Université de Lausanne
Travaux de Science Politique
Political Science Working Paper Series

Partnership in International Migration Governance

Rahel Kunz

N° 58 (2013)

CRII
Centre de Recherche Interdisciplinaire sur l'International

La collection **Travaux de Science Politique** vise à diffuser des travaux de chercheuses et chercheurs rattachés à l'Institut d'Etudes Politiques et Internationales (IEPI) de l'Université de Lausanne. Il peut s'agir de textes en prépublication, de communications scientifiques ou d'excellents mémoires d'étudiants. Ces travaux sont publiés sur la base d'une évaluation interne par deux membres de l'IEPI. Les opinions émises n'engagent cependant que la responsabilité de l'auteur•e.

Les **Travaux de Science Politique** sont accessibles gratuitement sur www.unil.ch/iepi (suivre le lien « Publications »).

The **Political Science Working Papers Series** is intended to promote the diffusion of work in progress, articles to be published and research findings by researchers of the Institute of Political and International Studies, University of Lausanne. The papers submitted are refereed by two members of the Institute. The opinions expressed are those of the author(s) only.

The **Political Science Working Papers** are available free of charge at www.unil.ch/iepi (click on « Publications »).

Partnership in International Migration Governance

Rahel Kunz[1]
Institut d'Etudes Politiques et Internationales, Université de Lausanne

Résumé

L'approche du partenariat dans la gouvernance de la migration internationale promet une gestion coopérative de la migration entre pays d'origine, de destination et de transit. La littérature a tendance à conceptualiser ces partenariats en tant qu'instrument politique. Cet article propose une reconceptualisation afin de mieux comprendre les transformations qui ont lieu actuellement sous la couverture de l'approche du partenariat. Basée sur une approche de gouvernementalité Foucauldienne, l'analyse propose une réinterprétation des partenariats de migration en tant que forme de gouvernance néolibérale. En mettant l'accent sur la convergence de la gouvernance de la migration entre la sphère internationale et la région Européenne et Nord-Américaine en particulier, l'article démontre comment l'approche du partenariat représente la migration internationale d'une manière à impliquer institutions gouvernementales, migrant-e-s et expert-e-s dans la gouvernance de la migration internationale. Des techniques de gouvernance néolibérale sont mises en œuvre pour former des partenaires responsables qui s'autogouvernent selon les normes établies à travers l'approche du partenariat.

Mots-clefs : Partenariat, Gouvernementalité, Gouvernance de la Migration Internationale, Néolibéralisme

Abstract

The partnership approach in international migration governance promises cooperative governance between countries of origin, transit and destination. The literature has generally conceptualised migration partnerships as a policy instrument. This article suggests that understanding the broader transformations taking place in international migration governance under the rubric of partnership demands a novel analysis. Using a Foucauldian governmentality perspective, I interpret migration partnerships as an instance of neoliberal rule. Focusing on the convergence of international migration governance between the international realm and the European and North American region in particular, I demonstrate that the partnership approach frames international migration governance in such a way that enlists governments, migrants and particular experts in governing international migration, and invokes specific technologies of neoliberal governing which help produce responsible, self-disciplined partner states and migrants that can be trusted to govern themselves according to the norms established through the partnership framing.

Keywords: Partnership, Governementality, Migration Governance, Neoliberalism

---

[1] Maître-assistante, Géopolis, Université de Lausanne, rahel.kunz@unil.ch

Table des Matières/Contents

Introduction

International migration governance since the 1990s has been transformed through the emergence of the partnership approach that promises cooperative governance between countries of origin, transit and destination. Thereby, conditionality was officially abandoned and replaced with notions of dialogue, participation and country ownership, based on the argument that the governance of international migration would be more efficient and beneficial if countries of origin and transit participated more actively and owned their migration policy agenda. This partnership approach has been promoted in the international realm and regionally, as well as in the European and North American region. Within the international realm, it has been diffused since the turn of the millennium through the work of the Berne Initiative and the International Agenda for Migration Management, the Global Commission on International Migration, the UN High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development, the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the Global Migration Group, and the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD). A growing number of Regional Consultative Processes (RCPs) also advocate partnerships, such as the Regional Conference on Migration (RCM) in North and Central America or the Budapest and Söderköping Process. In the European context, the partnership approach emerged against the backdrop of EU enlargement and outreaching, and a general move towards partnership in EU external relations, manifest among others in the EU Africa Partnership, the Strategic Partnership with Latin American Countries, the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) and more recently the Union for the Mediterranean and the Eastern Partnership (Lavenex and Stucky 2011). In the context of the Global Approach to Migration the EU developed the new instrument of Mobility Partnerships (EUMPs). In the North American context, the partnership approach emerged in the 1990s, when, after decades of a so-called 'policy of no policy' on migration between Mexico and the US, a gradual *réchauffement* translated into the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), accompanied by a bilateral dialogue on migration, such as within the Working Group on Migration and Consular Affairs of the Binational Commission, and the signing of a number of agreements, such as the bilateral Border Partnerships between Mexico and the US and Canada and the US, as well as the bilateral Partnership for Prosperity and the trilateral Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America (SPP)[2] (Grondin and De Larrinaga 2008: 675).

The literature on international migration governance has only recently started to pay attention to the emergence of the partnership approach. Migration partnerships are mostly conceived of as a policy instrument and as the expression of a move towards more cooperative forms of migration governance. Moreover, most studies have tended to focus on the European context and the particular instrument of EU Mobility Partnerships. This article suggests that understanding the broader transformations taking place under the rubric of partnership demands a novel analysis. Using a Foucauldian governmentality perspective, I interpret migration partnerships as an instance of neoliberal rule, a particular conceptualisation of government constituted through "practices of liberty" (Dean 1999: 194). These

---

[2] In 2001, the US and Mexico established the Partnership for Prosperity (P4P), a public-private cooperation aiming at unfettering the economic potential of the region (Bush Administration 6 September 2001). The SPP was established in 2005. Contrary to some commentators in the literature that characterise the SPP as an empty statement of principle or a dialogue, the SPP is a "regime of migration, security, and trade" that acts as a form of rule (Grondin and De Larrinaga 2008).

practices presuppose, depend on and shape free subjects – in the case of the migration partnership approach mostly sending and transit government agencies and migrants. Focusing on the convergence of international migration governance between the international realm and the European and North American region in particular, I demonstrate that the partnership approach frames international migration governance in such a way that enlists governments, migrants and particular experts in governing international migration, and invokes specific technologies of neoliberal governing which help produce responsible, self-disciplined partner states and migrants that can be trusted to govern themselves according to the norms established through the partnership framing. The partnership approach thus governs through the production and consent of responsible partners. I show that the partnership approach is not a mere policy instrument, goes beyond the European region, and has become an essential element of the governance of international migration. This does not mean that neoliberal governing has completely taken over international migration governance, rather it co-exists alongside other forms of governing, such as policing. But it is to say that it plays an important role and has hitherto not been accorded enough attention in the migration governance literature.

The analysis unfolds as follows: The next section outlines the ways in which the existing literature on international migration governance has conceptualised migration partnerships and the limits of existing approaches. Section three presents the analytical framework based on a governmentality perspective. Section four outlines the emergence of the partnership discourse at the international level as well as in the European and North American context, demonstrating how this discourse frames international migration and its governance in a particular way and through this framing prepares the terrain for particular neoliberal partnership technologies, which are analysed in section five. Having said this, a detailed mapping of the partnership approach goes beyond the scope of this article.

This article draws on document and policy analysis combined with interview data. The analysed texts include official documents issued by the relevant governmental and non-governmental institutions in the EU and North American regions. The software analysis tool ATLAS.ti was used for coding and analysis. In addition, approximately fifty semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted between 2009 and 2011, including US government and EU officials involved in migration policy-making, representatives of international and non-governmental organisations and regional consultation processes, as well as migration experts in the European and North American regions.[3] The particular focus on the European and North American regions is based on a number of elements. Several authors have highlighted a certain convergence in policy discourses on governing international migration globally and between these two regions, yet few analyses have made it their focus (Boucher 2008; Fargues et al. 2011; Pellerin 1999a). In addition, there exists a long-standing cooperation of migration officials from the US and from European governments, such as for example in the context of the Intergovernmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees (IGC).[4]

---

[3] I would like to thank all my respondents. To guarantee their anonymity, their names will not be mentioned. Special thanks also go to Rachel Stucky who carried out some of the interviews used in this article.

[4] See: http://www.igc.ch/ (All websites were accessed on 22 February 2013, unless indicated otherwise).

