

Global Prison Ethnography

Thomas Ugelvik

Department of Criminology and Sociology of Law

University of Oslo

In *The Palgrave Handbook of Prison Ethnography*, DH Drake, R Earle and J Sloan (eds), 2015. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Chapter outline and summary

Prison populations have grown in most European countries over the last few decades. Simultaneously, the prison populations have changed profile considerably in many jurisdictions. The average proportion of foreign national prisoners in Western European prison systems is currently 26 per cent. In stark contrast, Eastern European countries normally have very small numbers of foreign national prisoners. The everyday difficulties associated with housing all these foreigners who might have different wants and needs than what one commonly finds among domestic prisoners combined with the ever-growing task of transferring prisoners and deporting newly released former prisoners will be a formidable challenge for European criminal justice systems in years to come. This chapter explores and discusses how prison ethnographers should react to such developments. Inspired by Burawoy's work on global ethnography, it is an invitation to a global prison ethnography.

Introduction

According to the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN-DESA), in 2013, 232 million people worldwide, or 3.2 per cent of the world's population were living in a country other than the one they were born in, compared with 175 million in 2000 and 154 million in 1990.¹ Two facts can be inferred from this simple statistic. On the one hand, most people still live and die in the country where they were born. They are protected, taxed, and – when appropriate from the point of view of the powers that be – imprisoned, by the same state apparatus that first issued them a birth certificate and counted them as part of the exclusive group called 'state citizens'. On the other hand, the international mobility rate is increasing rapidly. This is, in part, a willed effect of international political changes. From a European

¹ <http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=45819&Cr=migrants&Cr1=#.U42VUHY4UdU> [Accessed 03.05.2014].

perspective, the increased movement of EU citizens has been one of the main objectives of the transformation of the Union from primarily an economic cooperation agreement, to what is today arguably looking more and more like a federal state. Briefly put, the relationship between the state and the people who for some reason find themselves on the state's territory (including increasing numbers of non-citizens) is changing in this age of globalization.

Processes of globalization bring new possibilities: Goods, services, ideas and (privileged) human beings are mobile and able to circulate across vast distances and old borders in ways unthinkable only a generation or two ago. But globalization also results in specific problems, challenges and risks. Wars, conflicts and natural disasters, an unstable and unpredictable global economy and its effects on a global employment market all have effects which transcend national boundaries.

The effects of these changes can be seen on prison wings around the world. The population controlled by the penal arm of the state is no longer largely restricted to citizens of the state (O'Nolan, 2011). Western European countries in particular are now imprisoning an increasing number of non-citizens (Ugelvik, 2014a). In certain parts of Europe the over-representation of non-EU citizens in prison is many times their share of the general population (Melossi, 2013); the situation has been compared with the over-representation of blacks in US prisons (Wacquant, 1999). The development should be seen as connected to changes in wider society; what has been called the "hyper-criminalization of immigrants" and in particular of so-called third country nationals, has been seen to play an instrumental role in the production of a vulnerable and exploitable workforce (De Giorgi, 2010).

Prison researchers have very often taken the nation-state as their default contextual frame for their analyses. In this chapter, I will argue that international and global developments are making this myopia untenable. According to O'Nolan,

The increased presence of foreign nationals in European prisons can only be accurately interpreted in the context of globalization processes, increased mobility, changes in modes and patterns of crime, as well as by reference to structural and individual discriminatory processes (2011: 385).

I will not present analyses of empirical material in this chapter. Instead, my aim is to discuss the consequences that changes associated with globalization could and should have for prison

ethnography, and to invite others to explore the possibilities of a truly global prison ethnography. Prisons are changing with the societies they are part of. The traditional ethnographic focus on prisons as nation-state institutions has left a regrettable knowledge gap. I will argue that as prison ethnographers, we need to re-conceptualize the boundaries of our discipline to keep up. I will, more precisely, explore the current development where prisons are being used by states to respond the effects of globalization and discuss how this might be explored ethnographically.

Why global prison ethnography?

As a research method, ethnography has always been connected to ‘the small scale’ and the local level of everyday interaction. For ethnography to stay ethnography, this cannot change. As ethnographers, we need to focus on the local, but we should – theoretically, empirically and analytically – acknowledge that the particular view from a specific prison today inevitably is influenced by social forces that transcend national borders. To be able to do this, we need to connect analyses on different levels; we need to employ an effective ethnographic zoom. The local level of everyday interaction will of course still be key, but we should strive to see the local as part of the national and even the global. I would like this chapter to be an invitation to broaden our theoretical and analytical horizons and study prison wings as part of the rest of the world. In the following, I will discuss examples of how this might be done, and the effects it may have.

