THE SCIENCES PO SERIES IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND POLITICAL ECONOMY

States and the Making of Others

Perspectives on Social State Institutions and Othering in Southern Africa and Western Europe

Edited by Jeanne Bouyat · Amandine Le Bellec · Lucas Puygrenier

palgrave macmillan

The Sciences Po Series in International Relations and Political Economy

Series Editor
Stéphanie Balme, Paris, France

Advisory Editor
Miriam Périer, Center for International Studies (CERI),
Sciences Po - CNRS, Paris, France

The Sciences Po Series in International Relations and Political Economy focuses on the transformations of the international arena and of political societies, in a world where the state keeps reinventing itself and appears resilient in many ways, though its sovereignty is increasingly questioned. The series publishes books that have two main objectives: explore the various aspects of contemporary international/transnational relations, from a theoretical and an empirical perspective; and analyze the transformations of political societies through comparative lenses. Evolution in world affairs sustains a variety of networks from the ideological to the criminal or terrorist that impact both on international relations and local societies. Besides the geopolitical transformations of the globalized planet, the new political economy of the world has a decided impact on its destiny as well, and this series hopes to uncover what that is.

The series consists of works emanating from the foremost French researchers from Sciences Po, Paris. It also welcomes works by academics who share our methods and philosophy of research in an open-minded perspective of what academic research in social sciences allows for and should aim for. Sciences Po was founded in 1872 and is today one of the most prestigious universities for teaching and research in social sciences in France, recognized worldwide.

Jeanne Bouyat · Amandine Le Bellec ·
Lucas Puygrenier
Editors

States and the Making of Others

Perspectives on Social State Institutions and Othering in Southern Africa and Western Europe

palgrave
macmillan

Editors
Jeanne Bouyat
NRF-SARChI Chair in Community,
Adult and Worker Education
University of Johannesburg
Johannesburg, South Africa

Center for International Studies
(CERI), Sciences Po
Paris, France

Amandine Le Bellec
Center for Political Research
(CEVIPOF), Sciences Po
Paris, France

Lucas Puygrenier
Center for International Studies
(CERI), Sciences Po
Paris, France

ISSN 2945-607X ISSN 2945-6088 (electronic)
The Sciences Po Series in International Relations and Political Economy
ISBN 978-3-031-59658-2 ISBN 978-3-031-59659-9 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-59659-9

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2024

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.
The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.
The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover image: © MirageC/Getty Images

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Paper in this product is recyclable.

Acknowledgments

This book is the product of a collective endeavor that has benefited greatly from the interest and generosity of several researchers and institutional bodies.

We first engaged in this reflection on states and othering during a public research workshop entitled "*Politics of Alterisation: manufacturing and governing Otherness: Comparative perspectives from European and African contexts*" hosted at the Maison Française d'Oxford[1] in May 2022. It brought together a dozen researchers from French and British academia, who approached othering through a variety of topics and disciplinary backgrounds (political studies, sociology, linguistics, anthropology, educational studies, and development studies). The workshop received the financial support of the Paris-Oxford Partnership (POP), an alliance between the University of Oxford and the Université Paris Cité, as well as from OxPo, a research partnership between the University of Oxford, Sciences Po, and the Maison Française d'Oxford. We are grateful to Florence Faucher, Pascal Marty, and Yves Sintomer for their unstinting support, and to all the staff of the Maison Française d'Oxford for their help with the logistics, catering, and communication for the event. We are also particularly indebted to the discussants for their useful comments on

[1] The Maison Française d'Oxford is a French research Centre in the humanities and social sciences supported by CNRS, the French Ministry for Europe and Foreign Affairs, and associated to the University of Oxford.

the initial drafts presented on this occasion, and which ultimately became chapters in this volume: Maxim Bolt, Fabrice Dhume, Laurent Fourchard, Desmond King, and Loren Landau.

A second internal edition of the workshop was held a year later in Paris, at the Center for International Studies (CERI—Sciences Po) to finalize the contributions for the volume. We are thankful to Sciences Po's Research School and OxPo again for funding this follow-up event. We are also especially grateful to Daniel Sabbagh and Leon Tikly, who gave us insightful feedback on the draft version of the book's introduction.

We are, furthermore, most obliged to the research and administrative teams of the CERI, whose confidence and expertise made this publication possible. We cannot thank Miriam Périer enough for offering her experience and for her dedication to the success of this project. We are also warmly appreciative of Sharmila Sarkar's support for editing the manuscript.

Last, but not least, we are grateful to the anonymous reviewers and to Palgrave Macmillan's editorial team for their interest and enthusiasm for the project.