Situating migration partnerships in the literature

There is a small but growing interdisciplinary literature on migration partnerships. In general, this literature has tended to portray migration partnerships as a particular policy instrument in the European context that signals a move away from repressive towards increasingly cooperative forms of migration governance (Cassarino 2009; Chou 2009; Weinar 2011). EU Mobility Partnerships (EUMPs) have received most attention.[5] EUMPs were launched in 2005 in the context of the Global Approach to Migration (GAM) that aims to increase dialogue and cooperation with African states and neighbouring countries across the Mediterranean. The literature tends to focus mainly on the emergence, evolution and main characteristics of EUMPs as well as on evaluating the efficiency of EUMPs as policy instruments (Bendel 2009; De Bruycker and Weyembergh n.d.; Parusel 2010; Parkes 2009). Thereby, EUMPs are understood as legal instruments and as mechanisms of coordination, which sidelines questions regarding governance and power and the connections to wider shifts in governing international migration.

Some authors have started taking up this challenge. They emphasise the possibility of EUMPs as a tool to gain influence either in the relationship between Member States and EU institutions (particularly the EU Commission), or in the relationship between states of origin and destination (Chou 2009; Weinar 2011; Reslow 2012). Thereby, EUMPs are framed as an instrument for the EU or its individual member states to achieve particular policy goals and the analysis focuses on the rationale of the EU or individual member states to enter MPs. Typically, a research project on EUMPs at the University of Maastricht asks: "to what extent does negotiating through the EU increase the bargaining power of the member states vis-à-vis third countries?".[6] Taking the example of the Dutch government, Reslow argues that member states use MPs as instruments of power and choose to cooperate in MPs when it allows them "to achieve their nationally formulated preferences" (Reslow 2012: 227). Her approach is situated within long-standing debates about why states choose cooperation. At a more supranational level, but similarly framing EUMPs as a policy instrument, Chou argues that "mobility partnerships possess the potential to increase the leverage the EU could exercise vis-à-vis third countries and, thus, adds value to its existing foreign policy toolbox" (Chou 2009: 1). All in all, the main focus of these studies is 'problem-solving', i.e. they are essentially concerned with whether and how effectively Europe can use EUMPs for external migration policy-making.

Moving beyond, Lavenex and Stucky situate EUMPs within the broader phenomenon of the externalisation of migration policies in the European context (Lavenex and Stucky 2011: 116). They interpret the institutional set-up of EUMPs as so-called transgovernmental networks (TGNs). They argue that EUMPs intensify "the model of network governance already institutionalized under the ENP in the sector of migration management" (ibid, 135) and are "an illustration of the Union's turn towards more technocratic modes of external governance based on transgovernmental networking … in the pursuit of foreign policy goals" (ibid, 136f.). In this perspective, MPs can be understood to "establish platforms for recurrent interaction between policy experts who meet below the level of heads of state or government and engage in operational cooperation" (ibid, 135). Thus, EUMPs are understood as a forum for norm diffusion, whereby powerful states impose their

---

[5] Given that the focus is on regions, it goes beyond the scope of this article to consider the bilateral migration agreements between individual EU member states and third countries.
[6] See: http://www.maastrichtuniversity.nl/web/Schools/MGSoG/ProjectPages/ISAcademie MigrationDevelopment/Research/EUMobilityPartnershipsAComparativePolicyEvaluation.htm

regulatory norms on weaker states, engaged in unilateral policy-transfer by 'softer means'. While EUMPs are still conceptualised as policy instruments, such studies propose an important analysis of the issues regarding governance and power that are raised by the emergence of migration partnerships.

The literature on international migration governance has also taken up this challenge, reconceptualising migration partnerships as an element in the broader multilayered architecture of the governance of international migration (Betts 2011; Kunz, Lavenex, and Panizzon 2011). From a regime theoretical approach Betts suggests that in the absence of formal multilateral governance, formal and informal types of transregional governance have gained importance and "states are increasingly developing a range of migration partnerships to collectively address migration" (Betts 2011: 17). Conceptualising migration partnerships as a form of informal network governance, he argues that these may represent an efficient way of managing migration, yet warns of their ambiguity in terms of guaranteeing rights, equity and accountability and their potential for reinforcing existing power asymmetries between states (Betts 2011: 321). Kunz et al. situate migration partnerships as an important element in the multilayered architecture of international migration governance and discuss the broader implications of the partnership approach in terms of international migration governance (Kunz, Lavenex, and Panizzon 2011). Thereby, the links between migration partnerships and broader shifts in international migration governance take centre stage. What has received less attention in this literature are the links between changing forms of international migration governance and the broader global transformations, particularly the shift towards neoliberalism.

Here, the research by scholars drawing on neogramscian perspectives is helpful as it looks into the ways in which neoliberal restructuring has influenced transformations of international migration governance (Overbeek 2002; Pellerin 1999a; Pellerin 1999b; Pellerin 2004; Dreher 2007).[7] In an early contribution, Pellerin calls for a study of migration policy that would move beyond the policy-making problems and analyse migration policies against the background of economic and social transformations situated in regionalisation and globalisation, and of the overall context of migration dynamics (Pellerin 1999a). She argues that neoliberal restructuring, through its effects on "strategies and the geography of production, as well as state forms" has led to the convergence of migration policies in the European and North American region, yet without completely homogenising them (Pellerin 1999a: 995). Thereby, her focus on the ways in which transformations of the organisation of production, production relations, economic activities, and organisation of economic and social space impact migration policies (Pellerin 1999a: 1000). She demonstrates how non-state actors, such the IOM, the OECD and the Trilateral Commission, have increasingly become involved in migration governance, seeking to put in place "a regulatory framework where the industrialised world will control the physical, represented and imagined space of peoples in the periphery. The migration policies of the countries of the EU and of North America have started adopting such a vision and strategy" (Pellerin 1999a: 1009).

Such research has been extremely important to situate migration policies in broader transformations and in revealing links to neoliberal restructuring. Yet, migration partnerships have so far not received much attention in this literature (for an exception see (Maisenbacher 2011). Moreover, it downplays the importance of the forms of governing characteristic of neoliberalism through which migration policies work. This is where a governmentality perspective is helpful, as it allows us

---

[7] For a more detailed overview, see Maisenbacher (2011).

to shed light on the broader implications of migration partnerships regarding contemporary ways of thinking and doing migration governance. Such a perspective focuses on the particular technologies and rationalities of the migration partnership approach and promises to reveal that neoliberalism not only influences the substantive content of migration policy-making, but also the ways in which governing international migration is thought and practiced.

Studying partnership as a form of governing

From a governmentality perspective, the partnership approach in migration governance is reconceptualised as a form of governing, as a form of conduct of conduct. As indicated in the composition of the word, governmentality focuses on the links between forms of governing (gouverner) and modes of thought or underlying rationalities (*mentalité*) (Lemke 2001: 2). Thereby, language is crucially important to understand "the constitution of the objects of politics, not simply in terms of meaning or rhetoric, but as 'intellectual technologies' that render aspects of existence amenable to inscription and calculation" (Miller and Rose 1990: 1). Thus, discourse is understood neither as a form of rhetoric nor as an ideology of hegemonic economic and political groups, but as a system of meaning that constitutes institutions, practices and identities (Larner 2000: 12). Every rationality of governing invokes specific forms of knowledge and truth regimes (Dean 1999). This demands that migration policy be located "within a wider discursive field in which conceptions of the proper ends and means of government are articulated" (Miller and Rose 1990: 5). Thus, the partnership discourse is understood as a way of framing the issues of international migration and migration policy-making in such a way as to prepare the grounds for particular kinds of action.

The second dimension of governmentality refers to governing technologies (or *techne*) associated with the partnership approach, which asks "by what means, mechanisms, procedures, instruments, tactics, techniques, technologies and vocabularies is authority constituted and rule accomplished?" (Dean 1999: 42). The focus is on the "mechanisms through which authorities of various sorts have sought to shape, normalise and instrumentalise the conduct, thought, decisions and aspirations of others in order to achieve the objectives they consider desirable" (Miller and Rose 1990: 8). A governmentality analysis thus examines which techniques are involved in governing international migration through partnership and what their broader power implications are.