How can macro processes – like globalization – be studied ethnographically? How can the study of everyday life grasp lofty and abstract processes that transcend national boundaries? According to Burawoy (1991b, 2000a, 2000b), we need to investigate how global changes are manifesting themselves on the local level. But we also have to go further; collecting anecdotal evidence of the global in the local is not enough. The challenge for ethnographers is to ‘ground’ globalization and show how specific events are connected to more general processes; how the flow of people, goods, and discourses are making an impact on local, national, and global levels simultaneously. We need to approach the micro-macro link from the ground up, but also try to understand the reciprocal influence between levels. On the micro level, a prison wing is a specific place where specific people are interacting. As ethnographers, we should study this process in all its specificity. But as prison researchers, we know that prisons are more than arenas for interaction. They are places where different people

with very different experiences and expectations have to coexist and, if possible, make the best out of a difficult situation. Increasingly, such difficulties include language problems and cultural differences between prisoners from different parts of the world. They are also institutions where a form of state power is exercised. From justice, via incapacitation and deterrence, to rehabilitation and positive personal growth, prisons have specific abstract goals that need to be 'translated' into practice on the wings. Today, the logic of citizenship is increasingly being put to use on the prison wings. European states are introducing policies that separate between citizen prisoners and foreign prisoners. Finally, prisons today are influenced by forces and developments that transcend the nation-state. When the global is impacting on the national, the results can still be found on the local level. The global is, in short, always present in the local. Globalization oriented prison ethnographers need, then, to find ways to manage the difficult zoom between (1) the micro level of everyday interaction, (2) what is in this context the meso level of nation-state optics and projects, and (3) the macro level of international movements and global flows and forces. Analyses on all three levels will be important and necessary if we want to fill the knowledge gaps that globalization processes have created.

The micro level: Everyday interaction and frustration on the wings

Prison populations have grown in most European countries over the last few decades. Simultaneously, the prison populations have changed profile considerably in many jurisdictions. The number of foreign national prisoners in the UK system (England and Wales) trebled between the early 1990s and 2006, increasing from 3,446 (7.8 per cent of the total prison population) in 1993 to 10,289 (13 per cent) in April 2006 (Bhui, 2008). Still, the UK is one of the jurisdictions in Western Europe with the smallest proportion of foreign national inmates; the average proportion of foreign national prisoners in Western European prison systems is currently 26 per cent (Ugelvik, 2014a). In stark contrast, Eastern European countries normally have very small numbers of foreign national prisoners, ranging from Poland and Romania, both with less than 1 per cent of foreigners in their prison populations, to Slovenia, in this context the most 'western' of the Eastern European countries with 10.7 per cent foreigner prisoners. The Slovenian prison system is thus close to the UK situation when it comes to the incarceration of foreigners. Western European correctional services, then, have to cope with increasing numbers of foreign nationals in their institutions. Eastern European governments, on the other hand, have to deal with growing numbers of their citizens

incarcerated in foreign countries and foreign governments putting pressure on them to return these prisoners to serve out the rest of their sentences in their country of origin.

In most jurisdictions, 'foreign prisoners' will obviously constitute a very complex and heterogeneous group, whose only common distinguishing features are incarceration combined with a relationship of non-belonging vis-à-vis a specific nation-state. Some have lived in the country they are imprisoned in for years and are fully integrated members of the national community in every respect except the fact that their passport has the wrong colour. Others have recently arrived, possibly without valid travel documents, and their citizenship and identity may be under question. This complexity is a challenge for prison officers and prison ethnographers alike. In fact, it is often easy to forget that we are all foreigners once we, as tourists, move across a domestic border and venture into foreign territories (Hudson, 2008). The everyday difficulties associated with housing all these foreigners who might have different wants and needs than what one commonly finds among domestic prisoners combined with the ever-growing task of transferring prisoners and deporting newly released former prisoners will be a formidable challenge for European criminal justice systems in years to come.

This development plays itself out and has effects locally, on specific prison wings where specific people are incarcerated. Staff, for instance, are often frustrated at the lack of knowledge (and time to develop such knowledge) and available resources to work constructively with foreign nationals. Foreign national prisoners are frustrated at the general uncertainty, discrimination, and racism they often experience, as well as the many everyday mundane problems resulting from their status as foreigners. According to Banks (2011), foreign nationals in prison typically experience isolation and language barriers, they often have limited or no family contact, only a limited understanding of the prison and criminal justice system, and many experience problems linked to immigration-status, and anxiety related to the prospect of post-sentence immigration detention and deportation.

As a result, the everyday life on the wings is impacted in many ways. The most common and significant problem reported by foreign national prisoners in general, is the lack of knowledge of the national language (Kalmthout, Meulen and Dünkel, 2007; Bhui, 2009; Kaufman, 2012). In many cases, both verbal and written communication is severely hampered. This may again

lead to feelings of social isolation, uncertainty and helplessness. A lack of understanding of the native language will colour every part of the everyday prison experience. Prisoners are frustrated at not being understood by staff, of having little to read in their own language and no television channels, and at missing out on basic provisions because they had not understood instructions.

