A SUBALTERNISTIC PERSPECTIVE ON THE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS DISCIPLINE THROUGH MIGRANTS AS POST-COLONIAL WORLD SUBALTERNS

Elif KARA[1]

Abstract

In this study, the main notions of International Relations (IR) discipline and the migrations to Europe in the post-colonial and post-World War II periods are discussed through the Subaltern Theory, which is a post-colonial approach. Through Subaltern Theory -which is a reassessment of history academics from India, a former colony- it is sought to show that the direction and the structure of migration have changed; the approach toward the migrants in the migration-receiving countries, mainly in the EU, is a continuation of colonial practices and the international migrants are new subalterns. To do this, it has been tried to reveal that the basic concepts of IR discipline, the nation-state, nation, nationalism, and citizenship are problematic as they are, do not meet today's dynamics, and push migrants into subalternity. This study, which is a theoretical examination of the concepts of the discipline of IR, includes a deconstructive analysis of the basic concepts of the discipline of IR.

The assimilation, multiculturalism, and integration policies of the EU have been put forward as factors that fix the subaltern position of migrants. As the breaking point, the post-1945 period is chosen, as after which this change in direction and form of migration began to be seen, and the global economic order has then changed, which marked the onset of decolonization and the new economic order after the Second World War almost overlapped. Migration theories focus on specific issues such as the

[1] Lecturer, Rectorate, Eskişehir Osmangazi University
ekara@ogu.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0001-7978-4861

opportunities that cause migration, the push-pull model, group decision and cultural ties, related migration networks, cost-benefit calculations, the structure of the internal labor market, economic developments, etc. However, Subaltern Theory grasps a broader aspect and general view of migration. In this study, the content analysis method is preferred among the qualitative research methods, it has been tried to show that the Subaltern Theory could be explanatory in the IR Discipline.

Keywords: *International Relations Theories, Subaltern Theory, Migrants, European Union, Migration Policies.*

POST-KOLONYAL DÜNYA MADUNLARI GÖÇMENLER ÜZERİNDEN ULUSLARARASI İLİŞKİLER DİSİPLİNİNE MADUNİYETÇİ BİR BAKIŞ

Öz

Bu çalışmada 2. Dünya Savaşı ve sömürgecilik sonrası dönemde Avrupa'ya yönelik göçler ve Uluslararası İlişkiler disiplininin temel kavramları, sömürgecilik sonrası bir yaklaşım olan Maduniyet Teorisi üzerinden ele alınmıştır. Eski bir sömürge toprağı olan Hindistan'da Hintli akademisyenlerin ortaya attığı tarihsel bir yeniden okuma olan Maduniyet Teorisinin yardımıyla göçün yönünün ve yapısının değiştiği, göçün istikameti olan ülkelerdeki göçmenlere yönelik yaklaşımların, sömürgeci düzen pratiklerinin bir devamı niteliğinde olduğu ve yeni madunların göç alan ülkelerdeki göçmenler olduğu gösterilmeye çalışılmıştır. Bunu yapmak için, Uluslararası İlişkiler disiplininin temel kavramları olan ulus-devlet, ulus, milliyetçilik ve vatandaşlık kavramlarının kabul edile gelen hallerinin günümüz dinamiklerini karşılamakta sorunlu kaldığı ve göçmenleri maduniyete iten kavramlar olduğu ortaya konulmaya çalışılmıştır. Uluslararası İlişkiler disiplininin kavramlarının teorik bir irdelemesi niteliğinde olan bu çalışma, Uİ disiplininin temel kavramlarının yapısökümsel bir analizini içermektedir.