A governmentality analysis also pays attention to the formation of subjectivities through governing. Thereby, governing influences conduct "to elicit various identifications for various reasons" (Dean 1999: 44). Following Dean, we can ask: what forms of subjectivities are presupposed by particular governing practices and what sort of transformations do these practices seek? What statuses, capacities, attributes and forms of conduct are assumed of those who exercise authority and those who are to be governed? (Dean 1999: 43). Thus, a governmentality analysis focuses on the formation of new forms of subjectivities through a particular mode of governing. Finally, each governmental rationality goes hand in hand with specific forms of resistance (Foucault 2012: 95). The practices through which resistance against the partnership approach are articulated will be discussed in the conclusion, although a detailed analysis of forms of resistance goes beyond the scope of this paper and warrants further empirical research.

Using a governmentality analysis, I develop the argument that the emergence of partnerships in the field of international migration governance is an expression of a particular form of governing: advanced liberalism or neoliberalism.[8] Thereby, neoliberalism is understood as a "formula of rule" (Rose 1993: 283) that works through governing individuals through "practices of liberty", rather than society viewed as an unitary domain in Keynesian welfarist mentality of rule (Dean 1999: 176). Such practices of liberty are "concerned with structuring, shaping, predicting and making calculable the operation of our freedom, and of working off and through diagrams of free subjects constituted by forms of governmental and political reasoning" (Dean 1999: 194). This link between partnership and neoliberal governing has so far been theorised mostly in the context of the nation state. For example, analyses on domestic partnerships show how these govern through consensus, cooperation, flexibility and entrepreneurship and create active neoliberal citizens (Dahlstedt 2009; Glendinning, Powell, and Rummery 2002; Wendy Larner and Craig 2005). Yet, a growing body of what Walters calls "international governmentality studies" (Walters 2012: 89) shows that such insights can fruitfully be taken beyond the national context. Most prominently, Abrahamsen has analysed partnerships in the field of development as an illustration of advanced liberal government (Abrahamsen 2004). Research on the EU reveals partnerships as a technique in the governmentalisation of EU integration, enlargement and outreaching: "Through the deployment of such technologies as league tables, best practice, peer review and partnership, European institutions and their national and local partners, are enjoined to become a sort of community of self-improvement that is dedicated to making Europe into a sort of social and economic 'centre of excellence'" (Haahr and Walters 2005, 19–20). In the North American context, the emergence of partnerships has also been situated in the context of North American integration (Gilbert 2007; Grondin and de Larrinaga 2008). In her analysis of the Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America (SPP), Gilbert suggests that "the discourse of 'partnership' signals a new political rationality that is reconfiguring the relationship between the North American states, their markets and their citizens" (Gilbert 2007: 77). The underlying premise of this model is that "it is only when Mexico becomes self-governing … that it will be an effective and responsible – albeit not necessarily equal – partner in protecting the economic and social security of the region" (ibid, 84). In sum, existing research points to the emergence of partnerships as situated within, and contributing to, neoliberal governmentality. Drawing on this insight, I ask whether something comparable can be said about the partnership approach in the field of international migration governance.

Partnership Discourse

How does the partnership discourse frame the issues of international migration and migration policy-making in a particular way so as to prepare the grounds for particular kinds of action? Which specific forms of knowledge and truth are invoked within the partnership discourse? Traditionally, international migration was largely perceived as a problem and zero-sum game (Lavenex and Kunz 2008). With the emergence of the partnership approach, international migration was recast as an opportunity that might be harnessed to the benefits of all (Kunz, Lavenex, and Panizzon 2011: 2). The partnership discourse is based on the belief that migration can be effectively managed in a spirit of cooperation between all affected countries to yield win–win (including countries of origin and destination) or win-win-win (also

---

[8] For a more detailed analysis of the emergence of advanced liberal rule see (Dean 1999).

including migrants) solutions; and emphasises common interests, mutual benefits and shared responsibility for migration management. For this to be achieved, the discourse advocates dialogue and trust-building, private-public cooperation and capacity-building and technical cooperation. This discourse can be found within the international realm, as well as in the European and North American context, as the following analysis shows.

International Context

Within the international realm, the IAMM was the first initiative to substantiate the concept of partnership:

Migration management is an area for partnerships between interested stakeholders and for consideration of responsibility sharing between States involved in or affected by particular migratory movements. Continued exploration is required to identify additional ways by which governments, international organizations, non-governmental organizations and other private sector and civil society organizations can work together to develop greater confidence and effective and joint management tools, technical cooperation, cost and other responsibility sharing. (International Agenda for Migration Management IAMM 2004, 13)

The GCIM Final Report also emphasises the need for cooperation and shared responsibility: "The very nature of transnational migration demands international cooperation and shared responsibility" (Global Commission on International Migration GCIM 2005: 66). In his address to the UN High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development, the Secretary-General reiterated the partnership concept: "Governments are now beginning to see international migration through the prism of opportunity, rather than of fear. You are focused on magnifying the positive, mutually beneficial aspects of migration: on sharing your experiences, developing practical ideas, building partnerships."[9] The 2010 Meeting of the Global Forum on Migration and Development held in Mexico, entitled *Partnerships for Migration and Human Development: Shared Prosperity, Shared Responsibility*,[10] reiterated the partnership discourse.

European Context

In the European context, the emergence of the partnership discourse can be traced back to the beginning of the communitarisation of migration and asylum policy under the Maastricht Treaty (Lavenex and Stucky 2011: 117).[11] Thus, for example, the EU Commission stated that "fighting illegal immigration" can only be effective if it fits "smoothly into a genuine management of migration issues, requiring … enhanced dialogue with third countries, which will increasingly be invited to be partners in dealing with migration" (European Commission 2002: 4). Yet, it was only with the launch of the Global Approach to Migration (GAM) that the partnership discourse gained real momentum, as the Conclusions of the European Summit at Hampton Court demonstrate: "The EU will strengthen its dialogue and cooperation with all those countries on migration issues, including return management, in a spirit of partnership and having regard to the circumstances of each country concerned" (EU Presidency 2005). In its Preparatory Document for the High-Level

---

[9] See: http://www.un.org/migration/sg-speech.html
[10] See http://gfmd.org/en/gfmd-meetings/mexico-2010.html
[11] For a more detailed analysis of the evolution of the partnership discourse in the EU context, see Lavenex and Stucky (2011).

Dialogue on Migration and Development, the Commission also stressed the principles of common interests and shared responsibility, key elements of the partnership discourse:

The EU believes that managing migration is a shared responsibility of countries of origin, transit and destination… Shared responsibility calls for enhanced cooperation between States to better manage migration, taking into account the interests and concerns of all countries involved. (European Commission 2006: 4)

The idea of managing migration in a mutually beneficial way was confirmed in an interview with the European Commission: "It's basically the framework under which you can advance in a set of issues in a balanced manner for both sides to be interested" (Interview with EC Official DG Development, Brussels, October 2009).

The partnership discourse was also taken up in inter-regional relations with Africa and Latin America (Lavenex and Stucky 2011: 123), as illustrated in the joint Africa-EU Declaration on Migration and Development concluded in Tripoli in 2006 that recognises "migration as a common challenge for Europe and Africa" and commits to "a partnership between countries of origin, transit and destination to better manage migration in a comprehensive, holistic and balanced manner, in a spirit of shared responsibility and cooperation" (European Union 2006). Emphasising the win-win-win principle, it further mentions that "meeting the concerns and interests of countries of origin, transit and destination alike, as well as the migrants themselves is an essential part of migration management" (European Union 2006). The partnership approach was also taken up in the Africa-EU Partnership on Migration, Mobility and Employment (European Union 2007), as well as in the Rabat Process, which is a framework for dialogue, bringing together ministers from countries of origin, transit and destination from Africa and Europe.[12]

One particularly interesting element of the partnership approach in the European context are the Mobility Partnerships (EUMPs), which were launched in 2005, as "the most innovative and sophisticated tool" of the GAM (European Commission 2009b). EUMPs are discussed below as a particular governing technology. Yet, they have also been crucial to the expansion of the partnership discourse in the European context. Particular EUMPs have taken up the elements of the partnership discourse, such as the principle of shared responsibility, as illustrated in an information newsletter published by the Moldovan Ministry of Foreign Affairs that describes the EUMP as "an exercise of sharing responsibilities" (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Moldova 2010). Capacity-building, training and technical assistance in asylum, migration and border management is inscribed in the Joint Declarations of all existing EUMPs.

