



Introduction

Rose Baaba Folson and Hijin Park

The transformation of the global economy is contributing to a new international economic order that is dominated by financial centres, global markets and transnational firms. Politicians across the world are warning their labour forces that in order to survive the increasing competition, they must embrace “the inevitability of both the mobility of the workplace and the redundancy of traditional skills” (Papastergiadis 2000). Thus, economies of nation-states are rapidly restructuring in response to the mobility of transnational capital, the development of new production and distribution techniques, and rapid technological advances.

Every nation-state is believed to be the product of multiple overlapping generations of immigrants (Stalker 2001), who embody the most ubiquitous aspect of globalization (Sassen 1998, 1999, 2000; Castles and Miller 1998; Held et al. 1999). It is important to stress that these twin processes of migration and globalization, although old, did not necessarily emerge in the same period in history. D. Held’s usage of the term “globalization of migration” indicates the presence of migration before it was *globalized*, which might serve as a useful distinction (1999: 283–326). Held defines globalization of migration as transoceanic or transcontinental movements that preceded the formation of nation-states. He cites the flows of enslaved Africans to the Americas from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries, prior to the existence of African nation-states. He looks at the movements of people by situating these movements in four historical periods of globalization: the “pre-modern period,” which covers an enormously long period around nine to eleven thousand years ago; the “early modern era” covers the period circa 1500–1850, followed by the “modern era,” 1850–1945, and the “contemporary period,” which starts from 1945 and is ongoing (283–326).

It is important to note that the current flows of migrant labour in the processes of globalization and international migration are fundamentally different from earlier forms. In contemporary migration, we note dramatic shifts in destinations, restrictions on residency and overtly strict limitations on settlement, imposed by immigration policies. Globalization theories suggest that we live in a post-national era, in which the nation-state is less powerful than it used to be. On the other hand, migration and immigration



experiences attest to a deeply national time, with affluent nation-states growing more concerned with policing their borders and devising increasingly more complex mechanisms for controlling people within and keeping people out.

According to S. Sassen (1998), although transnationalism and deregulation have reduced the role of the state in the governance of economic processes, the state remains the ultimate guarantor of the rights of capital, whether national or foreign. However, if we consider the economics of nation-states in the South, which have been controlled and directed both by colonial policies of the West and lately by structural adjustment policies (imposed economic restructuring) of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, we cannot with certainty assert that nation-states remain the ultimate guarantor of the rights of both national and foreign capital.

Various concepts of “globalization” do not consider in depth the ways in which the changes in the international economy result in differential outcomes for various groups in the society and different states in the world. The costs of structural adjustment policies in the South or economic restructuring in the North are social and economic displacement and exclusion for certain groups.

Over the last three decades, the economies of the advanced industrial countries in the North have undergone massive restructuring and transformation, changes that have had an enormous impact on the structure of labour, both on the domestic and on the international level. International developments are influencing domestic economic structures and vice versa. Only a small percentage of workers enjoy employment permanency, security and protection. All of these changes have led to social dislocation on a massive scale worldwide. Within this context, affluent nation-states, individually and collectively, have become increasingly restrictive about the movement of people transnationally. For example, what has been labelled Fortress Europe is a political and economic organization of European states that encourages the mobility of citizens of European Union member states through the fortress. However, with the exception of those deemed highly qualified, the movement of others is monitored, controlled or completely inhibited (Lucassen and Lucassen 1997; Westwood and Phizacklea 2000). Similarly, the United States has taken measures to build a fortress around its borders. Passed in 1996, the *Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act* created numerous provisions aimed at severely impeding both authorized and unauthorized movement of migrants, speeding up detention and deportation operations, expanding felonies for which one can be deported, increasing penalties for human smuggling and document fraud, and developing a national system that limits migrant access to employment and social services. The Act authorized a 50 percent increase in the number of border agents and sanctioned the expansion of a fourteen-mile fence



along the U.S.–Mexico border (1996 Congressional Quarterly Almanac; LeMay and Barkan 1999). These types of measures frame and contribute to a discourse prevalent in the 1990s where migrants are criminalized and dehumanized to the extent that they are defined as undeserving of human rights and human dignity (Santa Ana 1999).