Avrupa özelinde göçmenlerin modern madunlar olduğuna dair iddia AB göç politikalarından asimilasyon, çok kültürcülük ve entegrasyon politikaları ortaya konularak göçmenlerin madun konumunu sabitleyen faktörler olduğu savı doğrulanmaya çalışılmıştır. Göçmenlerin modern madunlar haline geldiğini göstermek için göçün yön değiştirdiği ve küresel ekonomik düzenin değişim gösterdiği kırılma noktası olarak dekonolizasyonun başlaması ve 2. Dünya Savaşı sonrası yeni ekonomik düzenin oluşmaya başladığı tarihlerin yaklaşık olarak üst üste bindiği 1945 sonrası dönem tercih edilmiştir. Göç kuramlarının göçe neden olan fırsatlar, itme-çekme modeli, grup kararı ve kültürel bağlar, bununla bağlantılı olarak göç ağları, fayda maliyet hesapları, iş gücü piyasasının yapısı, ekonomik gelişmeler gibi spesifik konulara odaklanıyor olması ve göçe Maduniyet Teorisi kadar geniş ve topyekûn bir bakış açısı oluşturmakta yetersiz kalması bu çalışmada bu teorinin seçilmesinin nedenini oluşturmaktadır. Nitel araştırma yöntemlerinden içerik analizi yöntemi tercih edilen bu çalışmada Maduniyet Teorisinin Uluslararası İlişkiler disiplininde de açıklayıcı bir kuram olma yetisine sahip olduğu gösterilmeye çalışılmıştır.

1. Origin of the Research: Migration

One of the developments that frequently occupies the national and international political agenda of the members and non-members of the European Union, is mass migration. The European Union has experienced a massive influx of migration for various reasons in recent decades, which has led to the formation of discourse and perception of migration and the migrant crisis with it. The crisis discourse has created a perception of emergency and intervention, thus causing decisions to be made without deep investigations, analysis, and detailed research of future solutions, and this causes the situation that Agamben defines as the "state of exception" (Agamben 2006, 7). Agamben's state of exception, which is a paradoxical situation like legal measures that are not understood at the legal level, emerges at the point of an imbalance between law and political phenomenon and is defined as exceptional measures taken in a situation of uncertainty and ambivalence, and the illegal application becomes a legal form (Agamben 2006, 9-10). It is possible to argue that the phenomenon of migration is understood and shaped by the perception of crisis and security discourses and that this state of exception is used functionally by becoming a norm and a management technique, especially when it comes to migrants, as Agamben states, is one of the reasons for the subalternity of migrants. This urgent situation of the concept of migration is frequently discussed in both academic and political fields and is the subject of new and intensive studies every progressing day.

According to the reports of the International Organization for Migration, there are 281 million migrants in the world and when compared to the world population, 1 out of every 30 people is thought to be a migrant. Certainly, these reports reflect the number of registered or non-registered migrants, and these figures increase even more when unregistered migrants are included. The number of migrants today is more than three times that of the 1970s (World Migration Report 2021, 21). Although the increase in migration in the European Union is perceived as a brand-new phenomenon and crisis, migration is not a new phenomenon in the history of EU member states. Today, we can find the reasons why immigration to the EU is experienced so intensely in the historical processes and developments that led European countries to become the European Union. What happened in our post-colonial world is the result of pre-colonial dynamics and is reflected in the present.

In this study, the concept of "the nation-state", which is one of the basic concepts of the International Relations (IR) discipline, and therefore the concepts of citizenship and nationalism, which are fundamental elements that shape the concept of "nation-state", are criticized through a subalternistic perspective. The hypothesis of the study is that these concepts of the IR discipline are problematic and far from reflecting the realities of the post-colonial world as they are, that the rising nationalist reaction due to increasing international migration causes a modern subalternity, and that the nationalist reaction to immigrants can be reconsidered with a subalternistic point of view. Qualitative research means "meanings, concepts, definitions, characteristics, metaphors, symbols, and description of things" (Lune

& Berg 2017, 12). Among qualitative research methods, content analysis is the examination and interpretation of a subject in an effort to identify themes, patterns, meanings and assumptions (Lune & Berg 2017, 182). Therefore, this article adopts content analysis as its base methodology and focuses on understanding migration-caused subalternity in the EU by providing a theoretical discussion.