Jeanne Bouyat
Amandine Le Bellec
Lucas Puygrenier

Contents

1 Introduction: States Make Others, Others Make States 1
Jeanne Bouyat, Amandine Le Bellec, and Lucas Puygrenier

Part I Obliterating Others, Reclaiming Otherness: Re-Narrations of Official History

2 History-Making as Othering: Perspectives on Zimbabwe's Patriotic History from Matabeleland 43
Lena Reim

3 Not White Enough, Not Biko Black Enough: The Othering of Coloured Identity in the South African History Classroom 77
Natasha Robinson

Part II Otherness, the State, and the Virtue of the Governed

4 The New Vagabonds: Labor, Mobility, and Virtue in the Making of "Illegal" Others in Malta 109
Lucas Puygrenier

5 The Other Mothers: Surrogacy or the Making and Unmaking of Motherhood Through the French State's Regulation of Surrogacy 133
Perrine Chabanel

Part III Leaving Them at the Gate: Rejection and Subordination Through Public Welfare Delivery

6 Gatekeeping the School Against Foreign Others: Three Dimensions of Institutional Xenophobia at School in South Africa 167
Jeanne Bouyat

7 Claiming Status: How Working State Jobs Mediates French Caribbean Women's Experiences of Othering 201
Marine Haddad

Part IV Othering, Neoliberal Politics of Recognition, and Assignment of Alterity

8 LGBTIQ Recognition in Asylum Policies: Vulnerability as a Disabling Entitlement 229
Amandine Le Bellec

9 The Other('s) Language: Interpreters at the Core of Othering Processes in the French Asylum Procedure 253
Maxime Maréchal

Notes on Contributors

Jeanne Bouyat is a postdoc at the NRF-SARChI Chair in Community, Adult and Worker Education, (CAWE, University of Johannesburg) and previously at the University of Oxford. She is a fellow at the Institut Convergences Migrations (ICM, CNRS) and the Center for International Studies (CERI, Sciences Po) where she obtained her Ph.D. Her research, primarily in South Africa, looks at xenophobia, citizenship and power relationships based on race, gender, social class and age in schools, with a focus on public administration, political attitudes, pedagogy, and activism.

Perrine Chabanel is a Ph.D. candidate in Political Theory at the Center for International Studies (CERI, Sciences Po). Her research focuses on public policies on natality, with a particular interest in the demographic and bioethical issues raised by new methods of assisted reproduction.

Marine Haddad is a tenured researcher at the French Institute for Demographic Studies (INED) and a fellow at the Institut Convergences Migrations (ICM, CNRS) and the Center for Research on Social Inequalities (CRIS, Sciences Po). Her work focuses on the links between migration and the life course, ethno-racial inequalities and population policies in a postcolonial context, with specific focus on the French Overseas.

Amandine Le Bellec obtained her Ph.D. in Political Science and International Studies from the University of Trento, Italy, and Sciences Po Paris, France. She is an associate researcher at the Center for Political Research

(CEVIPOF, Sciences Po). Her research focuses on the dynamics of politicization and depoliticization in the making of LGBTIQ+ rights at the EU level, with a focus on asylum policies.

Maxime Maréchal is a Ph.D. candidate in sociolinguistics at Paris Cité Université and a fellow at the Institut Convergences Migration (ICM, CNRS). He works on the function of interpreters in the screening of asylum claims in France. His research also deals with the relationship between language and border through the case of the waiting zone at the Roissy airport.

Lucas Puygrenier obtained his Ph.D. from the Center for International Studies (CERI) at Sciences Po. He was then an affiliated member and lecturer at CERAPS, University of Lille. He is now a postdoc at the Center Maurice Halbwachs (EHESS, ENS), and an associate member of CERI. His research explores the intersections between the making of social and economic order, and the attempts of various actors to distinguish between "desirable" and "undesirable" groups of populations.

Lena Reim is a D.Phil. candidate in the Oxford Department of International Development. Focusing on the Gukurahundi massacres, a period of unresolved state violence that took place in Zimbabwe's post-independence era, her research focuses on the afterlives of mass atrocities, particularly their legacies on second-generation political imagination and activism.

Natasha Robinson obtained her Ph.D. from the University of Oxford, where she is currently a British Academy Postdoctoral Fellow. Working primarily in South Africa, her research explores how young people learn about the legacies of difficult histories such as apartheid and colonialism.

List of Figures

Chapter 2

Fig. 1 Map of Zimbabwe with provinces 47

Chapter 4

Fig. 1 Offenses associated with the vagrancy charge (for 39 identified judicial decisions) 2007–2021 123

Chapter 5

Fig. 1 Composition of the working groups on surrogacy and interviewed people, CCNE (2010 and 2017) 150

List of Tables

Chapter 2

Table 1 Selected textbooks 54

Chapter 3

Table 1 Grade 9 Social Science textbooks included in this analysis 91

Chapter 4

Table 1 Asylum seekers, beneficiaries of international protection, and failed asylum seekers' rights to work in Malta 120

Chapter 7

Table 1 Education and employment of French Caribbean women compared to populations living in metropolitan France (%) 209
Table 2 Education and employment of French Caribbean men compared to populations living in metropolitan France (%) 212

CHAPTER 1

Introduction: States Make Others, Others Make States

Jeanne Bouyat, Amandine Le Bellec, and Lucas Puygrenier

Abstract This introductory chapter to the edited volume *States and the Making of Others* presents the rationales for researching what it calls the "states-Others nexus". It anchors the collection of contributions in a rich and diverse literature, and suggests that the concept of othering provides a fruitful theoretical and methodological framework

The views and analysis in this chapter have been presented by Amandine Le Bellec in her personal capacity, based on a research project conducted between 2018 and 2022. They do not represent the views of the European Ombudsman, where she is currently employed.