Communication problems may result in more than just everyday frustrations, however. The decision to grant prisoners early release is often based on a risk assessment where the previous criminal and prison records are important parts of the decision making process. An average prisoner will have a comprehensive computer file full of information for prison officers to consider in decision making processes. Most foreign national prisoners, however, lack such a history, and often look like walking and talking question marks from the perspective of the prison officers responsible for making, for them, important and life-changing decisions. Prison and court officials often decide to err on the side of caution. Foreign nationals are also very unlikely to be given home detention curfew and release on temporary licence, regardless of the fact that they often have very good prison records and may be regarded as 'model prisoners' (Kalmthout, Meulen and Dünkel, 2007; Bhui, 2009). They are also often unable to attend work or school in prison, because of selection criteria that keep them out, even if they may have 'the same rights' as citizens on paper. Important decisions that will impact prisoners' lives in profound and direct ways, that are normally taken based on sound knowledge and detailed information gathered from different cooperating state agencies, will be based on 'best guesses' in the case of foreign nationals. This may, in turn, lead to feelings of being the victim of discrimination, favouritism and even racism. Staff may also be frustrated by a lack of information, of course, and – at least those staff members who are committed to a rehabilitation and reintegration ethos – by being expected to keep foreign national prisoners under inappropriately strict conditions, in some cases on immigration detention orders past their criminal sentence.

To a certain extent, the challenges foreign prisoners are facing are similar to challenges experienced by prisoners in general. Even though 'foreign nationals in prison' as argued above is obviously a very complex category with much internal variety, foreign nationals also have many common experiences and needs, usually linked with the primary problems of family contact, immigration difficulties and language that makes it meaningful to consider them as a

distinct group with distinct needs (Bhui, 2009). Many foreigners are isolated, both literally, but also symbolically and culturally. Their foreigner status formally and informally creates specific challenges unique to them.

The meso level: The prison and state power

When citizenship is an exclusive status that gives bearers rights that are coveted by many, and at the same time the borders are not hermetically sealed, the predictable result is that unwanted foreigners or irregular migrants will be present on any given state's territory. And when they are present, they will soon, to some extent and whether they want to or not, present themselves to the state as someone the state has to consider, as 'state projects' and objects of state knowledge production.

From the perspective of social accounting, a Nation is similar to a factory. Whether it is people or things that are produced, the keeping of books is subject to the same rules and obligations: One must record exactly what *enters*, what *exits*, establish the *balance* of this two-way movement and *verify*, according to the *state* of the register and the products in the store (inventory and counting), the accuracy of the account of *movements* (what comes in and what goes out) (Bertillon, 1878, quoted in Neocleous, 2003).

Traditionally the prison has been intimately connected to the nation-state. Indeed, a 'state' as a unique entity has often been defined through its monopoly on the legitimate use of coercive force (Weber, M, 2004). On this meso level of analysis, the main challenge of a global prison ethnography is to explore how the everyday life on prison wings are connected to wider state projects, logics and optics. The penal apparatus is a core organ of the state, expressive of its sovereignty and instrumental in imposing categories, upholding material and symbolic divisions, and molding relations and behaviors. The prison, then, is an institution where a particular form of state power is put into practice. It is a place where a group of people are authorized by the state to exert legitimate power on the state's behalf over another group of people. In our current globalized world, however, these facts – once straightforward – are becoming increasingly complicated.

On the one hand, the state tries to keep unwanted migration to a minimum and keep unwanted migrants under control and, if possible, out of its territory. Internationally, we can see the emergence of an increasingly complex immobility regime of gated communities, ghettos, detention centres, and a range of related practices like electronic tagging and quarantining that

allows states to categorize and track individuals who are deemed to be dangerous or simply 'out of place', in order to bring about their bureaucratic control through spatial seclusion. Hayward recently described the phenomenon of 'kettling', understood as: '[T]he (legally ambiguous) corralling of protesters into a demarcated, confined space for an indeterminate period without access to food, water or toilet facilities. In short, it is a mass detention in public space' (2012: 13). The prison may be seen as part of this development. Understood as part of a wider immobility regime, the prison is of course one of the mobility control technologies that has the longest pedigree. The transition from forms of punishment directed at the bodies of the punished to forms of punishment directed at their souls does not mean that the prison is not concerned with bodies (Foucault, 1977). As a state technology of movement control that can be studied on the level of everyday practice the prison is part of a wider field of technologies of statecraft through the administration of bodies in time and space (Ugelvik, 2014b).

On the other hand, the state tries to gain information about, and control over, the unwanted migrants that nevertheless are present. Foreigners in European prisons increasingly find themselves in special wings or even entire institutions for foreign nationals only. In complex societies with considerable minority populations, however, it is not always easy to separate foreign national prisoners from ethnic minority prisoners. In the UK, determining citizenship at least initially depends on self-identification; prison officers simply ask where new arrivals are born. Kaufman (2012) shows that this strategy is not without flaws. She finds that the efforts to find foreigners in practice often depends on racialised assumptions about what constitutes 'Britishness' and 'foreignness'. As a result, the experience of imprisonment is altered for members of visibly different minorities who have to be able to prove that they belong, and are entitled to stay, in the country post release.