North American Context

In the North American context, the partnership discourse emerged in the late 1990s within broader shifts towards intensifying bilateral and regional cooperation on migration issues in the region. In an early testimony of the partnership discourse, US Secretary of State Christopher reported to the closing session of the Binational Commission (BNC) in May 1994: "Our talks were positive and constructive. The United States and Mexico are friends, neighbours, and partners in an increasingly important and dynamic relationship" (US Department of State 1994). In 1997, President Zedillo and President Clinton signed a Joint Statement on Migration, emphasizing:

---

[12] See : http://www.dialogueuroafricainmd.net/web/the-rabat-process

We … politically commit our respective governments to strive to ensure a proper and respectful management of this complex phenomenon ... Our governments have engaged in consultations and exchange of information through many mechanisms … This constructive dialogue should serve as a first step leading to specific proposals to manage migration between our nations in a mutually beneficial manner (Clinton and Zedillo 1997).

In the initial period of the Fox–Bush relationship in 2001, the partnership discourse appears extensively in official documents, evoking a full, mature, and equitable partnership for prosperity. The understanding of partnership is based on a dialogue between 'equals', and the establishment of common principles and objectives. Thus, President Bush affirmed in 2001: "We have a chance to build a partnership that will improve the lives of citizens in both countries. […] Geography has made us neighbors; cooperation and respect will make us partners" (Bush and Fox 2001). The emphasis on partnership and cooperation represents a shift away from the 'policy of no policy' (Dominguez and Castro 2009, 12) towards an issue that can be addressed through win–win solutions. Migration is reframed from something that either needs to be prevented (from the US perspective) or a natural phenomenon that cannot be regulated (from the Mexican perspective), towards an issue that can be addressed through 'proper and respectful management'. This acknowledgement that migration is a 'shared issue' and the willingness to contribute towards 'managing' migration was a sea change in perspective for Mexico (Interview with former US government official, January 2010). Thereby, the principle of shared responsibility plays a key role, which was made explicit in the Mexican National Development Plan 2001–2006, where the Fox administration emphasized the re-conceptualization of the migration phenomenon and the need for negotiating a comprehensive migration agreement, based on the concept of shared responsibility (Gobierno de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos 2001: 61).

Shared responsibility has also become a key principle underlying the dialogue within the RCM, as the Final Communiqué of the RCM meeting in 2008 states (Regional Conference on Migration 2008) and as a former staff confirmed in an interview: "The issue of partnership and shared responsibility have been constantly mentioned at the RCM" (Interview with RCM member, January 2010). RCM documents repeatedly emphasise the importance of capacity-building, technical and private-public cooperation, as exemplified in the RCM Brochure.[13] These elements also play a key role in local level cross-border forums for dialogue, such as the Border Liaison Mechanisms (BLMs) and the Interior Consultation Mechanisms (ICMs) (see below).

In sum, this section highlights that within the international realm as well as in the European and North American region, through emphasis on common interests, mutual benefits and win-win(-win) solutions the partnership discourse recast international migration governance as an issue in need of cooperation and shared responsibility, preparing the grounds for a number of 'partnership technologies' to be implemented. Through numerous sites of dialogue and interaction, a shared vocabulary and shared interests regarding international migration governance are constructed. This differs from existing studies that have tended to present common interests as pre-existing or naturally converging. The framing of migration as something that can be managed, as well as the emphasis on capacity-building and technical and private-public cooperation turns international migration governance into a space for expert knowledge and intervention. As will be analysed below, this has increased the involvement of a number of 'experts' in international migration and border governance, such as the IOM, the UNHCR, the EU's agency for

---

[13] See : http://www.rcmvs.org

cooperation at the external border FRONTEX, the European Police Office EUROPOL and the European Asylum Support Office (EASO), as well as a range of private actors providing border technology logistics. Finally, through the emphasis on shared responsibility, migration management is now perceived as also a task for countries of origin and transit, which was not the case before. Hence, the partnership discourse responsibilises these countries to the task and creates 'responsible partners'.

Governing Through Partnership

Which are the key technologies of governing through partnership and how do they work as neoliberal governing? This section analyses the technologies that are involved in governing international migration through partnership. It develops the argument that 'partnership technologies' invoke two main forms of governing commonly associated with neoliberal "practices of liberty": technologies of agency and technologies of performance (Dean 1999). Even though they can be distinguished for analytical purposes, they are better understood as working in tandem. The following analysis does not claim to be exhaustive, but merely illustrates the various ways in which neoliberal governmentality has come to influence international migration policy-making.

Technologies of agency

Technologies of agency seek to enhance or deploy the possibility of agency of target populations or institutions in two broad ways that are not mutually exclusive. On the one hand through what has been termed "new contractualism" (Yeatman 1998), i.e. the extra-juridical and quasi-juridical proliferation of contracts, as illustrated in the national context in the agreements for unemployed persons or learning contracts of students (Dean 1999: 196). Such contracts stipulate a set of mutual commitments while leaving the parties to decide on the measures required to live up to these commitments. On the other hand, technologies of agency also comprise what Cruikshank has called "technologies of citizenship" (1993) and Haahr has renamed "technologies of involvement" when applied beyond the national level (Jens, Henrik Haahr 2004: 217). These engage individuals "as active and free citizens, as informed and responsible consumers, as members of self-managing communities and organizations, as actors in democratizing social movements, and as agents capable of taking control of our own risks" (Dean 1999: 196). The objective of technologies of agency is thus to transform the status, attitudes and behaviour of individuals or institutions and to construct the involved parties as active participants in common projects (Jens, Henrik Haahr 2004: 218). In the context of the partnership approach in international migration governance, contractualism and technologies of involvement can be identified in numerous sites.

In the European context, these technologies are used most prominently in the context of EUMPs, which have become a key instrument of migration policy. EUMPs promote the integration of countries of origin in a dialogue on, and in the implementation of, migration management. EUMPs take the form of legally non-binding Joint Declarations signed by the European Commission, the Presidency of the EU, interested EU member states and the partner country (European Commission 2009a: 4). Reflecting the GAM principles, the Joint Declarations consist of three parts: mobility and legal migration, migration and development, and border management and the fight against irregular migration. The annex of the

Joint Declarations contains the particular projects to be implemented, which include information campaigns, cooperation with EU institutions like Frontex (e.g. training of border guards), the creation of channels and possibilities for legal migration. EUMPs were concluded with Cape Verde (2008), Moldova (2008), Georgia (2009), Armenia (2011) and negotiations are under way with Morocco and Tunisia, whereas Egypt refused to enter into concrete talks (European Commission 2012: 13). EUMPs aim to "boost political and technical dialogue on migration matters" and "improve synergies, coherence and mutual understanding" (Weinar 2011: 9), as reaffirmed in the Joint Declaration of the EUMP with Georgia: "The Mobility Partnership is conceived as a long term framework based on political dialogue and cooperation" (Council of the European Union 2009).

EUMPs are the expression of an agreement on a set of mutual commitments, rendering them official, visible and quasi-contractual, which then allows for monitoring and evaluating progress in implementing the commitments of individual parties, in this case mostly the institutions of the partner states. This creates a sort of peer pressure among states to self-govern in line with international 'good practice' norms on border and migration management, in order not to be perceived as a 'failed' state or security risk by the international community. EUMPs involve partner states as active participants in the common project of managing migration. Partner states are under constant monitoring and evaluation regarding their progress in implementing partnership activities and effecting changes to migration management practices, legislation and institutions (European Commission 2011: 8). This can be illustrated with the Moldovan case: In its 2011 newsletter, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Moldova lists among the impacts of the EUMP its participation in the GFMD in Mexico, where it presented the national experience in the field of migration, "addressing the most important achievements and initiatives of the Moldovan Government", i.e. the Extended Migration Profile, and activities related to the creation of a professional training and development system in Moldova (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Moldova 2011). Thereby, it proudly emphasises that "Moldovan practices and experience were appreciated by the EU and IOM officials, and were included in the category of Good Practices" (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Moldova 2011). Thus, the 'good student' Moldova has incorporated the international principles of migration management and is actively promoting them in international fora as 'good practice'.