J. Bouyat (✉)
NRF-SARChI Chair in Community, Adult and Worker Education, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa
e-mail: jeanne.bouyat@sciencespo.fr

J. Bouyat · L. Puygrenier
Center for International Studies (CERI), Sciences Po, Paris, France
e-mail: lucas.puygrenier@sciencespo.fr

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2024

J. Bouyat et al. (eds.), *States and the Making of Others*, The Sciences Po Series in International Relations and Political Economy,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-59659-9_1

for engaging in a dialogue between various fields of research—particularly those looking at racism and ethnicization, nationalism, xenophobia, sexism, and homo-transphobia. This framework both encompasses and broadens the discussion stimulated by the notions of "stigmatization" or "discrimination". Defending the book's focus on everyday statecraft and state-making, this chapter also demonstrates the importance of looking at othering from multiple perspectives—in the context of both "regalian" and "welfare" state institutions, and across a variety of geographical settings in Western Europe and Southern Africa. Finally, it highlights the book's original contributions to the study of the state-Others nexus with regard to the ambivalent politics of recognition, redistribution, and redress, the differentiated legacies of former states' modes of categorizing Others, and the globalized trends of neoliberal reforms of state institutions.

1 Introduction

For those interested in how societies come to be governed, the issue of otherness seems to lurk around every corner. Whether as a vagabond, a migrant or a refugee, in the guise of the poor, the welfare recipient or as a member of ethnic or sexual minorities, figures of the Other persistently haunt the very act of governing. This book provides some keys to understanding this never-ending resurgence of Others by exploring its connection to the functioning of the state, focusing on the ordinary management of populations, the everyday formation of state institutions, and the political subjectivities that emerge as a result of these processes.

The question of othering is certainly not new to researchers. Under the labels of "outsiders" (Becker, 1963; Elias & Scotson, 1994), "strangers" (Bauman, 1997), "human surplus" (Davis, 2006), "outcasts" (Wacquant, 2008), or "new dangerous classes" (Standing, 2011), the social labeling and hierarchization of some groups of people based on their "difference" has been the subject of lively academic discussion since the 1960s. Of particular relevance to this book, scholars interested in migration,

A. Le Bellec
Center for Political Research (CEVIPOF), Sciences Po, Paris, France
e-mail: amandine.lebellec@sciencespo.fr

nationhood, race, gender, and sexuality studies, as well as those interested in labor market transformations and the analysis of public policies on welfare and on law enforcement, have all emphasized the significance of the boundaries that state institutions draw or rely on in relation to social groups. State actors, it seems, whether to justify their actions, implement their decisions, spur change, or simply make sense of the world they administer, all rely heavily on the production and reproduction of Others.

However, the fields of research mentioned above have often each focused on "their own" Others. There is no doubt that there are good reasons to distinguish between particular modes of othering based on race, class, gender, sexuality, nationality, or other socio-political grounds. Each of these modes has its own logic. Nevertheless, the argument of this volume is that acknowledging these "different differences" (Brubaker, 2015, p. 19) is not incompatible with the development of a dialogue between these fields of research. Such dialogue is essential to reveal similarities, analogies, filiations, articulations, as well as specificities or disarticulations between these various modes of othering, especially when analyzing these in relation to or in the context of state institutions. Moreover, engaging in this conversation enables us to draw inspiration from various traditions to bring original perspectives on understudied topics. Important previous contributions have addressed some aspects of this comparative dialogue, centering on the generic forms of articulation of "difference" between populations based on race and gender, and material inequalities (Brubaker, 2015; Tilly, 1998), and on the patterns of emergence and transformation of "ethnic boundaries" that may be observed across racial, national, or ethnicized groups based on religious, linguistic, or regional affiliations (Wimmer, 2013). Yet, they often do not take sufficient account of the specific role of states in the broader social processes under study.