To be imprisoned is, to an extent, to be made visible, legible and, not least, countable for the state (Scott, 1998; Ugelvik, 2013). Yet, even states that routinely produce detailed statistical analyses of their prison populations often do not know fairly basic information about their foreign national population. Modern state power is based on the desire to name, order and control people (Scott, 1998; Smith, 2009). The dream of state power is the will to know, order and manage (Neocleous, 2003). As Weber and Bowling have stated, 'In a system designed to ascertain those who may move freely, and to immobilize and eject those who may not, matters

of identity are central' (2008: 125). Prisoners are, because they are imprisoned, drawn into the orbit of the state, whether they want to be or not. The mechanisms by which the state administers the population, such as the passport, the driver's license, the identity card, as well as the more underhand means of information-gathering such as phone-tapping, bugging and letter-opening, are all also important intelligence-gathering tools (Neocleous, 2003). Importantly, these state optics and techniques are constitutive; when the state divides the world into categories, the world changes. The efforts spent to gain knowledge and make people governable have very real consequences. By objectifying this group in a specific way as 'foreign national prisoners', subjects of a certain form of power are constructed. This process should be studied ethnographically.

When someone is imprisoned, however, they are not only made visible for the state and its agents. They are also made available for intervention. In rehabilitation and welfare oriented prison systems, a prison is thought of as an arena for successful reintegration work. To various degrees across Europe, the prison is described (at least on paper) as a social technology tailored to the overarching goal of increased security on a societal level through the rehabilitation of individuals. Being a prisoner, then, means being put in a particular relationship with the state, as a temporarily excluded project of state rehabilitation agents. What about the foreign national prisoners? A welfare state will normally run on the notion of citizens' rights to welfare. In most countries, some rights and benefits are reserved for people who possess citizenship status. This means that individuals who lack citizenship status are denied the full enjoyment of social, political, and civil rights (Bosniak, 2006). As Joppke has observed, 'Because rights are costly, they cannot be for everybody' (1999: 6). How does this play out on the prison wings?

According to the Council of Europe's European Prison Rules on the other hand, (Rec(2006)2, section I:2) all prisoners, including those of foreign nationality, should retain all rights not necessarily taken away by the fact of imprisonment. It seems to be a recurring risk, however, throughout European jurisdictions, that foreign prisoners may not be able to exercise their rights effectively, including their fundamental human rights (Kalmthout et al., 2007). According to section 33.3 of the same European Prison Rules, 'all prisoners should have the benefit of arrangements designed to assist them in returning to free society after release'. In practice, again, foreign nationals tend to be excluded. Such activities are often in short supply,

and foreign nationals are not given priority (Kaufman, 2012). A reason is that foreign prisoners are expected to leave the country – either voluntarily or forcefully – upon release. Many of the rehabilitation measures are seen as directly connected to the welfare system outside and are therefore not deemed appropriate or relevant for prisoners who will not be part of that society anyway. The default assumption is that foreign prisoners will be deported. Such an assumption might aggravate a problematic tendency to exclude vulnerable groups from welfare benefits in society in general, as observed by Barker (2012) discussing the case of Sweden.

From the perspective of Western European prison officials, foreign nationals are increasingly being seen more like potential deportees than potentially rehabilitated members of society; as risks to be managed and expelled, rather than individuals with individual needs. Will the result be the creation of two separate but parallel systems, one for citizens, and another for non-citizens? The European states seem to be cultivating a form of double vision: more sophisticated systems of control and exclusion for some, more open borders and a higher degree of mobility for others (Bosworth, 2008). What impact will this development have on the local level of specific prison wings? How will it change the prison as we know it?

In 1985, the German criminologist Jakobs wrote of the need to introduce a separate 'criminal law for enemies' or *feindstrafrecht* (Fekete and Webber, 2010). His work was based on the idea of a fundamental divide between citizens (subject to the rule of law) and non-citizens (not legal subjects and therefore non-persons in the eyes of the law). According to Fekete and Webber, Jacob's vision is being implemented, more or less informally, around Europe. Foreigners are being subject to harsher penalties than natives and migration status itself has become subject to criminal law and criminal penalties through a development towards what Stumpf (2006) has called 'crimmigration law', meaning a blurring of the difference between immigration control and crime control. As a result, the administration and even criminalization of some forms of immigration have become key aspects of the governance of many late-modern democracies (Genova, 2002; Aas, 2007b; Dauvergne, 2008; Dal Lago, 2009; Aas, 2011). The presence of large numbers of unwanted immigrants clearly indicates for many the fact that nation states no longer are able to regulate completely the number of foreigners entering a country (Engbersen, 2009). Border control and immigration administration practices should, in such a context, be understood as the enactment of

sovereignty, as a 'sovereignty gesture' (Bosworth, 2012) and thus as important tools in state crafting (Schinkel, 2009), and the prison is increasingly being made a part of it. Following Balibar, one could even argue that the nation-state borders now run through the prison wings of Europe:

Sometimes noisily and sometimes sneakily, borders have *changed place*. Whereas traditionally, and in conformity with both their juridical definition and 'cartographical' representation as incorporated in national memory, they should be *at the edge of the territory*, marking the point where it ends, it seems that borders and the institutional practices corresponding to them have been transported *into the middle of political space* (2004: 109).