Although these measures support the construction of the migrant as inhuman, they also support a discourse in which the North's humanity is defined through its "benevolent" acceptance of immigrants and refugees. Policymakers worldwide, and the public alike, believe that the causes of migration are self-evident. People who migrate are driven to do so by poverty, economic stagnation, overpopulation, wars and climatic catastrophes in their countries of origin. Because migration is thought to result from unfavourable socio-economic and political conditions in other countries, it is assumed to be unrelated to North American or Northwest European economic needs or broader international economic conditions. In this context, the decision to allow immigration becomes a humanitarian matter. The general public believes that the state admits immigrants by choice and out of generosity, not because it has any economic motives or political responsibility to do so (Sassen 1998). This perception of migration was widespread in academic and state produced narratives on the subject in the 1970s and 1980s. Migration literature projected migration as a process defined by the deficiencies of the South and the East, which were produced by the South and the East. This reading of migration led to the construction of the theory of the push and pull of economic factors (Sassen 1998). However, a cursory review of emigration/migration patterns reveals that there is no systematic relationship between emigration and what conventional wisdom holds to be the principal causes of emigration—economic push factors, created by deficiencies of the South and the East.

A decade later, migration literature focused on the relationships between labour migration trends and the North's foreign investment policies and military presence in the South in the 1960s, '70s and '80s (Sassen 1998). An important development in migration scholarship was the problematization of the image of the nation-state as a passive bystander in its immigration history. Migration studies revealed that migrations do not just happen but are produced. They do not involve just any possible combination of countries but are patterned, just like immigrant employment is not by chance but patterned as well. Unfortunately, in the process of exposing the ways in which immigration countries are implicated in the process of migration movements, the complex and diverse positions of migrants were inadequately addressed. On the one hand, migration scholarship constructed the migrant as passive, caught up in a pattern of globalization trends, labour market forces and migration/emigration policies over which she/he has no control. And on the other hand, fundamental traits of immigration policies single out the border and the individual as sites



for accountability, denying the responsibility of the nation-state in shaping the structures of migration. We are presented with two images of immigrants and refugees: 1) a passive labour force swept by the overwhelming waves of strictly patterned globalization, labour and migration forces, coerced by states and marginalized by markets; and 2) an individual making decisions independent of global transformations.

Within this framework of passive victim or autonomous individual in search of the American Dream, migrant women tended to be constructed as the former. Many studies of migrant women focused exclusively, to the dismay of many professional migrant women, on migrant women working in the unskilled sector of the global economy. The negation of class differences made it possible for the emergence of a picture of unqualified women of the South and the East and generally sustained the old images of the poor migrant. Recent work on transnational migration, however, has begun to present a different image. It attempts to impute migrants with decision-making capabilities influencing their outcomes (Roberts et al. 1999). Regrettably, there has also been a resurgence of xenophobic discourse that bestows the immigrant and refugee with a disproportionate amount of power to transform the North. As the majority of immigrants and refugees began to come from non-western European countries, the discourse became increasingly racialized along lines of colour and culture. Whereas two decades ago, the focus was on the implications of various migrations of labour, now we are preoccupied with the diverse cultures, or multiculturalism, that these labour migrations bring with them, the hybrid cultures they represent and the social and political tension involved with their settlement. Canada is a case in point.

In liberal democracies, like Canada, the law is not to be biased in such a way so that its equal application might favour some members of society over others. In theory, the Canadian electoral system, with its notion of a sovereign parliament, might produce laws with such bias; however the Canadian liberal democracy is said to contain a series of inhibitions on majoritarian law-making. For example, human rights legislation forbids governments and private power-wielding actors from basing decisions on certain grounds, e.g. family relationships, sexual orientation, age, gender, political ideology, religion, nationality, ethnicity, race, ability and other social and immutable categories. Similarly, the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* forbids government from making discriminatory laws or decisions. This is a portrait of the Canadian liberal democracy in theory. While the law and the ideology it furthers do not permit policymakers or lawmakers to talk in explicitly racialized terms, a reality is that they may well use that very law and its ideology to put racist/sexist policies into practice.