This volume uses the notion of othering as a central analytical concept because we believe that it provides a particularly stimulating theoretical and methodological framework for this dialogue, especially when centering the analysis on the state-Others nexus. We suggest that it enables a broader and more nuanced exploration and understanding of the making and reproduction of Others by state institutions than other related concepts, such as "discrimination" and "stigmatization" (Lamont et al., 2016). We do not consider these concepts to be useless—quite the contrary. But we contend that "othering" offers a useful way to circumnavigate some of their limitations. The notion of discrimination,

through its strong initial anchoring in legal studies, has been instrumental in providing legal tools (i.e., the characterization of "direct" and "indirect" discrimination used in class action litigation in the United States) to protect structurally oppressed social groups. Nonetheless, as underlined by Black feminist scholars, because anti-discrimination law has long required complaints to be based on one specific criterion (for example race or gender) and not on a combination of these, it has often failed to grasp what Crenshaw (1989) has coined as "intersectionality"—the intimate and inextricable intertwining of different forms of oppression. Thinking in terms of stigmatization has helped scholars avoid this, as stigma can be seen as a "social process of disempowerment" that is therefore less grounded in proving (and fragmenting) one's identity for the purposes of legal objectivization and redress (Solanke, 2021, p. 132). A second advantage is that, unlike the concept of discrimination, which postulates the existence of a theoretically "normal" or "right" treatment of social groups that has been violated and must be corrected, the notion of stigmatization conceives the marking of some social groups as deviants, fools, or subordinates as an intrinsic feature of the constitution of human societies and of their social norms. Although litigation and activist campaigns focused on "discrimination" are crucial to improving the world we live in, thinking through this lens tends to posit othering as an exception to the rule. Moreover, a focus on stigmatization confines the analysis to only one aspect of the matter. As this book shows, state-related othering can involve gatekeeping and criminalization of Others as much as paradoxical processes of apparent recognition, redistribution, or redress that counterintuitively relegate Others to subordinate positions. Othering, in other words, can take place through recognition and protection. Discrimination and stigmatization are specific forms of state-sponsored othering that, while central to the making of Others, do not exhaust these processes.

We engage in this dialogue on the state-Others nexus by drawing on a selection of empirical case studies in Western Europe and Southern Africa, which enable us to offer a fresh perspective on the relationship between states and Others. From border surveillance, policing, and judicial practices to the granting of refugee status, from the provision of public healthcare and educational services to the regulation of labor and reproductive rights, these case studies show that states do not merely encounter Others, but are in fact inextricably involved in their constitution, perpetuation, and salience in often counterintuitive ways. From drawing grand dichotomies between "Us" and "Them" (Anderson, 2013;

Delphy, 2010)—e.g., between citizens *vs*. foreigners, men *vs*. women, heterosexuals *vs*. "queer" people, Blacks[1] *vs*. Whites—down to the intricate administrative divisions of populations based on income brackets, residential zoning or generation, and including processes of redistributive justice, the state constantly produces and reproduces multiple categorizations of Others to operate. In a twist on Tilly's famous phrase (1985), we argue that *states make Others, and Others make states*. Others, in fact, are not accidental creations or the unfortunate results of misguided state officials: their production, we argue, is also instrumental to the emergence of a complex state apparatus whose task is to manage and organize populations. They appear as inevitable by-products of ordinary statecraft.

Our theoretical and ethical positioning is firmly grounded in various critical theories—drawing on Marxist and Foucauldian analysis (chapters by Puygrenier and Chabanel), Bourdieusian approaches (chapter by Maréchal), feminist theories (chapters by Le Bellec and Chabanel), critical race theories (contributions by Bouyat and Haddad), and critical approaches to nation-building and patriotism (chapters by Reim and Robinson)—the contributions in this book all seek to provide an empirical account of a disturbing aspect of ordinary state policies and practices in promoting unequal political orders and control. In doing so, they attempt to "speak truth to power" by problematizing the role of states in the making of Others by generating "troubling knowledge" about state institutions (Scraton, 2004). Consequently, without venturing to formulate practical recommendations, we hope that this "troubling knowledge" will be of interest and use not only to researchers, but also to students, practitioners, or activists who seek to better understand, and perhaps ultimately subvert, the insidious ways in which states contribute to the making of Others.

The rest of this introduction is organized in four parts. The first part takes stock of the existing literature on the subject and identifies three overarching research questions for this book: exploring the role of states in the fabrication of Others, analyzing how othering informs state formation, and, lastly, focusing on the contribution of othering to the politicization of public action. The second part highlights the theoretical and methodological choices underpinning the collection of chapters: a focus on ordinary state practices, transversal research on othering in the context of both "regalian" and "welfare" state institutions,[2] and contrasting case studies in Western Europe and Southern Africa, which are

seldomly considered together. The third part identifies key overall contributions of the book with regard to the ambivalent politics of recognition, redistribution, and redress, the differentiated legacies of previous state categorizations of Others, and the globalized trends of neoliberal reforms of state institutions. Finally, the fourth part presents the structure of the book, which, after this introductory chapter, contains eight chapters divided into four subsections. The last part of this general introduction has been co-written by all the contributors of this book, who have sought to both provide an overview of the different chapters and highlight how considering each duo of chapters together enriches our understanding of the state-Others nexus. This is a testament to the collective intellectual journey that brought this book together (see Acknowledgments section of the book) and an invitation to readers to join the conversation that unfolds between its chapters.