While making this analysis, the origins of the increasing international migration today will be sought in the colonial period and it will be tried to show that the explanations of the Subalternists, who are originally from the Indian geography which is a former colony and accepted in the international academy, have the capacity to deconstruct the concepts of the nation-state, citizenship, and nationalism.

The concepts of the nation-state, nationalism, and citizenship are concepts that are frequently discussed by the academicians of the International Relations discipline. Many academics working on globalization have predicted that traditional nation-states, which are surrounded by a certain terrestrial border, culturally homogeneous, economically integrated, and politically dominant, will decline (Hutchinson 2003, 5). For example, Hutchinson, in his article "The Past, Present and the Future of the Nation-State", discusses whether federal multinational systems are viable and effective alternatives to unitary nation-states in the European Union, and acknowledges that global migration patterns and increasing international recognition for the rights of minorities have pluralized and hybridized nation-state societies. He also highlights that the widely accepted national model is a very Eurocentric definition (Hutchinson 2003, 5). Thus, it may not fit into a post-colonial and global world.

Hutchinson emphasizes the idea of nation building as the basis of effective governance (Hutchinson 2003, 6). On the other hand, it is widely accepted by the international academic community that nation-states have administrative problems.

Criticizing the concept of the nation-state, Gordon L. Anderson, the Secretary General of Professors World Peace Academy, stated that the idea of the nation-state constitutes an obstacle to peace, and the desire to preserve cultural homogeneity as a result of globalization, migration of people to different parts of the world, "has been one of the greatest scourges on human society" (Anderson 2006, 75-76). He emphasizes that the idea of establishing a unitary nation-state is the underlying thought of genocide, civil wars, ethnic cleansing, and religious persecution.

Dane Kennedy, who established the relationship between the nation-state and colonialism, emphasizes that the nation-state is both the triumph and the tragedy of decolonization. He sees this as a victory because it has become clear that national self-determination is accepted as a universal norm at the political level. On the other hand, the idea of nation-building has been a tragedy because it has caused different ethnic, linguistic, religious, and cultural groups to be exposed to conflicts for exactly aforementioned factors in countries that are in efforts toward unity. For this reason, Kennedy states that the nation-state ceased to be a functional option in the post-colonial era (Kennedy 2016, 69).

In summary, considering these studies examined above, it can be seen that post-colonial studies on the concept of the nation-state gained

importance and need to be studied in more detail. When we look at the literature, there are post-colonial studies on the concept of the nation-state, which is one of the basic concepts in the discipline of International Relations, there are very few studies that deal with this concept from a subalternistic perspective. In this context, this study aims to develop an approach with a post-colonial concept in order to fill the gap in the literature.

Rana Dasgupta emphasizes that increasing nationalism is the result of the concern to regain the "nation-state" because its fall is felt as if it is the end of the world since we have no alternative to the nation-state. The decline of national political authority has led to the rise of political machismo, xenophobia, rising walls, mythology, and racial theory as symptoms (Dasgupta 2018). Dasgupta states that this coincided with the destruction of the 20th century's reckless colonized world. Therefore, the crisis of the nation-state needs to be reconsidered from a post-colonial perspective.

2. Historical Background

It is seen that the migrations after the colonial period differ from the migrations before and during the colonial period. Written sources on the migrations experienced in the pre-colonial period are quite scarce. One of the biggest reasons for this is the difference in the systematic of migrations before the colonial period. As it is known, people have led nomadic and hunter-gatherer lives for millions of years, and these migrations were necessary to meet the vital needs of human communities. In this sense, while migration is already one of the most natural and perhaps the most indispensable phenomena of human

history, the transition to settled life, the transition to agricultural society, and the invention of private property, eventually urbanization and the formation of modern society have caused the perspective of migration to change over time. So much so that a process that is so natural for human history would lead to the emergence of two concepts, which are known as barbarism and civilization, and the conflict between these two, by its nature. As a matter of fact, the emergence of barbarism coincides with the domestication of animals, husbandry, and agriculture (Engels 2003, 25-26). With the transition to settled life, mass migration would no longer be a necessity to meet basic vital needs, but mass migrations will take place when there is any kind of crisis/competition environment for these vital needs. Although there are examples where nomadic societies continue to exist, as in Anatolian and Mongolian peoples, or as relatively exceptional cases as wars, natural disasters, famine, and epidemics, there are examples of mass migrations, but nomadic life is no longer the norm.

