino, 2012). Further, the court argued that if there was no prospect of a refugees' removal from Australia, a person could be detained, possibly indefinitely, resulting in what Zannettino (2012) suggests "the equivalent of a life sentence" (p. 1097). This practice appears to have been maintained, as in 2011 more than 38% of refugees encompassed within the *camp* had been detained for more than 12 months (Zannettino, 2012).

This Australian policy noted as the "Pacific Solution" evokes a morbid similarity with the "Final Solution" proposed by the Nazi party, as it forces all refugees who are recognized by Australia to be settled in Nauru or Papua New Guinea (Warbrooke, 2014). While an attempt for the literal comparison of concentration *camps* and refugee *camps* is not possible, it is suggested that similarities between both manifestations of the *camp* exist (Zannettino, 2012). Despite the intentions of the *camp*, as a space to kill directly, as witnessed in Nazi concentration *camps*, or as a space to isolate and contain for Australian detention centres; both function as a mechanism to control and dominate (Zannettino, 2012). Australian detention centres are not aimed at producing corpses, however, using Foucault's (1997) conception of 'indirect death' or less traditional forms of murder, it becomes apparent that these *camps* still produce death to some extent.

The complete regulation of life within the space of the *camp* allows the threshold between life and death to be constantly mediated, reinvented, and tested on the encompassed population (Minca, 2015, p. 79). The precarious balance between life and death explains why the state attempts

to prevent death within the *camp*, but will not allow for true life, as refugees are forced to remain within the detention centre. The hyper-domination of the *camp*'s inmates is only feasible when they remain isolated from the rest of the world (Arendt, 1979). This may partially explain why the state has passed legislation that enables the indefinite detention, or 'life sentence,' (Zannettino, 2012) of refugees that have attempted to enter their territory.

The exposure to conditions of the *camp* have severe physical and psychological consequences for its inhabitants, such that self-harm and suicide become prevalent (Amnesty International, 2016). Over two-thirds of the refugees forced into an Australian detention centre have released an open letter demanding assisted suicide (Mortimer, 2015). The inhabitants of the *camp* on Manus Island suggest that "we are but a bunch of slaves...living in hellish condition[s]" (p. 5) and gave numerous potential remedies to end their suffering (Salomon, Heschl, Oberleitner, & Benedek, 2017). These suggestions include that "a navy ship... put us all on board and dump us all in the ocean, a gas chamber, or [an] injection of a poison" (Salomon, Heschl, Oberleitner, & Benedek, 2017, p. 5). Overall, the inmates argued that death would be a better alternative to the conditions of the *camp* (Mortimer, 2015; Salomon, Heschl, Oberleitner, & Benedek, 2017). Many of the refugees claimed that they are slowly dying through the continuous exposure to torture and trauma and that expedited death would be welcomed.

The sentiment of those asking for assisted suicide is not unique to the inhabitants of the *camp* on Manus Island. All of Australia's detention centres have witnessed hunger strikes, suicide attempts, and self-harm (Warbrooke, 2014; Zannettino, 2012). The rate of self-harm and suicide within Australian detention centres is significantly greater than the Australian population, at 41 times greater for men and 26 for women (Dudley, 2003). Specifically, in 2002, several hundred inmates at the Woomera detention centre initiated a hunger strike while more than 40 responded to their conditions through the drastic measure of sewing their mouths shut (Dudley, 2003). A psychologist working at the Woomera facility suggests the stitching of one's lips was "the deepest expression of despair and helplessness, the only form of control they had remaining" (Zannettino, 2012, p. 1104). The notion that an individual would sew their mouth shut as a modality to gain control over one's life is truly horrifying and signifies the hyper-domination that is possible in the *camp*. Bargu (2014) supports this conclusion, suggesting that forms of resistance must occur at the same level as the oppression. Considering this, as biopolitics functions by controlling life, it is possible to gain control over one's body through acts of self-starvation or mutilation (Bargu, 2014). Immigration policies such as the Pacific Solution result in the complete removal of the control over one's life through seemingly permanent detention. The potential that those housed within the *camp* may be deported, likely resulting in death, or may be forced to endure the conditions of the *camp*, demonstrate the

complete domination of the inhabitant by the state. While the use of detention facilities is posed as necessary, it may easily be framed as the state maintaining control over all aspects of the detained population's life (Minca, 2015). The extent of the state's power over life is so great that the right to die is removed from those within the *camp*. The state preventing the death of the *camp* inmate may be to further its interest in the complete domination of the refugee's life. According to Foucault's (1990) conception of biopolitics, death, specifically suicide, subverts power (p. 138). Considering this, the only escape of the state's biopolitical power is death. In this sense, Foucault's statement considering the state's ability to 'make live and let die' through biopolitics comes to life.