2 Three Questions to Research the State-Others Nexus, Beyond Foreign Threats and Powerless Victims

2.1 Preliminary Discussion: Conceiving Others as Homemade Products

Before setting out our research agenda on the state-Others nexus, it seems necessary to first recognize that we approach Others as "homemade products". This runs counter to the mainstream understandings of Others, who are often conceived as coming from afar, either literally—as in the case of migrants—or metaphorically, as in that of individuals accused of embracing lifestyles alien to the community they live in. They are portrayed as an unwanted presence that imposes itself on a community that "originally" and "normally" functioned without it. Yet, this widespread assumption that communities were—or could be—"Other-free" is nothing more than a conservative utopia with neither scientific, nor historical basis. Moving away from the persistent idea that the movement of people, identities, and ideas has brought unwanted Others to unexpected places, our starting point is that otherness does not surge from the outside. Rather, it is a homemade artifact.

Therefore, a key premise we operate under in this book is that we should move away from the idea that Others come from a distance. This

conception of the Other, imbued with assumptions of alienness, is contradicted by a plethora of examples. For example, on the French island of Mayotte (one of the last remnants of the French colonial empire), islanders coming from another part of the archipelago are depicted by politicians as criminal or illegal migrants, while EU citizens can fly in from different parts of Europe without any trouble. Similarly, the way in which local lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, intersex, and queer (LGBTIQ+) communities have been accused of being "foreign agents" in several parts of the world further illustrates how being depicted as "the intruder" does not correlate to the number of miles traveled. This observation explains our reluctance to use the term "outsider", which, although widely used and greatly inspiring when associated with the interactionist school, seems to suggest that Others come from a remote periphery, threatening or disturbing the "established" (Elias & Scotson, 1994). Others, in the sense we give to the term, can conversely very well emerge from the "inside" of political orders.

The claim that Others are homemade artifacts is certainly not new. Rather, it is based on a large body of research rooted in several academic traditions. Phenomenological philosophy, which first developed the notion of otherness, has long demonstrated that thinking about Others is necessarily a dialectical experience. As emphasized in the writings of Hegel (1807), and later bolstered by the development of psychoanalysis, thinking about Others requires thinking about a subtracted Self (Chiesa, 2007). This has also been an important topic of discussion in philosophy, as thinkers such as Derrida (1997) or Levinas (1998) have reflected on how we relate to difference and what we "owe" to our fellow humans. In this regard, since Georg Simmel's (1908) short but powerful reflection on strangers, Others have been approached through their position in relation to the referential group. Strangers, as the German thinker noted, are simultaneously close and distant: although peripheral to the mainstream community, they can be understood only via this direct interaction, only in relation to this co-presence.

Elias and Scotson (1994) provided perhaps one of the most notable empirical applications of Simmel's ideas. Looking at two working-class neighborhoods, they highlighted how the exclusion and stigmatization of the new residents were linked to the older district residents' claims of higher standards. By promoting the very social norms they accused the newcomers of violating, they reinforced their sense of superiority and produced their own Others. Similarly, in her study of Italian

Piedmont under the Ancien Regime, Cerutti (2012) showed that the dominant contemporary conception of otherness as foreignness, informed by geographical distance or territorial considerations, is a rather recent construction, which only loosely applied to European urban societies at the time. She showed that the social ascription of the status of Other was rather associated with a condition of "extraneity" with regard to local socio-economic networks, with limited access to stable employment and property.

These studies are grounded in the idea that human communities are always bounded entities. From the way we think of our neighborhood to the manner we envision our nation, the politics and feelings of belonging are intimately tied to social processes of "boundary-making" (Barth, 1969; Wimmer, 2013), informed by intertwined material, moral, and spatial dimensions. In this context, it is no coincidence that Benedict Anderson (1983) underlined the role of long-distance crusades and pilgrimages in the making of European nations, or that Edward Said (1978) analyzed the Orient's origins in the desires and frustrations born of Western civilization. The definition of Others—whether conceived as strangers, foreigners, or indigenous, deviant, or abnormal figures—is always linked to the conception of the limits of the world of our peers. Extending this argument beyond the colonial and postcolonial relations, where it has been previously developed (Fassin, 2011; Mudimbe, 1988; Spivak, 1985), one could say that the Other depends on the political space from which they are deemed to be alien. Migration politics are illuminating in this regard. The widespread discourse of "illegal" migration or "unintegrated" communities targets both newcomers and, later, their children. If second- or third-generation (im)migrants who know little about their parents' place of origin can still be accused of not "fitting in", if the labeling of otherness appears so sticky, it is because it is not generated from *there* but produced and reproduced *here*. As Zygmunt Bauman (1997, p. 17) puts it: "All societies produce strangers; but each kind of society produces its own kind of strangers, and produces them in its own inimitable way".