In any case, while European welfare systems can (more or less) successfully limit the constituency that they serve, the same is not true for European penal systems. This predictably creates particular problems in penal systems that are heavily welfare oriented. The more welfare oriented a criminal justice system is in fact, the more sophisticated information it will depend on, and the more problematic foreign nationals may turn out to be. Prison ethnography should try to stay on top of the development; a global prison ethnography would make it possible to study state power in the age of globalization.

The macro level: The prison, international mobility, and globalization

We live in a time that seems obsessed with international movement. Studies within the broad globalization paradigm seem often to emphasize flow and borderlessness as the norm to the extent that they risk making immobility and borders look like a thing of the past. Discourses about mobility-as-liberty and mobility-as-progress are frequently accompanied by notions of movement as healthy and even moral. From this perspective, a sedentary life is a life that is not lived to its full potential. *Peregrinor, ergo sum*. I travel, therefore I am.

If we regard the freedom to be mobile as a resource, however, it is clear that the capacities for international mobility are unequally shared. Consider the opening up of the borders in the European Union to enable the enactment of the EU mantra of free mobility. The so-called borderless Schengen area is undoubtedly dependant on the closing down of and detailed control over, mobility at the outer borders (Bosworth, 2008; Brown, 2010; Melossi, 2013). The historically speaking relatively recent introduction of passports is another example – we live in an age where nation-states increasingly are working together on the important task of

identifying and regulating moving bodies and denying and refusing any illegitimate movement. What is different today is that human mobility needs to be framed in relation to the global political system of nation-states, who set and control the parameters of international movements and seem to prefer relatively immobilized subject populations (Salazar and Smart, 2011).

Globalization thus paradoxically produces significant new forms of immobility and closure for some categories of persons alongside the increased mobility of others; what Shamir (2005) has called a 'mobility gap'. As a form of human experience, border-crossing mobility could still be said to be the exception rather than the norm. International borders are not singular and unitary, but are designed to encourage some kinds of mobility (business travellers, tourists, migrant workers, students) and discourages other (illegal migrants, refugees). Following Salazar and Smart (2011), one could say that mobility is the key difference and otherness producing machine of our age, involving significant inequalities of speed, risks, rights, and status. Consider for instance the difference between EU citizens and so called third country nationals.

The prison is a case in point. In addition to being connected to a wider range of state institutions and forms of state power, the prison today is increasingly part of a regime of international mobility control. In the process, the very core of the prison as a state technology is changing. There are several results. One is an emerging risk-management system that has a global reach. In the context of the European Union, border control cooperation, a common asylum seeker registration and deportation system and shared responsibility for the return of illegal immigrants to their point of entry are all examples with high priority (Broeders, 2007; Balibar, 2010). The borders around the Schengen area are being fortified because old borders between member states have evaporated. According to the EU Internal Security Strategy (EU ISS), the various forms of serious and organised international crimes are the most urgent challenges to EU security. Even petty crime such as burglaries and car thefts are often seen as local manifestations of border-crossing crime, with international criminal networks necessitating a concerted European action. The notion of 'international crime' is, of course, hardly a new invention (Knepper, 2011). More generally, the modern state has always had to cope with non-citizens behaving badly. It is the scale of the phenomenon that is new; from being a relatively marginal issue, the foreigners, asylum seekers and third country nationals

have become important objects of control and administration, for the nation-states but also for the union as a whole (Aas, 2007a, 2007b; Weber, L and Bowling, 2008; Pakes, 2013). Seen from this perspective, the prison is part of a wider field of border control technologies, together with international police databases, agencies working with deportation of unwanted foreigners, immigration detention centres, and so on. In short, the prison is becoming a vital part of an international migration control system encompassing practices of border control and immigration removal and deportation. So we are no longer faced with a prison as a technology of selective immobility; prisons are also aiding in the forced movement of people across borders in new ways.

These international and even global changes also manifest themselves locally, on specific prison wings. Many foreign national prisoners have a deportation order added to their prison sentence, either by the court as part of sentencing, or by the immigration authorities in a separate process. In practice, it will often be down to the prison locally to effectuate the deportation together with police and immigration officers. The prison is thus made part of the 'deportation machine' (Fekete, 2005). In short, the question of deportability (Genova, 2002) is taking centre-stage when prison officers are making everyday decisions. Some jurisdictions, such as France and the UK (Wacquant, 1999; Banks, 2011; Bosworth, 2011; Kaufman, 2012) imprison people on an immigration order in regular prisons, alongside prisoners serving a penal sanction. When deportation procedures are put on hold, deportable former prisoners are just kept in prison in some cases, sometimes for months or even years on end. Over the last decade, the non-criminal prison population in the UK for instance has almost trebled, according to Banks (2011).

