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**Aim of the workshop:**

Two decades have passed since research started engaging with the issue of externalization of migration control (Andreas 2003; Lahav and Guiraudon 2000; Sciortino 2000; Zolberg 2003). During this period, the relevant body of work has grown exponentially, and externalization has become a core issue of migration and border studies.

The general aim of this workshop is to discuss the state of the art and identify new avenues for research. In doing this, the aim is also to reflect critically on current approaches. While pointing out the importance of paying a continued attention to externalization, we should also be aware of the limits that may derive from an uncritical focus on this issue.

The following is a provisional, non-exhaustive exposition of questions on the table.

- The use of the concept of ‘externalization’ assumes a specific perspective positing that there is an interior and an exterior, a centre and a margin (Parker 2008). This ‘concentric’ (Casas-Cortés and Cobarrubias 2019; İşleyen 2018b) perspective may end up obscuring the fact that migration and border dynamics are determined not only by the ‘centre’ or the ‘interior’ of rich countries of the Global North which externalize their migration-related narratives, policies and practices to the ‘margins’, but also from those very ‘margins’. So-called countries of origin and transit may also take autonomous decisions in the field of migration, responding to their own interests rather than to requests from destination countries of the Global North (Cassarino, 2018; El Qadim, 2015). All that glitters is not externalization!

- The idea of ‘externalization’ mostly also assumes a state-centric perspective. Surely, states (and supra-state entities such as the EU) are key players, and a lot could be done to shed more light on the different ways in which states trigger, support and oppose externalization, and how regional maps change as a consequence. However, the role of other actors in supporting or resisting externalization is still under-researched. While international organizations (IOs) have received comparatively more attention (Brachet 2015; Fine 2018; Geiger and Pécoud 2010; Lavenex 2016), the role of NGOs and civil society in general (also including pro-migrant and migrant-led organizations) in supporting, resisting and representing externalization has been hardly addressed (Andersson 2014; Korneev and Kluczewska 2018; Rodriguez 2019). Similarly, the relationship between externalization and private for-profit actors (Lemberg-Pedersen 2018), ranging from the border security industry to smugglers and brokers, is largely under-researched. Finally, people on the move are not just the passive objects of externalization. While they surely are its main victims (and research could do much to shed more light on the relationship between externalization and, say, human rights abuses), they also deserve to be studied in their multiple roles as active subjects triggering, challenging, resisting and circumventing externalization (Papadopoulos, Stephenson and Tsianos 2008). Pretty much like states, the other actors engaged in activities related to migration and border management are not necessarily, not always part of processes of externalization.

- Externalization is supported and/or resisted by specific discourses/logics, e.g. security, humanitarianism, human rights etc. (Cuttitta 2018; İşleyen 2018a). What are the potential and the limits of using these lenses to study externalization?

- And what could be the advantage of looking at postcolonial logics and trajectories, at continuities and ruptures between externalization (also in its relationship with other regional processes, such as the ENP – see Boedeltje and van Houtum 2011) and colonial past (Lemberg-Pedersen forthcoming)? More broadly: what could race, class and gender perspectives add to the study of externalization? Could they help countering a-historicity and depoliticization? Could they help going beyond the mere geopolitical (state-state) centre-margin dimension to include power relations between (categories of) different subjects at different geographical scales?

- Some concepts and heuristic perspectives, such as (‘migration’ or ‘border’) ‘management’ (Geiger and Pécoud 2010; 2012), (‘migration’ or ‘border’) ‘regime’ (Hess 2012; Kasparek, De Genova and Hess 2015), ‘borderscape’ (Brambilla 2015; Perera 2007), (‘border’ or ‘itinerant b/ordering’) ‘assemblages’ (Casas-Cortés and Cobarrubias 2019), delocalization (Cuttitta 2018) etc., may prove useful. They may help reducing the risks of state-centrism (or Euro-centrism) and methodological nationalism (or methodological Europeanism) in migration and border studies (Gaibazzi, Bellagamba and Dünnwald 2017; Genç, Heck and Hess 2018; Tazzioli 2015). They may help ‘relativizing’ externalization, seeing it as but one of the drivers that contribute to determining migration and border dynamics in given regional contexts. However, the potential and the limits of these concepts and perspectives for a critical approach to the study of externalization are not fully explored yet. More concepts and perspectives may be identified to better grasp the complexity of migration and border dynamics and the role and significance, as well as the limits, of externalization.

The workshop may also open up opportunities for further collaboration (e.g. panel proposals at conferences, publication projects etc.).

**Format:**

Full day workshop consisting of three sessions: one in the morning and two in the afternoon (approximately between 10.30 and 18.30).

Closed workshop for a limited number (max 15) of invited participants.

There will be no traditional paper presentations but rather informal discussions around a table (no conference-like setting; no division between speakers and audience).

FIRST SESSION: The morning session will consist of short introductory presentations.

All participants are invited not only to introduce themselves with name and affiliation but also to speak for up to X minutes (e.g. 5 minutes; it might be a bit less or a bit more, depending on the number of participants) about their previous and current work and what it has in common with the workshop theme; about which issues, among the ones mentioned in this outline, they find particularly important or interesting, and why; about further issues which would deserve attention, etc. These inputs are meant to facilitate discussion and exchange in the following sessions.

SECOND SESSION: Informal discussion based on the inputs provided by the morning session.

THIRD SESSION: Informal discussion – also including possible proposals for future collective projects – and wrap-up.
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Shoshana Fine (Sciences Po Paris)

Caterina Giusa (Université Paris 13)

Charles Heller (Goldsmiths University London)

Beste İşleyen (Universiteit van Amsterdam)

Bernd Kasparek (Universität Göttingen)

Martin Lemberg-Pedersen (Aalborg Universitet)
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