Mass migration based on the supply of labor, which is the most up-to-date or the most modern type of migration, would emerge with the discovery of the New World in the sixteenth century. Even though slavery has existed in the world until this date (because it would be wrong to claim that many events in the world are historically separated by sharp boundaries), the discovery of raw materials in the New World and the power and technology of European people to access these resources from indigenous peoples in the New World. The fact that it has reached before will also form the basis of the colonial order (Zavala 1961, 914). With the discovery of the American continent, the natives, who cannot in any way resist the power and technology of the European

people, will be employed for the rapid processing of the untouched gold and silver mines there; in the face of unbearable working conditions, diseases brought by the Europeans, and modern weapons, the natives would be defenseless. As a result, when the natives began to disappear *en masse*, the need for urgent and cheap labor to work in the plantations and mines would be met from African lands, and Europe's inclusion in the history of mass economic migration and the colonial order would be consolidated. Simultaneously, Europeans themselves would start migrating to the regions they colonized in masses to manage these regions and to extract a share of the income obtained. It can be mentioned that there was a migration circulation in this period.

On the other hand, while the presence of the Europeans destroyed the indigenous population on the continent, African slaves brought to replace the declining workforce were also held captive to be embarked at the ports, and died on long ship voyages, under heavy working conditions and inhumane treatment when they arrived at the destination. The frequency of deaths meant the existence of a migration cycle and migrant market due to the "imports" of new slaves (Dedman 2009, 12). The discovery of the New World and the associated human trafficking was at the heart of the accumulation of capital that drives the development of capitalism today.

As a result of the discovery of the new world, there was massive participation from the European voluntary workforce, and Europeans migrated to its colonies during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. These migrations were directed towards the settlements in Asia and Africa as well as to the Americas. The concept of "contracted labor" was also used for the first time in this period. Contracted labor is a

category between slavery and free labor (Dedman 2009, 14). Therefore, migrations in this period are directly related to the economic development of the West by reducing labor costs and increasing profitability, and the accumulation of capital in Europe took place during these periods. However, since the half of the twentieth century, the world migration direction has been reversed from a European perspective. Immigration from Europe stopped with the First World War, and after the Second World War, the migration changed direction, and Europe passed from the status of the emigrant to the status of receiving immigration.

After the Second World War, migration to Europe can be examined in ten-yearly periods. Between 1940-50 in Europe, mass migrations were experienced due to the change of borders in Europe and due to resettlement policies. The largest of these migrations took place between Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. It came to a standstill with the establishment of the Berlin Wall in 1963.

The revival of the post-war European economy in the 1950s increased the demand for labor, and contract labor policies were followed. While countries such as France and England drew workers from their former colonies, countries such as Germany, the Netherlands, and Belgium provided workers from the periphery such as Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey. This process continued until the 1970s (Schierup et al. 2006, 27; Dedman 2009, 25). The push-pull factors that dominated the migrations experienced in this period are historical ties, former colonial relations, geographical distance, and cultural similarities. During this period in Europe, there was no great opposition to mass migration. The social belief that incoming workers will return

after staying for a while causes the absence of opposition and the definition of these workers as guest workers (*Gastarbeiter*). In fact, during this period in Germany, struggles were for equal wages for German and foreign workers by the unions so that the incoming labor supply would not reduce labor wages (De Haas 2018, iii; Dedman 2009, 27). This situation can be read as one of the reasons preventing opposition to international migration.