Immigration detention in prison often happens following a penal sanction, when the immigration authorities have not been able to effectuate deportation in time for the release date. Some prisoners have no valid travel documents. Some countries have no embassy in the country where their citizens are imprisoned, making the process of return – voluntary or coercive – difficult. Some embassies refuse to issue travel documents unless the imprisoned foreign citizen appears in person. The deportation process is adding difficult new tasks to prison officers' and prison managers' schedules that are already quite full in many places.

National governments are increasingly bound by decisions taken at the supranational level. Much has been written about the decline of the nation-state and its power in the era of globalization (Bauman, 1998; Creveld, 1999; Beck, 2002). Some have argued that we are moving towards a form of supranational control-without-a-state, where the national governments are replaced, or, at least where the power of the nation-state and national institutions are watered down (Mathiesen, 2008). The state is allegedly losing much of its importance and its traditional power base is eroding, so that we are living in a post-national world where the state has abdicated and surrendered its power to other agents and organizations on other levels. Others (Neocleous, 2003; Schinkel, 2009; Neumann and Sending, 2010) have claimed that the state is just thriving in new ways that are difficult to analyse from the point of view of traditional state theory. Many prison scholars would argue that traditional forms of state power such as the prison and the related state monopoly on legitimate violence seem to be doing just fine; increasing prison populations around the world can attest to that. In addition to this, prisons seem to work well both symbolically and practically as a tool of border control (Bosworth, 2008). According to Melossi (2003), the 'deviant immigrant' has played a vital part of the intra-European construction of a shared European identity. It might also be that border-crossing and international crime is being used to 'govern through crime', as Findlay (2008) has argued with reference to Simon (2007). The prison is then, still, placed in the core of state sovereignty as one of the fundamental tools of statecraft.

Conclusion and suggestions for future research

The division of labour between academic disciplines has resulted in criminology being preoccupied with the national and with the specific nation-states. Crime and justice have traditionally been seen as phenomena on the national level. This chapter has argued that the notion that there is a distinction between the domestic and the international, or between 'inside' and 'outside', should be challenged (Loader and Percy, 2012). We are living in an era where the received inside/outside binary has been radically disturbed. This has consequences for prisons as well as for prison ethnographers. Prison ethnography can no longer strictly be interested in the nation-state.

As a technology of state mobility control, we need to understand that the prison is also part of a wider international regime of practices, policies and systems whereby states increasingly

exert power through the administration of and control over mobility. I have argued for the need for prison ethnographies that see the prison as part of a wider international mobility control regime employed by states to exert and reproduce sovereignty in new ways. We need to reposition the prison conceptually as part of a wider field of interconnected technologies of immobility and forced mobility and understand that the ways into and out of the prison may lead from and to other forms of immobility and forced mobility. In short, we need to take Wacquant up on his challenge to study prisons ‘both as a microcosm endowed with a distinctive material and symbolic tropism and as a template or vector of broader social forces, political nexi, and cultural processes that traverse its walls...’ (2002: 386). The boundaries of prison ethnography must be redrawn not only to include society outside the prison, however, but to also encompass the world outside the limited social space that is the nation-state.

Much work is yet to be done. I will briefly suggest a few possibilities that seem to have promise for prison ethnographers.

- According to Burawoy (1991a), we are living in a world where space itself has become a more floating and immaterial concept. In many ways, prisons are exceptions to this. Prisons are built according to a very concrete and closed notion of space. For most prisoners, the world is no more open than it was a century or two ago. They are held behind concrete walls and often only have very limited access to a telephone, and no Internet access. Even in a context of globalization, the prison world is in most ways as closed as ever. Prison ethnographers should study how prisoners experience the enforced immobility and the lack of contact with the world and their loved ones that many take for granted today.
- Fraser (2013) recently pointed to a paradox; that even though criminologists long have argued for more transnational approaches, criminological knowledge remains clustered in a relatively narrow range of geographical sites. Understandings of crime and criminology in the South also too often are defined through the lens of the North (Aas, 2012). This chapter has admittedly been lopsided in favour of (Western) European perspectives. Prison ethnographers need to examine the world beyond the global North. This work is already being done by Bandyopadhyay (2006), Darke (2013), Jefferson (2014) and others. We should also develop this and try to study the movement between North and South and the interconnected international regime of power that prisons, as local ethnographic sites, are part of.

- Prisons are increasingly being used for immigration detention and other immigration control purposes. Prison-like immigration detention centres are opening in all European jurisdictions to make the control of deportable foreigners possible and facilitate their deportation. A significant part of the prison population in many jurisdictions is today imprisoned for having committed immigration offences, and not crimes in the classical sense. In Norway, the normal sentence for violating the reentry ban (an immigration offence) was recently raised from 60 days to one year for the first offence, and eighteen months for repeated offences. Compared with general sentencing levels for more traditional offences, reentering the country after being deported is now considered to be a relatively serious crime. This blurring of the borders between immigration control and crime control should be studied ethnographically.
- Finally, we should study what happens when a tool that was custom made to do a specific job is being used for something else. What happens in more welfare oriented prison systems when institutions are filled with prisoners who lack the right to basic welfare provisions according to national legislation? According to O'Nolan (2011), a range of measures is used by states to discourage 'less eligible' immigrants from coming and staying within their boundaries. A governmentality of immigration is being developed; an incentive structure taking as its fundamental mechanism the difference between citizens and non-citizens. Theodore (2011) has described this as the 'attrition strategy'; the notion that measures can be set up to make unauthorized immigrants 'self-deport' and leave the country 'voluntarily'. This logic seems to be colonizing the prisons of Europe to a certain degree. Prison ethnographers should study the effects of such a policy and how it plays out on the prison wings.