If there are no essential Others, then the origins of otherness are not to be found in the individuals themselves, nor to be located in their "strange" or "exotic" backgrounds. The story of the making of Others is not about the exceptional encounter between a given society and an alienated difference that would be, literally, out of place. Instead, it is relative

to the ordinary ways in which political communities operate. Acknowledging Others as an endogenous presence has powerful epistemological and methodological consequences. It implies reflecting on the ways in which public action creates the "problems" it then seeks to "solve" (Dubois, 2009), including when it aims at "dis-othering" Others—for example, through integration, de-radicalization, or social cohesion. It pleads, in short, for considering othering as a result of state endeavors.

2.2 State-Sponsored Others

The role of public action in constructing Others brings us to our second analytical steppingstone to approach the state-Others nexus, which is that states are key actors in othering. Exploring how Others are being produced and reproduced by state institutions constitutes our first overarching research question for the book.

Many of the classic texts discussed above focus on othering as a phenomenon that unfolds within and between social groups or individuals. States are not absent, but they often assume the role of the observer, the arbitrator, and, sometimes, the executioner of social categorizations. Yet, states are not the mere receptacle of exclusionary ideologies and practices that are developed in more "extreme" or "undemocratic" spheres before being incorporated into politics. Rather, political modernity is based on the figure of the ideal citizen as an affluent and healthy White man, as the advent of equality was never meant to extend to society as a whole (Mills, 1997; Pateman, 1989). For many thinkers of the American and French revolutions, there was no incoherence between excluding the poor, women, and slaves from the benefits of democracy and preserving the vertical organization of society (Manin, 1997). Today, "legitimate" members of political communities continue to develop alongside many excluded Others (Anderson & Hughes, 2015). The rise of mass incarceration in the United States, for example, has resulted in the deprivation not only of liberty but also of the political and economic rights of ex-convicts (Wacquant, 1999). In a similar manner, persons with disabilities are still arbitrarily institutionalized and deprived of their most fundamental rights in many countries around the world (Zaviršek & Fischbach, 2023). Meanwhile, contemporary capitalism still largely functions on the exploitation of a segment of foreign labor (De Genova, 2016; Mezzadra & Neilson, 2013), giving birth, in its most caricatural variety, to the cities of strangers in the Persian Gulf (Gardner, 2010).

States, therefore, fabricate their Others even more effectively as they are prominent sites for the production of what Bourdieu (1994) termed unscrutinized, unquestioned, "categories of thought", which—because they are seen as neutral and rational—have a particularly powerful "effect of universality" that gives them traction in society. This is well illustrated in the common and normalized use of the category "minors" to refer to individuals who are considered too young to exercise their full civil, legal, or social rights and responsibilities. This restriction of rights is largely based on an arbitrary criterion of biological age, which varies substantially depending on the political community in question. This has far-reaching material and ideological consequences on political representation, penal procedures, or schooling obligations and entitlements, to list but a few (Delphy, 1994). The various racial, ethnic, and linguistic taxonomies promoted by state censuses are probably the most telling historical case of state engineering of "principles of vision and division" of populations (Kertzer & Arel, 2001), to use Bourdieu's terminology (1981/1991). The remarkable variety of ethnic divisions across national contexts and public policies reveals both their constructed dimension and the power of definition that state actors wield. For instance, the United States has long applied the so-called one-drop rule which states that an individual is Black even if only one of their forebears was considered Black. This is in contrast to Caribbean and South American countries, where a wider range of mixed-race categories associated with differentiated rights and dignities existed (Kelly, 2023). These categorizations are not just fantasies of the past. In contemporary Denmark, the ministries of the Interior and Housing officially differentiate between "Western" and "non-Western" migrants. The latter describes a composite racialized category without saying its name, lumping together all people who are not from the EU, the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. Most often than not, such categorizations persist long after state policies have suppressed them, adopting more liberal rules of racial self-identification, or even explicitly attempting to deconstruct such racialized categories. State-engineered categories thus tend to outlive their own creators.

These remanences have been eloquently demonstrated by Mahmood Mamdani (2020), who has spotlighted the continuities between state rationalities and the institutional devices underpinning the genocide of Native Indians in the United States, the Shoah in Nazi Germany, the Nakba in Palestine, the Apartheid regime in South Africa, and the

Sudanese civil wars. For Mamdani, these extreme forms of political violence are all based on a modern homogeneous conception of the polity, which he argues has its roots in the generalization of the nation-state model that emerged in 1492 with the Castilian state in Spain. This historical model combined the homogenization of the polity within the kingdom (during the *Reconquista*) and a civilizing mission attached to the colonial project (the conquest of the Americas). Mamdani contends that "the making" and later "the unmaking of permanent minorities" essentially resulted from the political use of social identities, which were transformed into citizenship and administrative categories and applied to provide unequal work opportunities and unequal access to land and mobility.