The 1973 Oil Crisis shook the economy in Europe, the recruitment of workers ceased due to the economic recession, but the way for migrant workers who did not return to take their families with them through family reunification was paved. As the end of the 1980s approached, with the disintegration of the Eastern Bloc, mass migrations from Eastern Europe started again, and asylum applications to central European countries increased in this period (Schierup et al. 2006, 27). Immigration to Europe was not limited to these waves. From the 1980s to the present day, the world has entered a period in which communication and transportation are much easier and cheaper compared to previous periods. In the 1990s and later, instability in world politics pushed people to seek safer places, and mass migrations to Europe, especially from Africa and the Middle East began due to cheaper transportation and geographical proximity. All these developments mentioned above are evidential reasoning that a complete picture of Europe cannot be drawn without migration.

It is claimed that Europe's migrant crisis dates back to the 1990s. The disintegration of the Soviet Union meant a change in balance for Eastern Europe and some Central European countries, and it was predicted that migrants from underdeveloped Eastern and Central

European countries would go towards the western welfare system. However, according to OECD statistics, the main mobility consisted of Russians who migrated from central and eastern European countries to central Russia or were deported. Apart from this, among the migrations that these countries are the subject of, most of them migrated to countries where ethnic minorities are said to have ethnic ancestors. Examples include Schierup, Hansen, and Castles ethnic Germans who immigrated to Germany (Germans in East Germany and the former Soviet countries); He cites Russian Jews immigrating to Israel, Bulgarian Turks immigrating to Turkey, and Greeks immigrating to Greece as examples. But the fact that immigration has become a deeper policy issue and the urgent solution requirements stem from the refugees that emerged with the disintegration of Yugoslavia in the 1990s. In 1992, due to the civil war in Yugoslavia, there was an influx of 695,000 refugees to European OECD countries. Economic transformations, political turmoil, ethnic conflicts, and environmental disasters in the nineties triggered migration, including refugees, asylum seekers, and unregistered workers. Therefore, the result would be a further increase in social diversity with the effect of migrants from different cultural, geographical, and ethnic backgrounds. Since the 1990s, the idea of ethnically homogeneous populations and monocultural identities has become unsustainable. Schierup (Schierup et al. 2006, 21-23), attributes this situation to the welfare state in Europe and the change in class relations. Since it coincides with globalization and regional integration, the sovereignty and independence of the nation-state have become debatable. As seen above, in the rapidly capitalist world after the colonial period, migrations take place more

frequently, more systematically, and massively, and the economic causes and consequences of migration become more evident. In this context, the causes and consequences of migration are similar to the phenomena that led to the emergence of the Subaltern Theory. In this sense, Subaltern Theory can be meaningful in explaining the phenomenon of migration, which is frequently discussed in the European Union.

3. Subaltern Theory and Subalternity

Subaltern Theory was developed in 1982 by a group of Indian Academics under the editorship of Ranajit Guha in a group of articles constituting the "Subaltern Studies", aiming to rewrite history by including the voices of those who have not been heard in history, with the foreword of Edward Said. 10 years after the Subaltern Studies first published in 1982, and in 1992, the "Latin American Subaltern Studies Association" was established in North America, and Subaltern Studies has qualified as being a "close relative" of postcolonialism (Chakrabarty 2000, 9).

There is no single and precise definition for the term "subaltern". However, the Marxist Antonio Gramsci is accepted as the person who introduced the word subaltern to the literature. Gramsci preferred to use the term "subaltern" rather than "the class" to avoid prison controls while he was in prison and to censor his writings so that they could reach the outside. Subalternity, which constitutes the field of analysis in Marxist thought, but without a name or a specific context, was already an *ante litteram* term (Modonesi et al. 2014, 10). However, according to Gramsci, the word subaltern has a scope far beyond the

proletariat and generally represents groups that have not been systematically included in Marxist theory (Afacan 2020, 6; Lee 2005, 2; Modonesi et al. 2014, 14). The extension of the meaning of the word subaltern to include all marginalized groups enables the definition of migrants in Europe as "subaltern". The idea of "Provincializing Europe" led Chakrabarty and Guha to directly question European history and thus brought Subaltern Studies into the ideological borders of Europe (Chakrabarty 2012, 89; Lee 2005, 9). This permits us to use Subaltern Studies to understand the subalternity of migrants in Europe. As Guha says, "There is no single method of investigating this problem. Let hundreds of flowers bloom, and then we don't mind the weeds" (Lee 2005, 9).