Historically, Canada's immigration policy was explicitly racist and forbade the immigration of "non-preferred races," while actively recruiting white immigrants from Northwest Europe. Demands of the labour market

and the rise of internationalism and labour market restructuring pressured Canada in 1967 to replace its project of building and maintaining a white Canada with the point system, which became formally anchored in the *Immigration Act* of 1976/77 (Jakubowski 1997; Dua and Robertson 1999; Arat-Koç 1999; Thobani 2000; Reitz 2001). The point system selected immigrants on the basis of occupation, recognized skills and family and resulted in the end of the domination of white European immigration by the 1990s (Thobani 1999). The 1976–77 legislation remained largely intact until the 1990s, when Canada embarked on a substantive review of its *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act* (IRPA) (Thobani 2001). This restructuring process formally commenced with the 1994 Immigration Policy Review, which produced the report, *Not Just Numbers* (1998), and the White Paper, *Building on a Strong Foundation for the 21st Century: New Directions for Immigration and Refugee Policy and Legislation* (1999). Canadian *immigration* legislation underwent two major rewrites and was amended approximately thirty times. The process culminated in the creation of Bill C-11, the proposed *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act*. Tabled in February 2001, Bill C-11 was passed by the House of Commons in June 2001 and received royal assent in November 2001. After the public hearings, the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration released its report on IRPA, *Building a Nation: The Regulations under the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act*, in March 2002. This report contains seventy-six recommendations for changes to the proposed regulations. After the final regulations under the *Act* and the government of Canada's response to the Standing Committee, the IRPA was released in June 2002 and came into force on June 28, 2002.

On the whole, the IRPA is consistent with the current trend in western nation-states to restrict the conditions for future immigration, weaken the rights given to landed immigrants and liberalize grounds for detention. The Act includes a new offence of human smuggling and trafficking, with harsh penalties for undocumented migration. The above has the effect of constructing all immigrants and refugees as potential criminals (Dei and Calliste, 2000; Thobani 2001; Pratt and Valverde 2002; Chan and Mirchandani 2002). Sherene Razack (2000) argues that the emphasis on criminality speaks to the ways in which racialized bodies in general, within and around the borders, are being constructed as part of a public ritual of legitimating the state's polices to limit the rights of raced bodies in and into the Canadian nation space. The construction of the immigration and refugee "crisis" of the 1990s is intrinsically connected to increased economic insecurity and public hostility towards bodies of colour (Jakubowski 1997; Sharma 2002; Henry and Tator 2002).

Although migrants are objectified simply as the "migrant in need of detention" and the "refugee intent on abusing the system," migratory flows are diverse. They incorporate men, women and children of different nationalities and linguistic, ethnic and religious affiliations. Some migrants are



documented, others are not. Some migrate in search of work; others are fleeing persecution and the draft; some are highly skilled professionals, making conscious choices for better paid jobs; others have limited skills. There are different levels and opportunities of potential for maximizing human capital. There is no single theory; neither is there a single discipline that can encompass all types of migration. The complexity of processes of contemporary migration requires the deployment of a cross-disciplinary approach to study them: sociology, demography, political science, economics, anthropology, history, psychology, geography, philosophy, cultural studies, art criticism and space theory. We can rely on broader-based paradigms that provide more satisfactory frameworks. What is important is that we do not allow the difference and diversity to obscure the very real material inequalities and positioning that diversity represents.

In the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, and the United States' subsequent pinpointing of Osama bin Laden as the mastermind behind these attacks, U.S. President George W. Bush broadcast a battle cry that the United States and its allies must identify and eliminate the global threat of terrorism. Framed within a discourse of good versus evil and civilized versus barbaric, the United States and its allies are defined as the defenders of freedoms whose actions are not simply retaliation and certainly not the defending and upholding of United States' global economic supremacy but as the only option in the face of such barbarity. Prior to September 11, the face and place of such barbarity was generalized to bodies of colour and the South. Post September 11, issues of national and global security became fixated on the figure of the brown terrorist and Middle Eastern, Arab and Central Asian "terrorist harbouring" countries. Today, the changing qualities of peoples' mobility is evident in both abstract and physical spaces.