In the North American context, contractualism and technologies of involvement work in numerous sites. A first site is the *Working Group on Migration and Consular Affairs of the Binational Commission* (BNC), a forum for regular meetings between Mexican and US Cabinet-level officials (Bush Administration 2001).[14] This Working Group led to the institutionalization of channels for regular communication, information exchange and trust-building. Its focus was mainly on so-called 'technical cooperation', such as the exchange of information and procedural issues linked to repatriation or the coordination of anti-trafficking initiatives. A second site in the Mexico-US context, includes a number of bilateral migration governance initiatives emerged, such as the Border Liaison Mechanisms (BLMs) and the Interior Consultation Mechanisms (ICMs). BLMs brought together local, municipal, state and federal officials from both sides of the border and business and community representatives to discuss issues of 'mutual interest', including public safety and law enforcement issues, and to develop joint actions to help resolve local problems, such as cross-border law enforcement issues, health concerns, and coordination of port security and operation.[15] ICMs were similar instruments in the interior of the US, aimed at "sharing information concerning migratory practices and procedures

---

[14] For a more detailed analysis of the BNC see Kunz 2011.
[15] See http://mexico.usembassy.gov/eng/releases/ep050824BLM.html (Accessed July 2012)

by authorities on both sides of the border, and resolving problems at the local level" (Clinton and Zedillo Administration 1996). All these initiatives aimed at increasing dialogue and trust-building and creating shared understandings of migration issues. Through regular and sustained cooperation, different partners were brought into the governing of international migration both at the state-level with Mexican government officials, and at the local level, where various officials as well as civil society and private actors were enrolled in the common project of effective, win-win-win migration governance.

Another site in which technologies of agency are at work in the North American (and Central American) region is the Regional Consultation Mechanism (RCM), which was established in 1996, bringing together eleven states from the North and Central America region.[16] The RCM concentrates on three themes: migration policy and management, in particular human trafficking and smuggling and return; human rights of migrants; and migration and development.[17] RCM activities focus on dialogue, sharing best practices, and capacity-building and technical cooperation, implemented with the assistance of the IOM. It has elaborated a Plan of Action that is available online and contains the objectives, the activities of the different member states as well as an execution schedule monitoring implementation.[18] The RCM has also developed a number of regional guidelines on particular topics linked to migration, such as the *Regional Guidelines for Special Protection in Cases of Repatriation of Child Victims of Trafficking* (2007), *Guidelines for the Signing Of Multi and/or Bilateral Agreements Between Member Countries of the Regional Conference on Migration (RCM) Regarding the Repatriation of Regional Migrants by Land* (2004).[19] Through these activities, the RCM contributes to spread norms of migration and border management and the principle of shared responsibility. They also act to mobilise the agency of member states and to enrol them in conforming to certain guidelines regarding migration governance. The focus on best practice sharing and the monitoring process acts to visibilise what each country is doing, puts the member states in competition with each other on who is doing more and being most active. As a result, Central American countries have established new, or reformed existing, migration and border management institutions and legislation. Migration officials have been hired and have undergone training given by US officials or IOM representatives. In addition, detention centres co-funded by the US have been established in a number of Central American countries to intercept and deal with undocumented migrants prior to their arrival to the US (Interview with former US government official, January 2010).

In sum, technologies of agency mobilise and govern the agency of partner states and turn them into active participants of international migration governance. Thereby, sites of deliberation, consultation and negotiation are established and non- or quasi-juridical forms of contracts are established in order to make mutual commitments on the management of migration visible and hold the parties accountable. The various efforts to systematise the creation and exchange of information also serve this aim of rendering visible and holding accountable. Yet, it is not only partner states that are enrolled through partnerships, but also migrants and migration management experts – which can be rendered visible through the concept of technologies of performance.

---

[16] See http://www.rcmvs.org/

[17] Ibid.

[18] See : http://www.rcmvs.org/plan_accion.htm

[19] See : http://www.rcmvs.org/Publicaciones/Publicaciones.htm

Technologies of performance

Technologies of performance are based on the increasingly important role that experts and expert authority play in neoliberal governing. They are defined as the "plural technologies of government designed to penetrate the enclosures of expertise fostered under the welfare state and to subsume the substantive domains of expertise (of the doctor, the nurse, the social worker, the school principal, the professor) to new formal calculative regimes" (Dean 1999: 197). Through performance indicators, benchmarking, quality controls and best practice standards, the performance of individuals and institutions is monitored, measured and rendered visible and amenable to optimisation. Thereby, "partners and stakeholders are enwrapped in webs of knowledge and circuits of communication through which their actions can be shaped and steered and by means of which they can steer themselves" (Rose 1999: 147). Experts play various roles: they become involved in providing information that will allow the assessment of the performance and the government of a particular entity. They also tutor in the techniques of self-government (Rose 1999: 147).

In the field of international migration governance, the IOM plays a crucial role as an expert in facilitating technologies of performance, which stands in a certain contrast to its quite narrow formal mandate. The IOM provides a number of services to countries of origin that encourage them to become aware of the migration situation and their migration management needs. One key element are migration profiles, which are analyses of the migration situation within a country, containing information on the labour market situation, a country's need for skilled labour, skilled labour available in the diaspora, migration flows, financial flows resulting from migration, and aspects concerning gender and age.[20] The IOM is prominently involved in preparing such migration profiles.[21] The preparation process promotes discussion about migration policy and is linked to "a range of capacity-building and policy-development activities that aim to improve the basis for coherent policymaking and foster country ownership".[22] Migration profiles have evolved into Extended Migration Profiles, supported by the European Commission, which are long-term processes including consultation with various actors and a monitoring phase: "Rather then an end to itself, a Migration Profile is the beginning of a process"[23] Thus, far from being 'neutral' analyses, these profiles contribute to foster a particular consensus about the understanding of migration and 'good' migration policy, and to develop particular forms of migration policy-making in 'partner' states. They establish the grounds upon which different partner states can be compared regarding their migration policy, systematising comparison and evaluation. Thereby, they encourage the self-government of states of origin who become responsibilised for international migration management.

The IOM is also involved as an expert in the elaboration of EUMPS. Thus, for example, after the EU decided to propose a EUMP to Georgia, IOM helped Georgian officials to design a 'wish-list' that includes the areas in which Georgia would like closer cooperation with the EU (Interview with Official from Mission of Georgia to the EC, Brussels, October 2009; Interview with IOM Georgia, June 2011). As outlined above, in the North American context, the IOM is also prominently involved in the RCM: it is in charge of the secretariat and most onging activities, such as elaborating guidelines on migration management (Interview with RCM member,

---

[20] See http://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/policies/external/external_ga_tools_en.htm

[21] See http://www.iom.int/jahia/Jahia/policy-research/migration-research/migration-profiles

[22] ibid

[23] See : https://www.iom.int/cms/en/sites/iom/home/what-we-do/migration-policy-and-research/migration-research-1/migration-profiles.html

January 2010). IOM thus plays a key role in technologies of performance, diffusing a particular understanding of migration governance and in offering services to address the needs created therewith.

Migration Profiles, 'wish-lists' and guidelines are all part of a broader phenomenon of a global geography of migration- and border-related pedagogy installed by the IOM and other migration management experts (Andrijasevic and Walters 2010: 988). This includes a three-volume publication Essentials of Migration Management (EMM) that serves as a learning tool and the related Essentials of Migration Management newsletter, which provide the basis for migration management training sessions. The EMM has been used for training in the framework of the Migration Dialogue for Southern Africa (MIDSA) and the Migration Dialogue for Western Africa (MIDWA), and is promoted as a "support (for) the RCPs' dialogue by providing a solid knowledge of basic migration issues" (International Organisation for Migration 2006). For instance, the EMM asks: "What are the land and sea boundaries that your state is responsible for" (Andrijasevic and Walters 2010: 988). Thereby, it reaffirms the importance of border governance and states' responsibility for the governance of migration. Frontex has also developed a training manual, the Common Core Curriculum for basic border guard training (CCC), through which 'partner' countries have progressively taken on board EU training standards and border management.[24] This encourages partner countries to self-govern along these lines.

Experts are not only involved in information provision and monitoring, but also in technical cooperation and capacity-building, which is key to the partnership approach. A recent Commission Communication regarding the establishment of EUMPs with southern Mediterranean countries following the 'Arab spring' emphasises: "The EU will support, both technically and financially, the efforts made by the partner country, including through the EU Agencies (Frontex, EASO and EUROPOL)" (European Commission 2011: 11). Thus, for instance, instance, the activities mentioned in the Joint Declaration of the EUMP with Moldova include the "sharing of knowledge and best practices", whereby Italy proposes to train Moldovan officials, and study visits and exchange of experiences between administrations of various EU member states and Moldova are organised (Council of the European Union 2008). EUMPs also include "a package of capacity building measures to be implemented in the partner countries" in various areas, such as the management of irregular migration, legal migration, refugee flows, diaspora policies, integration, etc. (European Commission 2011: 9). The IOM supports a project for "supporting the implementation of the EU Moldova Mobility Partnership by strengthening the Moldovan institutional capacity to better manage all aspects of migratory flows through the establishment of a Migration Technical Facility and a Migration Profile".[25]

Creating (Responsible) Partners

Which subjectivities that are (re-)produced through the partnership technologies analysed above? A governmentality analysis examines the ways in which the migration partnership approach seeks to produce and transform specific types of partners – instead of assuming their pre-existence. Through the migration partnership approach, countries of origin and transit are turned into responsible

---

[24] See : http://www.frontex.europa.eu/news/common-training-standards-for-the-eu-border-guard-services-kzNUsM
[25] See : http://www.iom.md/index.php/en/programs/migrationa-development/mobility-partnership/137.

partners that are willing to manage international migration according to international standards of 'good practice', to cooperate on joint border and anti-trafficking initiatives and to stem undocumented migration. As a result, partner countries have initiated far-reaching institutional and legislative transformations, and some have made emigration more difficult, seriously restricting the freedom of mobility of their citizens. Further, enabled through new legislation on migration management, new migration and border management institutions have been created.