Subaltern Studies has expanded the definition of social class and the class consciousness argument that is isolated in Marxist literature and has moved this term away from the economic perspective of Marxism. Based on Gramsci's ideas, Modonesi defines subalternity as a state and a relative development process. However, at the center of this relative development is the subjective development of political subjectivation, which includes relative acceptance and resistance (Modonesi et al. 2014, 36).

What exactly "Subaltern Studies" is has often been discussed among academics, and its inability to provide a universal theoretical explanation is accepted as a limitation. However, it is possible to argue that this universality concern goes beyond a positivist concern and that the claim of universal applicability and the theories that desire universality are related to modernity (Appadurai 2005, 1). According to Dirlik, Subaltern Studies is a child of postmodernism as it is a part of

post-colonialism. According to him, the reason why the West finds post-colonial theories interesting is that they shape power relations in a seemingly amorphous world (Ahluwalia 2001, 2). Subaltern Studies, on the other hand, have the motto of criticizing the power relations in the seemingly amorphous world, the results of power relations, and the political platform they have created because the postcolonial theory has been constituted upon criticism of the colonial ideology, economic determinism, Eurocentrism, and nationalism. Even Chibber (2016, 18), who criticizes postcolonial theory, finds the effects of the Subalternists' arguments meaningful as they are real, although not universal. In this respect, "subaltern studies" is definitely within the scope of postcolonial theories.

In his book "A Small History of Subaltern Studies" Chakrabarty introduced Subaltern Studies in an understandable and comprehensive way. Based on his article, we can concisely say that Subaltern Studies is a theoretical initiative. Although Subaltern Studies aimed to produce a new historiography, it primarily challenged Marxism, which is the most widely discussed and adopted ideology after the independence of the former colonies, but which Indian historians claim to impose a blindfold on them (Chibber 2016, 26). In short, subaltern studies is at the intersection point of common knowledge and criticism of this knowledge (Lee 2005, 4).

Subalternists did not set out with the claim of universality, but simply emphasized the necessity of criticizing the Eurocentric point of view. In summary, it can be said that the main points of criticism are imperialism and the capitalist world system, and the structural order that these systems have created. For example, Gabilondo (2006, 5) claims

that global capitalism legitimizes itself by creating a global subalternity defined by its exclusion from biopolitics. To put it more clearly, the existence of subalternity is essential for the existence of global capitalism. In addition, despite the criticism of universality, the fact that Subaltern Studies was first accepted by those who worked on Latin American and then African colonialism and started to be studied in different dimensions can prove that the perspectives of subalternists on the necessity of a new theoretical approach are widely accepted. Accordingly, Chibber accepts that "subaltern" is an adjective describing an approach to political analysis. Chibber, one of the strongest critics of Subaltern Studies, considers Subaltern Studies successful and groundbreaking as it combines popular history with the analysis of colonial and post-colonial capitalism (2016, 20-21). Since it opposes the determinism that it can define with the same accuracy, it brings the subaltern approach to the fore.

On the other hand, Chatterjee says that "the structure of global modernity will inevitably structure the world according to a highly colonial model" (1998, 68). It is precisely this statement that supports the claim that this study should include subaltern studies in the discipline of International Relations. Because Chatterjee, Appadurai, and Holston openly state that the structure of democracy will make modernity self-declared as inappropriate and deeply flawed, and transnational tendencies render nation-state forms inadequate (1998, 68-69).