Mamdani's focus is on the deadliest outcomes of state-sponsored othering, while this book is committed to analyzing the less spectacular aspects of state othering. Nonetheless, his work remains relevant to the contributions collected here, as it shows how formal differentiations within the definition of citizenship are translated into administrative categorizations, and how they are put to use, on a daily basis, to exploit and oppress the "permanent minorities"—ultimately paving the way for violent events. This is particularly important to understand the chapters of this volume devoted to Southern African contexts. In South Africa and Zimbabwe, state-sponsored Others were rigidly and formally structured by indirect colonial rule in a "bifurcated" manner, primarily as racialized lesser citizens in urban contexts, and as ethnicized subjects of colonially endorsed reinvented "traditional" authorities in rural areas (Mamdani, 1996/2018). These fault lines served to control residency, educational and employment opportunities, and mobility, to the benefit of White supremacist regimes (Fredrickson, 1982). This occurred in the context of the rapid expansion of "racial capitalism" (Vally & Motala, 2023) in both countries, giving way to the massification of labor conflicts, and government and White minority concerns over the rapid urbanization that accompanied industrial growth.

Today, these racial, ethnic, and national state-sponsored categorizations still largely inform the making of Others, although they are reinvented in relation to contemporary politics. This is well illustrated in Natasha Robinson's chapter, in which she analyzes the reinvention and attachment of South African youth to the "Coloured" identity—despite the state's attempts to marginalize its use. These categories are also used in postcolonial settings to marginalize social and political groups that have

different, competing "liberation" projects than the ruling party, as shown in Lena Reim's chapter on Zimbabwe. They can also serve to limit the benefits of newly acquired rights and freedoms to "locals" and rigidify the divide between nationals and non-nationals, as highlighted in Jeanne Bouyat's chapter on post-apartheid South Africa. In the European and especially French "colorblind" context (Beaman & Petts, 2020)—France being also a polity particularly oblivious to its colonial legacy (Anderson, 2018)—the refusal and suspicion of any explicit racial and ethnic categorization within the state administrations do not prevent race from playing an indirect and unacknowledged role in public policies, sometimes recoded under the reference to "migrant descent" (Sabbagh, 2011). This approach plays a key role in rendering the racial discriminations experienced by French nationals from overseas territories invisible, as discussed in Marine Haddad's chapter focused on French Caribbean women who immigrated to Paris.

Crucially, however, the involvement of states in making Others is not limited to the forging of explicit and recognized categories. It also includes official practices. This means that, when investigating state-sponsored Others, it is essential to not limit oneself to what states claim to do, but to consider policies and operational measures, including their sometimes-unintended outcomes. This is a common thread running through all the chapters in this volume, as they explore practices of state-sponsored othering beyond explicit exclusion and unpack the subtle and sometimes contradictory and counterintuitive ways in which discourses and actions intertwine in the production of Others. For instance, Amandine Le Bellec examines the contradictions between positive discourses on LGBTIQ+ asylum claims and the harsh material consequences of border management for all asylum seekers, including those who, on paper, should benefit from specific guarantees due to their "vulnerability". Similarly, Maxime Maréchal shows how the introduction of new public management reforms in the aughts has combined with a highly restrictive turn in the asylum regime in France, which has led translators—who are officially supposed to assist exiled people—to play a key role in the selective and suspicion-based process that asylum has become.

What these few examples also help underline is the necessity of taking the discussion on othering beyond the realm of citizenship. Non-nationals can be simultaneously desired and rejected—as seen in the differentiation between "illegal migrants" and "highly skilled workers" in European migration policies (Freedman & Le Bellec, forthcoming)—and nationals

can embody national pride as much as they can become a source of embarrassment. Bridget Anderson and Vanessa Hughes (2015) differentiate between the "Good", the "Bad", and the "Non-" Citizen. Building on their work, in this book we seek to move the discussion further, linking the issue of othering to the broader question of the consolidation of a particular social order. Of course, citizenship plays a crucial role there, but it does not exhaust it. For instance, while figures such as the fool, the drug addict, the orphan, or the homeless may be alienated as "Bad Citizens", this alienation may sometimes take more subtle or complex forms that are loosely connected to the stratification of citizenship, and that are more closely related to moral concerns over the protection of other institutions, such as the notions of decency, family, home, or the organization of labor. For instance, Lucas Puygrenier's contribution (Chapter 4) looks at the renewed use of the colonial figure of the "vagabond" and its projection onto persons in exile in Malta due to their exclusion from public aid and their failure to secure formal employment. Similarly, Perrine Chabanel's chapter studies the French state's discourses directed at those termed as "surrogate mothers", to highlight how gestational carriers are officially conceived as a perversion of the desirable figure of national motherhood. She thereby shows how both the women involved in surrogacy—the one who carries the child, and the one who wants it—are being constructed by the state as incomplete, abnormal, if not perverse figures of Other mothers.