This subjectivity of active responsible partners is expressed in myriad ways. In the European context, the partnership approach creates a situation whereby potential partner countries have to prove worthy of becoming partners through showing interest and willingness to cooperate with the EU on migration and border issues (Interview with EU Commissioner, 2009). Thus, third states are not a priori potential partners, but first have to be turned into partners, by showing their commitment. This is illustrated in a recent Commission Communication regarding the establishment of partnerships with southern Mediterranean countries following the 'Arab spring':

During the preparatory phase, the Southern Mediterranean countries would be requested to make progress towards building capacity for the efficient management of migration and to contribute towards establishing a secure environment for mobility, as conditions for the fair and sustainable implementation of the Mobility Partnership. (European Commission 2011: 11)

However, it is up to the EU to decide which countries are responsible enough to become partners. This production of partners is illustrated in the following statement:

We always wanted two things: that the country in question wants to be a partner. So they usually would give a sign that they were potentially interested, either by sending an ambassador to talk to our director or to the Member States or they would write a letter or something. (Interview with EC Official DG JLS, Brussels, October 2009)

Thus, partner countries need to prove they are 'good students', as has been shown for Cape Verde and Moldova . The example of the good student Moldova detailed above illustrates this point and highlights how Extended Migration Profiles play important roles in (re-)producing responsible partner countries. This clearly goes beyond 'identifying partners' and is more a matter of constructing specific types of partners.

In the case of North America, Mexico has been turned into an active responsible partner. This can be illustrated through the way in which the notion of shared responsibility has become included into the Mexican National Development Plan 2001–2006, where the Fox administration emphasized the intention to re-conceptualize the migration phenomenon: "We need comprehensive negotiations that address the structural roots of the phenomenon, its manifestations and consequences, and that consider migration management as a shared responsibility" (Gobierno de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos 2001: 61) [My translation]. Mexico officially acknowledges its responsibilities for the migration phenomenon, whereas previously migration was perceived as an immigration problem of the US. Similarly, as detailed above, in the context of the RCM, there are a number of monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place that ensure that Central American countries learn lessons and implement good practices of migration management.[26]

---

[26] ibid

Yet, it is not only states that are turned into 'partners' within the partnership approach, but also migrants. In most cases, the emphasis is on migrants as partners for development in the context of migration-linked development initiatives. Yet, there are also activities that aim at turning migrants into active partners in return policy-making, such as in their own deportation or the deportation of their co-nationals. Thus, for example, Andrijasevic and Walters (2011) analyse the case of a 2002 IOM programme in the Netherlands, which offers migrants financial incentives to return to their countries of origin. In an effort of targeted governance, these programmes "explore and experiment with ways of enlisting the cooperation of migrants in their own expulsion through the provision of forms of information, assistance, and financial inducement" (Andrijasevic and Walters 2010: 994). In the context of EUMPs, the Moldovan example illustrates this attempt to responsibilise migrants for migration management. A European Training Foundation representative explained:

I think after three years now they really start to get to the level of individual migrants. There is the involvement of the diaspora communities in different European member states. They are informed about MPs. They are informed about job opportunities when they come back to Moldova. They are asked to contribute to small activities perhaps to inform new migrants, to help them, to integrate in the country of destination. So they are more actively given the responsibility. (Interview with ETF, Moldova, June 2011)

In the North American context, a number of programmes aim at producing self-governing subjects who regulate their conduct to facilitate international migration governance. This can be seen, for example, in the context of the SENTRI programme27 between Mexico and the US, and the NEXUS programme between Canada and the US28 (Grondin and De Larrinaga 2008). These programmes promote a particular subjectivity of the neoliberal citizen who is efficient, productive and self-maximising, but also includes a hierarchical citizenry, enforced through temporary work agreements or pre-clearance programmes (Gilbert 2007: 79). An anecdotal example from the Swiss context points to recent attempts by the Swiss government to involve certain groups of legal migrants to convince their 'irregular' co-nationals to return voluntarily. Through individualisation of migrants and through competition among them, such initiatives contribute to create active and responsible migrant partner subjects and hierarchies among them: the potential worthy and useful partners who become the target of courting strategies by the government, and the undesired 'deportable' undocumented migrants who become the objects of policy interventions.

Conclusion

The central concern of this article has been to provide an account of the contributions of a governmentality perspective to the understanding of partnerships in international migration governance. This perspective allowed me to reconceptualise migration partnerships as a form of governing, which reveals the ways in which migration partnership approach is embedded in broader shifts towards neoliberal governmentality. This seeks to challenge the tendency in the existing literature to underestimate the importance of partnerships for the governance of international migration when conceptualising migration partnerships as a mere policy instrument. Instead, the analysis demonstrates how the

---

27 See: http://www.cbp.gov/xp/cgov/travel/trusted_traveler/sentri/
28 See: http://www.cbp.gov/xp/cgov/travel/trusted_traveler/nexus_prog/nexus.xml

partnership discourse frames international migration and migration policies in a particular way that prepares the grounds for neoliberal technologies of governing, and creates new state and migrant subjectivities. Through technologies of agency partner states and migrants are enrolled as 'free' subjects to participate as active partners in the governance of international migration, as established in (quasi-)contractual joint agreements establishing mutual commitments, thus reforming attitudes, institutions and legislation. Technologies of performance promote expert authority and self-governing in international migration governance. Through various instruments such as best practices standards or benchmarking, the performance of state and migrant partners is measured and rendered visible and amenable to steering and self-optimisation. This analysis shows the contradictory nature of neoliberal rule: it opens up new possibilities of agency for its subject, but at the same time restrains and shapes this agency. Thus, the partnership approach allows for a certain room of agency for state and migrant partners, yet also shapes this agency in particular ways as to turn them into responsible and self-governing partners. Thereby, these subjects are turned into active responsible partners governing themselves according to the principles of 'good practice' in migration management. Yet, at the same time, the partnership approach allows for the presumption of state sovereignty to be retained: it facilitates cooperation because the issues to be addressed are presented as 'outside' and as posing little challenge to national sovereignty. Moreover, it opens space for the intervention of experts, and seeks to influence the conduct of subjects by responsibilising countries of origin and transit, and to some extent migrants themselves, to the task of migration and border management. Thus, couched in terms of cooperation between sovereign states, i.e. "without shattering their formally distinct or 'autonomous' character" (Miller and Rose 1990: 14), the partnership approach quietly operates to transform legislation, institutions and practice in countries of origin and transit regarding migration management. Yet, these transformations are not left unchallenged and provoke new forms of resistance. A proper analysis of these forms of resistance goes beyond the scope of this paper and more empirical research is needed.

Bibliography[29]

Abrahamsen, Rita (2004). "The Power of Partnerships in Global Governance." *Third World Quarterly* 25 (8): 1453–1467.

Andrijasevic, Rutvica, and William Walters (2010). "The International Organization for Migration and the International Government of Borders." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 28 (6): 977 – 999.

Bendel, P. (2009). "Die Migrationspolitik Der Europäischen Union." *Zuwanderung Im Zeichen Der Globalisierung*: 123–135.

Betts, Alexander (2011). *Global Migration Governance*. Oxford University Press.

Boucher, Gerard (2008). "A Critique of Global Policy Discourses on Managing International Migration." *Third World Quarterly* 29 (7) (October): 1461–1471.

De Bruycker, Phillippe, and Anne Weyembergh. "The External Dimension of the European Area of Freedom, Security and Justice." In *The European Union and Global Governance*, edited by Jens-Uwe Wunderlich and David Bailey, Routledge, 210–232.

Bush Administration (2001). "Fact Sheet on Binational Commission." http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010904-10.html.

Bush, G.W., and Vicente Fox (2001). "Joint Press Conference, San Cristobal, Mexico." http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/02/20010216-3.html.