Further reading

Aas (2007b) is a broad introduction to the many issues related to crime and crime control in the era of globalization. Stumpf (2006) was among the first to use the term 'crimmigration' to describe the progressive intertwining of immigration law and penal law. The notion of global prison ethnography is heavily inspired by Burawoy's writings on global ethnography (e.g. 2000b). Bhui (2009), Bosworth (2012) and Kaufmann (2012) provide important analyses of how the developments described in this chapter play themselves out in specific institutions.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Anette B. Houge, Jennifer Sloan and Kjersti Lohne for insightful comments to earlier versions of this chapter. The writing of this chapter has been funded by the European Research Council (ERC starting grant).

Bibliography

- Aas, KF (2007a): "Analysing a World in Motion : Global Flows Meet 'Criminology of the Other'". *Theoretical Criminology* 11 (2), 283-303.
- Aas, KF (2007b): *Globalization & Crime*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi & Singapore: Sage.
- Aas, KF (2011): "'Crimmigrant' Bodies and Bona Fide Travelers: Surveillance, Citizenship and Global Governance". *Theoretical Criminology* 15 (3), 331-346.
- Aas, KF (2012): "'The Earth Is One but the World Is Not': Criminological Theory and Its Geopolitical Divisions". *Theoretical Criminology* 16 (1), 5-20.
- Balibar, É (2004): *We, the People of Europe : Reflections on Transnational Citizenship*. Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Balibar, É (2010): "At the Borders of Citizenship: A Democracy in Translation?". *European Journal of Social Theory* 13 (3), 315-322.
- Bandyopadhyay, MM (2006): "Competing Masculinities in a Prison". *Men and masculinities* 9 (2), 186-203.
- Banks, J (2011): "Foreign National Prisoners in the UK: Explanations and Implications". *The Howard journal of criminal justice* 50 (2), 184-198.
- Barker, V (2012): "Nordic Exceptionalism Revisited: Explaining the Paradox of a Janus-Faced Penal Regime". *Theoretical Criminology* 17 (1), 5-25.
- Bauman, Z (1998): *Globalization: The Human Consequences*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, U (2002): "The Terrorist Threat: World Risk Society Revisited". *Theory, Culture & Society* 19 (4), 39-55.
- Bhui, HS (2008): "Foreign National Prisoners". Y Jewkes and J bennett (ed.): *Dictionary of Prisons and Punishment*. Cullompton: Willan.
- Bhui, HS (2009): "Foreign National Prisoners: Issues and Debates". H S Bhui (ed.): *Race and Criminal Justice*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi & Singapore: SAGE.
- Bosniak, L (2006): *The Citizen and the Alien: Dilemmas of Contemporary Membership*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bosworth, M (2008): "Border Control and the Limits of the Sovereign State". *Social and legal studies* 17 (2), 199-215.
- Bosworth, M (2012): "Subjectivity and Identity in Detention: Punishment and Society in a Global Age". *Theoretical Criminology* 16 (2), 123-140.
- Broeders, D (2007): "The New Digital Borders of Europe: EU Databases and the Surveillance of Irregular Migrants". *International sociology* 22 (1), 71-92.
- Brown, W (2010): *Walled States, Waning Sovereignty*. New York: Zone Books.
- Burawoy, M (1991a): *Ethnography Unbound: Power and Resistance in the Modern Metropolis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Burawoy, M (1991b): "The Extended Case Method". M Burawoy, et al. (eds): *Ethnography Unbound : Power and Resistance in the Modern Metropolis*. Berkely, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