The *camp*, today as it was during the Second World War, is a mechanism of isolation that separates its inhabitants in an attempt to 'cleanses' the body (the population) from the corrupting 'filth' of the animals that are the Other (Minca, 2015, p. 79). In Nazi Germany, the leader of IBM Germany commented that the statisticians were very similar to physicians; "in that we dissect, cell by cell, the German cultural body. We report every individual characteristic... [to] our nation's physician [Adolf Hitler] with the material he needs for his examination" (Neocleous, 2003, p. 55). Similarly, Katie Hopkins, a British newspaper columnist, compared refugees to a virus (Williams, 2015). Biopolitical policies regarding immigration bear a striking resemblance to a medical procedure in which the virus, such as cancer, is removed from the body in order to improve its overall condition (see Williams, 2015). Considering this, security forces and immigration perform the role of a surgeon, who surgically removes threats to the organism. Viewing the populous as the patient, the 'doctors' in the scenario (politicians) heavily endorse the need for intrusive surgery (the removal of the Other) in order to sustain the best quality of life. Therefore, the patient (the Western world) feels safer if their 'surgeon' (security forces) surgically targets refugees, resulting in an increase of 'global health' (Byravan, 2006).

Conclusion

Western immigration policies are based on the exclusion of the undesirable population of the Other to protect Fassin's (2012) Western privilege, specifically the securitization of the state's public security, social resources, and cultural identity. However, the alleged risk the Other poses to Western privilege largely appears to be unfounded (OECD, 2014), suggesting the rationale provided by the West is merely a veil hiding the true intentions of the state. Foucault's conception of biopolitics has been used to argue that strict immigration policies are a mechanism for the bioregulation of the Western world. And more worryingly, that these policies are deeply founded in racist motivations, specifically the 'purification' of the Western nations. Considering this, the relationship between immigration strategies and DNA technology creates a new form of eugenics, in which those whose biological markers designate them as the Other are exposed to death. Therefore, immigration

policies of the Western world have been claimed to embody Foucault's (1997) less traditional forms of murder, exclusion and rejection.

Australian detention centres, exemplary of the refugee *camp*, have been suggested as the space in which the state can control all aspects of life for those who are forced to remain within its borders. The extent that autonomy has been removed from those within the *camp* is so great that inhabitants engage in hunger strikes, suicide, and self-harm in an attempt to regain some control over their body. While a direct comparison is not suggested, a morbid similarity is evident between the refugee *camp* of today and the notoriously horrific Nazi *camp* seen during the Second World War. The longevity of the *camp* may be in part explained by the restructuring of rhetoric and mechanisms instilled within its borders. The modern refugee *camp* may easily be framed as a humanitarian response to the influx of refugees caused by conflict in non-Western states (Overseas Development Institute, 2012), whereas the Nazi's targeted the Other within the borders of their control before confining them to the *camp*. Further, the refugee *camp* produces a different kind of death, not the mass production of corpses that Arendt (1979) attributes to the Nazi *camp*, but a much less tangible modality of death. Both manifestations of the *camp* demonstrate a biopolitical motivation to control and dominate, as well as produce death, either literally or in Foucault's less traditional forms of murder; the present analysis illuminates that state domination of the Other through the *camp* is not an artifact of the past.

References

- Adams, J., Clark, M., Ezrow, L., & Glasgow, G. (2006). Are niche parties fundamentally different from mainstream parties? The causes and the electoral consequences of Western European parties' policy shifts, 1976-1998. *American Journal of Political Science*, 50(3), 513-529.
- Adams, J., Haupt, A.B., & Stoll, H. (2009). What moves parties? The role of public opinion and global economic conditions in Western Europe. *Comparative Political Studies*, 42(5), 611-639.
- Agence France-Presse. (2017). *The EU migrant deal with turkey has turned Greek Islands into open-air prisons*. Retrieved from <https://www.pri.org/stories/2017-03-19/eu-migrant-deal-turkey-has-turned-greek-islands-open-air-prisons>
- Allen, G., & Watson, C. (2017). *UK prison population statistics*. Retrieved from House of Commons Library website, <http://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/SN04334#fullreport>
- Amnesty International (2016). *Island of despair: Australia's "processing" of refugees on Nauru*. Retrieved from Amnesty International website, http://www.abc.net.au/reslib/201610/r1626465_24834993.pdf
- Arendt, H. (1979). *The origins of totalitarianism*. New York, NY: Harcourt
- Byravan, S. (2006). DNA typing: A technology of fear. *Development*, 49(4), 28-32.
- Currie, S. (2016). Reflecting on Brexit: Migration myths and what comes next for EU migrants in the UK? *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 38(3), 337-342.
- Dudley, M. (2003). Contradictory Australian national policies on self-harm and suicide: The case of asylum seekers in mandatory detention. *Australian Psychiatry*, 11(sup 1), S102-S108.
- Dunn, E. C. (2015, September 28). The failure of refugee camps. Retrieved from Boston Review website, <http://bostonreview.net/editors-picks-world/elizabeth-dunn-failure-refugee-camps>
- European University Institute (2017). *The integration of migrants and refugees: An EUI forum on migration, citizenship and demography*. Retrieved European University Institute website from <http://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/>

d68aa615-5bdd-11e7-954d-01aa75ed71a1

European Network Against Racism. (2016). *Racism and discrimination in the context of migration in Europe: ENAR Shadow Report 2015-2016*.