Cassarino, Jean-Pierre (2009). "EU Mobility Partnerships: Expression of a New Compromise." *The Migration Information Source*. September. http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?ID=741.

Chou, Meng-Hsuan (2009). "European Union Migration Strategy Towards West Africa: The Origin and Outlook of 'mobility Partnerships' with Cape Verde and Senegal". Paper presented at EUSA Biennial International Conference Information and Ideas on the European Union, Los Angeles. http://www.unc.edu/euce/eusa2009/papers/chou_08C.pdf.

Clinton and Zedillo Administration (1996). "Memorandum of Understanding on Consular Protection of Mexican and United States Nationals." http://www.migracioninternacional.com/docum/index.html?buttonbot=memora_i.html.

Clinton, Bill, and Ernesto Zedillo (1997). "Joint Statement on Migration." http://www.migracioninternacional.com/docum/index.html?buttonbot=joint.html.

Council of the European Union (2008). "Joint Declaration on A Mobility Partnership Between the European Union and the Republic of Moldova". Doc. 9460/08 ADD1.

——— (2009) "Joint Declaration on A Mobility Partnership Between the European Union and the Republic of Georgia". Doc. 16396/09 ADD1.

Dahlstedt, M. (2009). "The Partnering Society: Governmentality, Partnerships and Active Local Citizenship." *The Open Urban Studies Journal* 2: 18–27.

Dean, Mitchell (1999). *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. SAGE.

---

[29] All websites were accessed on 22 February 2013, unless indicated otherwise.

Dominguez, Jorge I., and Rafael Fernández de Castro (2009). *The United States and Mexico: Between Partnership and Conflict*. Taylor & Francis.

Dreher, Sabine (2007). *Neoliberalism and Migration: An Inquiry Into the Politics of Globalization*. Lit.

EU Presidency (2005). "EU Presidency Conclusions, Hampton Court European Summit". Hampton Court.

European Commission (2002). "On a Community Return Policy on Illegal Residents". COM(2002)564. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2002:0564:FIN:EN:PDF.

——— (2006). "Contribution to the EU Position for the United Nations, High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development". COM (2006)409.

——— (2009a). "Staff Working Document on Mobility Partnerships as a Tool of the Global Approach to Migration". SEC (2009) 1240 final.

——— (2009b). "Mobility Partnerships as a Tool of the Global Approach to Migration". COM(2009)1240.

——— (2011). "A Dialogue for Migration, Mobility and Security with the Southern Mediterranean Countries". COM(2011)292.

——— (2012). "Delivering on a New European Neighbourhood Policy."

European Union (2006). "Joint Africa–EU Declaration on Migration and Development, Tripoli Declaration." http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/47fdfb010.html.

——— (2007). "EU–Africa Partnership on Migration, Mobility and Employment." http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/repository/EAS2007_action_plan_migration_en.pdf#zoom=100.

Fargues, Phillippe, Demetrios Papademetriou, Giambattista Salinari, and Madeleine Sumption (2011). *Shared Challenges and Opportunities for EU and US Immigration Policymakers*. Florence and Washington, DC: European University Institute and Migration Policy Institute. http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/US-EUimmigration systems-finalreport.pdf.

Foucault, Michel (2012). *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.

Gilbert, Emily (2007). "Leaky Borders and Solid Citizens: Governing Security, Prosperity and Quality of Life in a North American Partnership." *Antipode* 39 (1): 77–98.

Glendinning, Caroline, Martin A. Powell, and Kirstein Rummery (2002). *Partnerships, New Labour and the Governance of Welfare*. The Policy Press.

Global Commission on International Migration GCIM (2005). "Migration in an Interconnected World: New Directions for Action, Final Report". Geneva.

Gobierno de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos (2001). "Plan Nacional De Desarrollo 2001–2006." http://dgpp.sep.gob.mx/planeacion/pdf%20inf/PND.pdf.

Grondin, David, and Miguel de Larrinaga (2008). "Securing Prosperity or Making Securitization Prosper." *International Journal* 64: 667.

Haahr, Jens, Henrik (2004). "Open Co-ordination as Advanced Liberal Government." *Journal of European Public Policy* 11 (2) (April 1): 209–230.

Haahr, Jens Henrik, and William Walters (2005). *Governing Europe: Discourse, Governmentality and European Integration*. Taylor & Francis.

International Agenda for Migration Management IAMM (2004). "Chairman's Summary, Presented at Berne II Conference, Berne, Switzerland, December."

International Organisation for Migration (2006). "Essentials of Migration Management Newsletter 2."

Kunz, Rahel, Sandra Lavenex, and Marion Panizzon (2011). *Multilayered Migration Governance: The Promise of Partnership*. Taylor & Francis.

Larner, Wendy (2000). "Neo-liberalism: Policy, Ideology, Governmentality." *Studies in Political Economy* 63.

Larner, Wendy and David Craig (2005). "After Neoliberalism? Community Activism and Local Partnerships in Aotearoa New Zealand." *Antipode* 37 (3): 402–424.

Lavenex, Sandra and Rahel Kunz (2008). "The Migration–Development Nexus in EU External Relations." *Journal of European Integration* 30 (3) (July): 439–457.

Lavenex, Sandra and Rachel Stucky (2011). "Partnering for Migration in EU External Relations." In *Multilayered Migration Governance: The Promise of Partnership*, edited by Rahel Kunz, Sandra Lavenex, and Marion Panizzon, 116–142. London; New York: Routledge.

Lemke, Thomas (2001). "'The Birth of Bio-politics': Michel Foucault's Lecture at the Collège De France on Neo-liberal Governmentality." *Economy and Society* 30 (2) (January): 190–207.

Maisenbacher, Julia (2011). "Neoliberal Migration Policy: A Neogramscian Perspective on EU Mobility Partnerships". MA Dissertation, University of Lucerne.

Miller, Peter, and Nikolas Rose (1990). "Governing Economic Life." *Economy and Society* 19 (1): 1–28.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Moldova (2010). "Mobility Partnership Moldova European Union, Information Newsletter 2." http://www.mfa.gov.md/img/docs/bi_mp_nr2_en.pdf.

——— (2011). "Mobility Partnership Moldova European Union, Information Newsletter 3." http://www.mfa.gov.md/img/docs/buletin-parteneriat-mobilitate-III-eng.pdf.

Overbeek, Henk (2002). "Neoliberalism and the Regulation of Global Labor Mobility." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 581 (1): 74–90.

Parkes, R. (2009). "EU Mobility Partnerships: a Model of Policy Coordination?" *European Journal of Migration and Law* 11 (4): 327–345.

Parusel, Bernd (2010). *Abschottungs- und Anwerbungsstrategien: Die Interessen Der EU-Institutionen Bei Der Entwicklung Einer Gemeinsamen Politik Zur Steuerung Der Arbeitsmigration*. Springer DE.

Pellerin, Helene (1999a). "Regionalisation of Migration Policies and Its Limits: Europe and North America Compared." *Third World Quarterly* 20 (5): 995–1011.

——— (1999b). "The Cart Before the Horse? The Coordination of Migration Policies in the Americas and the Neoliberal Economic Project of Integration." *Review of International Political Economy* 6 (4): 468–493.

——— (2004). "Economic Integration and Security: New Key Factors in Managing International Migration." *Choices* 10 (6). http://irpp.org/choices/archive/vol10no6.pdf.

Regional Conference on Migration (2008). "Declaration of the XIII Regional Conference on Migration (RCM) Tela, Honduras." http://www.rcmvs.org/pagina_n1.htm.

Reslow, Natasja (2012). "Deciding on EU External Migration Policy: The Member States and the Mobility Partnerships." *Journal of European Integration* 34 (3): 223–239.

Rose, Nikolas (1993). "Government, Authority and Expertise in Advanced Liberalism." *Economy and Society* 22 (3) (August): 283–299.

——— (1999). *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge University Press.

US Department of State (1994). "The United States and Mexico: Friends, Neighbors, and Partners, US-Mexico Binational Commission Meeting: Mexico City."

Walters, William (2012). *Governmentality: Critical Encounters*. Routledge.

Weinar, Agnieszka (2011). "EU Cooperation Challenges in External Migration Policy." *EU-US Immigration Systems* 2011 (02). Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, San Domenico Di Fiesole (FI): European University Institute.

Yeatman, Anna (1998). "Interpreting Contemporary Contractualism." In *Governing Australia: Studies in Contemporary Rationalities of Government*, edited by Mitchell Dean and Barry Hindess, 227–41.