In order to maintain the distinctions between law-abiding "civilized nations" and "fanatical fundamentalist nations incapable of abiding by democratic laws" (western political slogans), a great deal of emphasis has been placed on amending and/or creating laws that allow previously illegal activities, such as the ability to arrest and detain with no evidence. The drafting and expeditious passing of anti-terrorism and immigration laws is in keeping with United Nations Resolution 1373, passed on September 28, 2001, which encourages all states to combat terrorism by lawful means. The United States has amended its anti-terrorism act, called the *Patriot Act*, and plans to give those currently being imprisoned as terrorist suspects secret military tribunals. Other countries that have taken up the UN resolution and introduced or passed anti-terrorism acts since September 11 include France, New Zealand, Japan, Italy and the United Kingdom. The Council of the European Union has also taken measures to significantly strengthen its legal and administrative abilities and that of the European Union member states to take action against terrorists and their supporters.



In Canada, two main pieces of legislation have been legitimated as necessary in response to September 11: the *Anti-Terrorism Act* and the *Public Safety Act*. The *Anti-Terrorism Act* was introduced on October 15 and passed in just over two months, on December 18, 2001. Based on the *Act's* broad definitions of terrorist activity and terrorist group, measures in the *Act* include: tougher sentences for terrorism offences; increasing government powers to use electronic surveillance against those suspected of being part of a terrorist group and increasing powers of preventative arrest. For example, the new law allows security officials to detain persons for up to seventy-two hours prior to a bail hearing. The *Public Safety Act*, initially Bill C-42 and later reintroduced as Bill C-55, amends, for example, the *Immigration Act* and the *Aeronautics Act* to require advance passenger information to be provided to the Government of Canada in order to prevent the fraudulent use of identity papers and travel documents.

In addition to the *Anti-terrorism Act* and the *Public Safety Act*, the federal budget, released in December 2001, designates that 7.7 billion dollars be invested over the next five years to increase security measures and fight terrorism: 2.2 billion dollars will go towards increasing airport security, such as purchasing bomb detectors and hiring armed sky marshals; 1.6 billion will be used to enhance the abilities of Canada's spy and policing agencies; 2.2 billion will be spent on improving border checks and screening capabilities and; 1.2 billion will be forwarded to the defence department. As part of these measures, Canada and the United States signed the Smart Border Declaration in December 2001. The objectives of the declaration are to ensure the free flow of goods, improve general screening processes for all persons and to increase immigration and customs officials' abilities to detain and arrest all suspect persons. The Smart Border Declaration is largely designed to ensure the safe passage of the approximately 1.9 billion dollars in trade that crosses the Canada-U.S. border on a daily basis.

Although these measures are defined as necessary in order to protect the future of the nation, its citizens and western democracy, it is clear that the casualties of September 11 are not limited to Afghani and Iraqi victims of a U.S.-led war and to persons who lost their lives in New York, Washington, DC and Pennsylvania. A number of recently released reports on hate crimes and human rights abuses in the United States since September 11 make it clear that brown bodies in the United States are not only being defined as "not one of us" but as "against us" (Amnesty International 2002; National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium 2002).

Canadian officials are also attempting to uncover the enemy within. Welsh (2001) reports that as a response to September 11, a "war room" has been established in Toronto. The purpose of the war room is to investigate terrorist related tips that have been generated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) or called into the Royal Canadian Mounted Police's (RCMP) terrorist hotline. (As of November 19, 2001, the hotline has received



over 7,500 tips.) United States FBI agents assist the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS), the RCMP, the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) and the Toronto police to investigate suspected activities and people. A number of squads have been organized, such as *Project O Canada*. The project investigates local residents for suspected links to Osama bin Laden. Experts on organized crime have also been solicited. For example, Peel Region prosecutor Stephen Sheriff's role (in 2001) in the war room is to interpret the anti-terrorism law and to advise police on ways of using their new powers to find and build cases against suspected terrorists and their supporters. It is not surprising that within a framework that fixates on the inevitability that the enemy is among us, incidences of hate crimes are on the rise. The tide has also turned on the debate of racial profiling. Recently defined as objectionable, post-September 11 debates have defined the practice as a necessary evil (Choudhry 2001). After the invasion of Iraq, one cannot say with certainty what further actions will occur in response to September 11 and its subsequent deployment as a globally significant event. It is unlikely, given the overwhelming commitment to the supposed fight against terrorism, that any drastic re-thinking of this current direction in both internal and external policy will be undertaken.