Thus, this book seeks to expand our conceptions of the processes at play in the state-making of social order by decentering the discussion on othering away from an exclusive focus on citizenship. It broadens the dialogue between different fields of research, particularly between migration studies and studies on race and racism, where othering is often tied to citizenship, and studies on gender and sexuality, labor, social protection and education, where othering is often less directly articulated with a discussion on citizenship.

2.3 Othering as State-Making

The second overarching research question for this book, and perhaps one that is less explored in contemporary research, is flipping the terms of the equation that links states and othering. It asks: what do practices of othering "do" to states? This is indeed a productive question, which can be answered along several axes that are all present in the book. The first,

pragmatically, entails investigating the “who” of state administration. Or, in other words, to look at how othering plays out in the recruitment and subjectivation of civil servants, thus contributing to the further alienation (or, on the contrary, recognition) of some groups (Prauthois & Biland, 2022). The second involves exploring which domains of the state flourish and which ones are amputated when the (re)production of Others takes center stage in the development of a polity. Finally, building on this inquiry, the third involves reflecting on what kind of states—but also what kind of democracy, what kind of polities—emerge from othering.

Before proceeding further, it should be acknowledged that the purposes of state othering are manifold. (Re)producing and vilifying Others have been useful in the past to mobilize for the conquest of adjacent territories in the context of empires and for colonial and enslavement projects. It remains an essential component of contemporary warfare and civil conflicts (Marchal & Messiant, 2006), especially as it helps set the boundaries of the nation (Anthias & Yuval-Davis, 1989). This is well illustrated by the flawed rhetoric of “denazification” used by the Putin administration to justify the Russian invasion of Ukraine in February 2022, and by the framing of Palestinians as a whole as “Hamas terrorists” by Netanyahu’s war cabinet to legitimize the bombing of civilians residing in the Gaza Strip in October 2023. The state production of Others is, of course, central to any state-mediated processes of domination, exploitation, or oppression among social groups (Dunezat, 2016). It is also true, however, that state institutions may also rely on othering practices to organize the redistribution of material and symbolic resources to disenfranchised groups, for instance, by admitting to past injustices. Despite this diversity of ends, we argue that there are significant continuities and similarities between othering-as-exclusion and othering-as-recognition, and that in both cases, othering helps constitute a particular kind of polity.

Indeed, manufacturing Others is a crucial way in which state bureaucracies can be expanded. In his classic study on the rise of marijuana as a deviant consumption in the United States, Howard Becker (1963) underscored the role of moral entrepreneurs in the labeling of these Others. Some of these entrepreneurs were located within the state apparatus, such as police departments, the judiciary, and a variety of related actors who, in the wake of the Prohibition era, were seeking new Others to find a new purpose. Didier Bigo (1996) observed a similar phenomenon in the framing of asylum as a “security issue” by European policy departments after the end of the Cold War, as these departments replaced the figure of

the "communist" by that of the "terrorist" to justify their own continued relevance (see also Guiraudon, 2003). Similarly, one can see more recently how the framing of new threats and social problems and the subsequent making of Others leads to the establishment or consolidation of bureaucracies and specialized departments. The post-9/11 context arguably benefited job and value creation in the military-industrial sector (Cox, 2014), as is the ongoing war in Ukraine. Meanwhile, widespread concern across Europe about "irregular migration" has given way to an "illegality industry" benefiting not only smugglers but also the professional actors specializing in detention and returns, or, conversely, humanitarian assistance (Andersson, 2014). Discourses of "migration threat" have, for example, been crucial to the expansion of institutions and agencies specializing in border control (Sachseder et al., 2022). Similar dynamics can also be observed in Southern Africa, as illustrated by the recent launch of the South African *Border Management Authority*, involving significant increase of state spending for the "securitization of borders" (see Bouyat, Chapter 6).

In this context, therefore, othering shapes the very polities that implement it. However, this shaping is not just quantitative in terms of the expansion of bureaucracies; it also very much affects the quality of what states are at their core. Michel Foucault (1972) has famously documented how, through information processing, sorting, and confinement, states pushed away unruly or deviant subjects, thereby establishing the boundary of the respectable community and creating, to some extent, societies in their image.

Through these processes, which are always time- and context-specific, particular types of states—or, more broadly, of political authorities—emerge. For instance, this is the case of what Frederick Cooper (2002) has called the "gatekeeper state"—African colonial states whose activities largely revolved around enabling extractive economies and controlling "the gates" through which exported goods circulated and were taxed. For such states, producing data on their own population (especially about "natives") was secondary to the delivery of public welfare.[3] Even in South Africa, where the apartheid regime had developed an extraordinarily extensive infrastructure to identify populations, the information recorded about "natives" was briefer than about the White minority. The reason for this was that this information-gathering was geared toward the control of mobility, residence, and work opportunities for the former and the recognition of rights for the latter. As Keith Breckenridge (2012)