Fassin, D. (2012). *Humanitarian Reason: A moral history of the present*. (Gomme, R. Trans) Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Foucault, M. (1971). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1990). *Introduction: Volume one of the history of sexuality*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1997). *Society must be defended: Lectures at the College de France 1975-1976*. New York, NY: Picador.

Foucault, M. (2007). *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the College de France 1977-1978* (Snellart, M. (Ed)). London, UK: Palgrave.

Heinemann, T., & Lemke, T. (2014). Biological citizenship reconsidered: The use of DNA analysis by immigration authorities in Germany. *Technology and Human Values*, 39(4), 488-510.

Katz, I. (2015). From spaces of thanatopolitics to spaces of natality—A commentary on ‘geographies of the camp.’ *Political Geography*, (49) 84-86.

Lamble, S. (2013). Queer necropolitics and the expanding carceral state: Interrogating sexual investments in punishment. *Law Critique*, 24(3), 229-253.

Margaronis, M. (2016, May 27). *The EU has turned Greece into a prison for refugees*. Retrieved from The Nation website, <https://www.thenation.com/article/the-eu-has-turned-greece-into-a-prison-for-refugees/>

Minca, C. (2015). Geographies of the camp. *Political Geography*, 49, 74-83.

Mortimer, C. (2015, December 2). 600 refugees in australian detention centre write open letter

demanding assisted suicide. *Independent News*. Retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/australasia/refugees-australian-detention-centre-open-letter-assisted-suicide-manus-island-regional-processing-a6756911.html>

Murdocca, C. (2014) Racialization, criminalization, representation. In D. Brock, A. Glasbeek, & C. Murdocca (Eds.), *Criminalization, representation, regulation*. pp. 107-132. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Neocleous, M. (2003). *Imagining the state*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2014). Retrieved from Migration Policy Debates website, <https://www.oecd.org/migration/OECD%20Migration%20Policy%20Debates%20Numero%202.pdf>

Overseas Development Institute. (2012). *Humanitarian space: A review of trends and issues*. Retrieved from <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/7643.pdf>

Porter, A. (2011, June 30). Migrants 'take the jobs from young britons'. *The Telegraph*. Retrieved from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/immigration/8609827/UK-jobs-Migrants-take-the-jobs-from-young-Britons.html>

Public Safety Canada. (2015). *The government of canada's response to the terrorist attacks of 9/11*. Retrieved from <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/ntnl-scr/cntr-trrrsm/sptmbr-11th/gvrnmnt-rspns-en.aspx>

Reus-Smit, C. (1999). *The moral purpose of the state: Culture, social identity, and institutional rationality in international relations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rozakou, K. (2012). The biopolitics of hospitality in Greece: Humanitarianism and the management of refugees, *American Ethnologist*, 39(3), 562-577.

Sayad, A. (2004). *The suffering of the immigrant*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Simonton, D.K., & Ting, S. (2010). Creativity in Eastern and Western civilizations: The lessons of historiometry. *Management and Organization Review*, 6(3), 329-350.

- Steinmetz, G. 2003. The state of emergency and the revival of American imperialism: Toward an authoritarian post-Fordism. *Public Culture*, 15(2), 323-345.
- Soloman, S., Heschl, L., Oberleitner, G., & Benedek, W. (2017). *Blurring boundaries: Human security and forced migration*. Boston, MA: Brill Nijhoff.
- Taitz, J., Weekers, J., & Mosca, D. (2002). DNA and immigration: The ethical ramifications. *Health and Human Rights*, 359, 794.
- Topak, O.E. (2014) The biopolitical border in practice: Surveillance and death at the Greece-Turkey borderzones. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 32(5), 815-833.
- Turner, B. 2002. Sovereignty and emergency: Political theology, Islam and American conservatism. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 19(4), 103-119.
- Warbrooke, A. (2014). Australia's 'Pacific solution': Issues for the Pacific Islands. *Asia and the Pacific Policy Studies*, 1(2), 337-348.
- Williams, Z. (2015). Katie Hopkins calling migrants vermin recalls the darkest events of history. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/apr/19/katie-hopkins-migrants-vermin-darkest-history-drownings>
- Zalashik, R., & Davidovitch, N. (2006). Measuring adaptability: Psychological examinations of Jewish detainees in Cyprus internment camps. *Science in Context*, 19(3), 419-441.
- Zannettino, L. (2012). From Auschwitz to mandatory detention: Biopolitics, race, and human rights in the Australian refugee camp. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 16(7), 1094-1119.