This book examines various complex issues regarding the nation, globalization, im/migration, the im/migrant and inequitable flows of labour, capital and bodies, and also explores the extent to which international migration is linked to the broader social changes associated with globalization. Although current trends of global migration are more multidirectional, not exclusively generated by the needs of the North, the book critically examines the few cases of the ways in which the North actually produces migration flows and benefits from them. More importantly, attempts are made to address the structures and discourses by which the North is defined as benevolent. The authors, to varying degrees and in their own particular sites, contextualize the specificities of inequities by bringing into view broader historical and structural frameworks. In so doing, the chapters contribute to current work on globalization, which generally does not adequately address issues of race, gender and sexuality beyond a neo-Marxist framework, and contemporary work on immigration, which is often insular and does not adequately attend to the relationship between worldwide economic restructuring and national immigration policies and debates. In effect, this book is about making connections between the local, national and global, which reveal both the continuities and discontinuities over time and space. In addressing these issues, this text focuses on the Canadian nation as a site in which much can be learned about how things change and also remain the same. The specific bodies being addressed include Ghanaian immigrant women, Canadian aid workers in the South, undocumented migrant women working as sex-workers, foreign-trained professionals in Canada, South Asian migrants and East Asian Canadian



women. The diversity of bodies alludes to the diversity of migration flows and how migration is structured and experienced differently according to race, class, gender and sexuality.

It is our hope that this diverse collection of complementary essays can assist the reader in acquiring a broader understanding of global economic restructuring, nationalism and migration at a time when these issues are at the centre of a number of contentious debates going on in public spaces, in classrooms, international conferences, government buildings and within the offices of international agencies and corporations. Rose B. Folson's opening chapter explores different representations of the im/migrant, mapping out some of the contradictory relations between the im/migrant and the state. Power relations between immigrants and the Canadian state are examined in the following chapters. Archana Sharma's piece on the history of South Asian migration to Canada provides us with a general overview of Canadian immigration policy over time and of globalization theories as they relate to immigration. Martha Donkor and Eve Haque both look at the relationship between immigration, language and practices of exclusion; however, they examine different aspects of the spectrum. Haque analyzes immigration policy and legislation texts, while Donkor's research utilizes interview data with Ghanaian immigrant women to examine the politics of language-training programs. Likewise, Magaly San Martin and Hijin Park both engage with the migrant woman's body, which has been sexualized along lines of race, gender, class and nation. The authors address the ways in which the oppression of racialized women supports the Canadian nation and its structures. The women San Martin interviews and writes about, however, are migrant sex-workers, whereas Park looks at how racialized sexual harassment is a manifestation of the ways in which racialized women are defined by the North as an extension of the South—a space where everything is allowed—as expendable property to be owned and discarded at will. Bonnie Slade and Nupur Gogia focus on migrants defined as highly skilled rather than as persons defined through their lack of respectable skills. These skilled bodies are in spaces where it is not intended they should be: in the case of Slade, it is professionals from the South and Eastern Europe in Canada, and for Gogia, it is Canadian aid workers in the South. Both sets of migrants are part of the processes that contribute to western domination, but as Slade and Gogia reveal, while foreign-trained professionals face numerous barriers to employment, Canadian migrants to the South have few problems with access and perceptions of competency. This speaks to the multiplicity of what is occurring to different bodies in different spaces. The world may indeed be a much smaller place, where the movement of capital and bodies occurs at rates once unimaginable; however, this does not necessarily equate to familiarity or equity.

Increased globalization and immigration have also increased and diversified practices and processes of segregation and inequity. The tragic events



20 / Calculated Kindness

of September 11, 2001 have brought into sharp focus a variety of discourses associated with Islam and the Muslims. Alireza Asgharzadeh focuses on some core elements of Islam *vis-à-vis* globalization, migration, cultural interchange and international cooperation. This chapter contributes to an understanding of certain tenets of Islamic ideology that may throw some light on the worldview of those who were architects of the events of September 11.