Dans la collection
« Travaux de Science Politique »

Disponibles sur www.unil.ch/iepi

57. **Gilles Descloux** (2013). Déviance et stratégies de conservation de l'estime de soi chez les jeunes de catégorie populaire en quête d'insertion professionnelle.

56. **Pierre Eichenberger, Sébastien Guex, Cédric Humair et André Mach** (2013). Les organisations patronales suisses : Bilan historiographique et perspectives de recherche.

55. **Andrea Plata, Mattia Pacella et Oscar Mazzoleni** (2012). Verso il parlamento. Candidati, partiti e campagna elettorale nelle elezioni cantonali ticinesi del 2011.

54**. Jean-Christophe Graz et Patrick Csikos** (2012). Satellizing Galileo? Non-state authority and interoperability standards in the European Global Navigation Satellite System.

53. **Claire Dupuy et Julie Pollard** (2012). Retour sur une source écrite centrale pour l'analyse des politiques publiques.

52. **Jean-Marie Chenou** (2012). Élitisme dans la politique mondiale. Le rôle des acteurs transnationaux dans les nouvelles formes de gouvernance.

51. **Oscar Mazzoleni, Mattia Pacella et Andrea Plata** (2011). Le elezioni cantonali ticinesi del 2011. Partecipazione e orientamento di voto fra lealtà, defezione, protesta.

50. **Olivier Fillieule** (2011). Disengagement process from radical organizations. What is so different when it comes to exclusive groups?

49. **Olivier Fillieule et Philippe Blanchard** (2011). Fighting Together. Assessing Continuity and Change in Social Movement Organizations Through the Study of Constituencies' Heterogeneity.

48. **Jean-Christophe Graz et Eva Hartmann** (2010). Global regulation of the knowledge-based economy : The rise of standards in educational services.

47. **Jean-Christophe Graz et Nafy Niang** (2010). Standards and services offshoring in India : Moving beyond industry and institutional specificities.

46. **Maude Gex** (2010). Le divin profané par Da Vine ? La Contestation du brevet sur l'ayahuasca et les débats autour de la biopiraterie.

45. **Pacella Mattia** (2010). Qui gouverne le Tessin? Les Elites politiques cantonales tessinoises : l'évolution du profil sociologique des Conseillers d'Etat de 1905 à nos jours.

44. **Aline Mugny** (2010). Analyse du processus de réétatisation du secteur des

eaux urbaines dans l'aire métropolitaine du Buenos Aires (1993-2009).

43. **Nicolas Rieder** (2009). La diffusion scientifique dans les Expositions universelles. Les sciences anthropologiques à l'Exposition universelle de Paris en 1889 et à la World's Columbian Exposition de Chicago en 1893.

42. **Philip Balsiger, Yassin Boughaba, Gwendoline Véniat** (2009). Conflit du travail et investissements militants. Les grèves des employés.es de Swissmetal à Reconvilier (2004-2006).

41. **Dietmar Braun** (2009). Federalism in South Africa – Can it work?

40. **Romain Bertrand** (2009). Habermas au Bengale, ou comment "provincialiser l'Europe" avec Dipesh Chakrabarty.

39. **Oscar Mazzoleni et Hervé Rayner** (2008). Une coalition gouvernementale durable. Emergence, institutionnalisation et crise de la «formule magique» en Suisse (1959-2003).

38. **Andrin Hauri** (2008). Les conséquences de la barrière de séparation entre Israël et la Cisjordanie à court et à long terme. Les perspectives pour la fondation d'un État palestinien.

37. **André Mach et Andrea Pilotti** (2008). Professionnalisation et changements de profils des parlementaires suisses au cours de la période récente (1980-2000)

36. **Olivier Fillieule** (2008). Travail militant, action collective et rapports de genre.

35. **Olivier Fillieule et Philippe Blanchard** (2008). INdividual SUrvey in RAllies (INSURA). A New Tool for Exploring Transnational Activism.

34. **Dupuis Johann** (2008). Analyse politique des conditions de succès et d'échec des marchés de droits d'émissions.

33. **Dietmar Braun et Björn Uhlmann** (2007). Ideas and Power in Swiss Health Care Party Politics.

32. **Fabrizio Gilardi, Katharina Füglister, Stéphane Luyet** (2007). Learning from Others: The Diffusion of Hospital Financing Reforms in OECD Countries.

31. **Natalia Gerodetti** (2007). Enduring Legacies – Intersecting Discourses in the Context of Eugenics.

30. **Véronique Mottier** (2007). Meaning, Identity, Power : Metaphors and Discourse Analysis.

29. **Olivier Fillieule** (2007). On n'y voit rien ! Le recours aux sources de presse pour l'analyse des mobilisations protestataires.

28. **Kathrin Daepp** (2006). La re-régulation sélective de la finance internationale : l'initiative sur les pays ou territoires non-coopératifs du GAFI.

27. **Martino Maggetti** (2006). Assessing the De Facto Independence of Regulatory Agencies. The Case of the Swiss Federal Banking Commission in the 1990?

26. **Dietmar Braun** (2006). Modernising Federalism. Towards Convergence in the Organisation of Intergovernmental Relations?

25. **Gilardi Fabrizio** (2006). The Same, but Different. Central Banks, Regulatory Agencies, and the Politics of Delegation to Independent Authorities.

24. **Péchu Cécile** (2006). Entre résistance et contestation. La genèse du squat comme mode d'action.

23. **Gotheil Sarah** (2005) ACCOBAMS. Les pays de mer noire, méditerranée et zone atlantique adjacente s'unissent pour la protection des cétacés.

22. **Schnyder, Gerhard, Martin Lüpold, André Mach et Thomas David** (2005) The Rise and Decline of the Swiss Company Network during the 20th Century.

21. **Buffat Aurélien** (2005) La mise en oeuvre de la réforme de l'armée suisse « Armée XXI » : les changements vécus à l'interne. Etude de cas des militaires professionnels des écoles, hôpital de la place d'armes de Moudon.

20. **Rey Léonard** (2005) La construction du marché intérieur suisse à la lumière de l'expérience européenne : centralité et intervention contrastée des Hautes Cours dans les processus d'intégration économique.

19. **Csikos Patrick** (2005) Emergence d'une nouvelle gouvernance internationale privée/publique : les cas des agences de notation financière et des normes comptables.

18. **Voegtli Michael** (2004) Entre paternalisme et Etat social. Le cas de la fabrique de chocolat Suchard (1870-1940).

17. **Chinotti Luca** (2004) Les effets de l'Accord sur l'Agriculture de l'Uruguay Round sur les pays en développement. Une entrave ou une opportunité pour le développement?.

16. **Afonso Alexandre** (2004) Internationalisation, économie et politique migratoire dans la Suisse des années 1990.

15. **Freymond Nicolas** (2003) La question des institutions dans la science politique contemporaine: l'exemple du néo-institutionnalisme.

14. **Steiner Yves** (2003) Le coût réel de l'indépendance de la banque centrale: économie politique comparée de la Deutsche Bundesbank et de la Banque du Japon dans les années soixante-dix.

13. **Braun Dietmar** (1999) Toward a heuristic framework of the Territorial division of Power in comparative public Policy research.

12. **Braun Dietmar** (1998) Bringing State structures back in: The Significance of Political Arena's in Political Decision-making.

11. **Kübler Daniel** (1996) Neighbourhood conflicts and dialogues.

10. **Mach André** (1995) Représentation des intérêts et capacité d'adaptation de l'économie suisse.

9. **Sancey Yves** (1995) Le Gentlemen's agreement de 1927. Lutte autour de la (non-)politisation de l'exportation du capital.

8. **Kübler Daniel** (1993) L'Etat face à la toxicomanie, action publique et contrat social.

7. **Leresche Jean-Philippe** (1993) Les transformations du pouvoir local en Suisse.

6. **Voutat Bernard** (1993) Les minorités territoriales, quelques considérations théoriques.

5. **Voutat Bernard** (1992) Les origines sociales de la "question jurassienne".

4. **Seiler Daniel-Louis** (1991) Le cas des partis politiques dans les nouvelles démocraties de l'Est européen.

3. **Kobi Silvia** (1991) Les "Neinsager" dans le processus référendaire suisse: des variations sur un thème mythique.

2. **Papadopoulos Ioannis** (1991) La Suisse: un "Sonderfall" pour la théorie politique?.

Spang Nadia (1991) Scholarly View of Japan throughout the XXth Century.

Vaziri Shahrokh (1990) Eléments de réflexion sur les partis politiques et références idéologiques dans le Tiers Monde.