- Burawoy, M (2000a): "Grounding Globalization". M Burawoy, et al. (eds): *Global Ethnography : Forces, Connections, and Imaginations in a Postmodern World*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.
- Burawoy, M (2000b): "Introduction: Reaching for the Global". M Burawoy, et al. (eds): *Global Ethnography : Forces, Connections and Imaginations in a Postmodern World*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Creveld, Mv (1999): *The Rise and Decline of the State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dal Lago, A (2009): *Non-Persons: The Exclusion of Migrants in a Global Society*. Vimodrone: IPOC.
- Darke, S (2013): "Inmate Governance in Brazilian Prisons". *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice* 52 (3), 272-284.
- Dauvergne, C (2008): *Making People Illegal: What Globalization Means for Migration and Law*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- De Giorgi, A (2010): "Immigration Control, Post-Fordism, and Less Eligibility". *Punishment & Society* 12 (2), 147-167.
- Fekete, L and F Webber (2010): "Foreign Nationals, Enemy Penology and the Criminal Justice System". *Race & Class* 51 (4), 1-25.
- Findlay, M (2008): *Governing through Globalised Crime: Futures for International Criminal Justice*. Cullompton: Willan.
- Foucault, M (1977): *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London, New York: Penguin.
- Fraser, A (2013): "Ethnography at the Periphery: Redrawing the Borders of Criminology's World-Map". *Theoretical Criminology* 17 (2), 251-260.
- Genova, NPD (2002): "Migrant 'Illegality' and Deportability in Everyday Life". *Annual review of anthropology* 31 (419-447),
- Hayward, KJ (2012): "Five Spaces of Cultural Criminology". *British journal of criminology* 52 (3), 441-462.
- Hudson, B (2008): "Difference, Diversity and Criminology". *Theoretical Criminology* 12 (3), 275-292.
- Jefferson, A (2014): "Conceptualizing Confinement: Prisons and Poverty in Sierra Leone". *Criminology and criminal justice* 14 (1), 44-60.
- Joppke, C (1999): *Immigration and the Nation-State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kalmthout, Av, FH-vd Meulen and F Dünkel (2007): "Comparative Overview, Conclusions and Recommendations". A v Kalmthout, F H-v d Meulen and F Dünkel (ed.): *Foreigners in European Prisons*. Nijmegen: Wolf Legal Publishers.
- Kaufman, E (2012): "Finding Foreigners: Race and the Politics of Memory in British Prisons". *Population, Space and Place* 18 (6), 701-714.
- Knepper, P (2011): *International Crime in the 20th Century: The League of Nations Era, 1919-1939*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Loader, I and S Percy (2012): "Bringing the 'Outside' in and the 'inside' Out: Crossing the Criminology/IR Divide". *Global Crime* 13 (4), 213-218.
- Mathiesen, T (2008): "*Lex Vigilatoria* : Global Control without a State?". M Deflem (ed.): *Surveillance and Governance: Crime Control and Beyond*. Colombia: Emerald.
- Melossi, D (2013): "The Borders of the European Union and the Processes of Criminalization of Migrants". S Body-Gendrot, M Hough, K Kerezsi, R Lévy and S Snacken (ed.): *The Routledge Handbook of European Criminology*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Neocleous, M (2003): *Imagining the State*. Maidenhead & Philadelphia: Open University Press.

- Neumann, IB and OJ Sending (2010): *Governing the Global Polity: Practice, Mentality, Rationality*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- O'Nolan, C (2011): "Penal Populations in a World in Motion: The Case of the Republic of Ireland". *The Howard journal of criminal justice* 50 (4), 371-391.
- Pakes, FJ (2013): *Globalisation and the Challenge to Criminology*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.
- Recommendation on the European Prison Rules* (Rec(2006)2). (2006): Strasbourg: Council of Europe, Committee of Ministers.
- Salazar, NB and A Smart (2011): "Introduction: Anthropological Takes on (Im)Mobility". *Identities: global studies in culture and power* 18 (6), i-ix.
- Schinkel, W (2009): "Dignitas Non Moritur? The State of the State in an Age of Social Hypochondria". W Schinkel (ed.): *Globalization and the State: Sociological Perspectives on the State of the State*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Scott, JC (1998): *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Shamir, R (2005): "Without Borders? Notes on Globalization as a Mobility Regime". *Sociological Theory* 23 (2), 197-217.
- Simon, J (2007): *Governing through Crime: How the War on Crime Transformed American Democracy and Created a Culture of Fear*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, MJ (2009): *Power and the State*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Stumpf, J (2006): "The Crimmigration Crisis: Immigrants, Crime, and Sovereign Power". *American University Law Review* 56 (2), 367-419.
- Theodore, N (2011): "Policing Borders: Unauthorized Immigration and the Pernicious Politics of Attrition". *Social Justice* 38 (1-2), 90-106.
- Ugelvik, T (2013): "Seeing Like a Welfare State: Immigration Control, Statecraft, and a Prison with Double Vision". M Bosworth and K F Aas (eds): *Borders of Punishment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ugelvik, T (2014a): "The Incarceration of Foreigners in European Prisons". S Pickering and J Ham (eds): *The Routledge Handbook on Crime and International Migration*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Ugelvik, T (2014b): *Power and Resistance in Prison: Doing Time, Doing Freedom*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wacquant, LJD (1999): "'Suitable Enemies': Foreigners and Immigrants in the Prisons of Europe". *Punishment & Society* 1 (2), 215-222.
- Wacquant, LJD (2002): "The Curious Eclipse of Prison Ethnography in the Age of Mass Incarceration". *Ethnography* 3 (4), 371-397.
- Weber, L and B Bowling (2008): "Valiant Beggars and Global Vagabonds: Select, Eject, Immobilize". *Theoretical Criminology* 12 (3), 355-375.
- Weber, M (2004): "Politics as a Vocation". D Owen and T B Strong (ed.): *The Vocation Lectures*. Indianapolis & Cambridge: Hackett.