Spivak and O'Hanlon have slightly expanded the scope of subalternity by drawing attention to the lack of gender-related inquiries in the Subaltern Studies. Thus, they succeeded in bringing deep

criticisms about the theoretical orientation of subaltern studies. They opened the idea of "self-determination" established by post-structuralist thinkers to criticism (Chakrabarty 2007, 481; Chakrabarty 2000, 24). Can we really talk about self-determination unless we can define the object, objectively? Spivak discussed this rhetorical question in her book "Can the Subaltern Speak?". So, the gender-based discussion has been incorporated into contemporary feminism debates and Subaltern Studies, by the articles of Ranajit Guha, Partha Chatterjee, and Susie Tharu (Chakrabarty 2007, 480; Chakrabarty 2000, 25). This situation succeeded in bringing Subaltern Studies to a position that exceeded the historiographic agenda that they had started in the 1980s. Therefore, today Subaltern Studies, although it has its origins in postcolonial Indian historiography, has now expanded its scope far beyond, including other unheard-of elements of society.

Karl Marx in his book "The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte" says that "in ancient Rome, the class struggle took place only within a privileged minority, between the free rich and the free poor, while the great productive mass of the population, the slaves, formed the purely passive pedestal for these combatants" which means that the real productive population of the community does nothing but simply lay the groundwork for those who struggle (Marx 1976, 9). Historically, this reminds us that they were pushed behind the stage of history, no different from the subalterns that existed and continue to exist in the present time. Accordingly, it is possible to say that today's subalterns are not so different from the slaves of Ancient Rome that they are free citizens and that subaltern masses, like slaves, are under the socially dominant classes laying at the bottom of the society (Galastri 2018, 55).

This idea will help us understand international migrants who are now at the bottom of economical ground, western countries mostly depend on, have become modern subalterns.

Above, it was stated that the subalterns have no history and therefore cannot speak (Spivak 2016, Galastri 2018, 57; Zembylas 2018, 115). We can apply the same subalternistic view to the migrants who are the subject of this study. Because migration is a definition obtained at the beginning of the action of migration, so, it has no history. Migration has always existed throughout history, however it was defined within the context of the political conditions of the period in which it occurred, and these definitions were made by the "free" citizens of the receiving country. Laws, practices, and even non-governmental organizations speak for or about but on behalf of the migrant. Since the "migrant" is surrounded by the concept of citizenship in the modern world, s/he is silent and under domination due to his statuslessness until s/he obtains legal status in the destination country. The Migrant's freedom is limited, s/he does not have the right to representation as s/he is not a citizen. Therefore, migrants cannot speak. In conclusion, it is possible to say that migrants are subalterns of the modern world considering their status and especially their silence.

4. Conceptual Causes of Subalternity

The 1648 Peace Treaty of Westphalia is accepted as the beginning of international relations in the modern sense. The Westphalian Peace Agreement is important in terms of recognizing the sovereignty of national states and making the nation-state the main actor in international relations and is considered a milestone in the discipline of

International Relations. Consequently, the concepts of nation and nation-state have founding importance in the IR discipline. However, these two basic concepts are experiencing their own crisis in the twenty-first century as they are insufficient to respond to the dynamics of this century. In the following section, the nation-state which is the basic concept of the IR discipline will be examined and the concepts of nation, citizenship, and nationalism associated with the nation-state will be deconstructed to show that these notions are problematic as they are and do not have the ability to meet the needs of the world today. It has become a necessity to re-read the discipline of International Relations from a subalternist perspective.

4.1. Nation and the Nation-State

While the formation process of the nation-state is a subject learned by many social scientists, discussing the ontology of the nation-state, on the other hand, is a process that today's social scientists have witnessed as much as they have learned. Everyone alive today, without exception, was born into a system of nation-states, and since the nation-state has been around for too short for history and too long for human memory, nation and nation-state can be seen as a given or even natural concept. However, the nation-state is not an *a priori* natural structure and it is possible to be redefined in global world conditions with current developments such as migration.

The nation-state is one of the most basic concepts of the International Relations discipline and this discipline is built on the assumption that sovereign nation-states are the main actors in the international system. We can see the importance of the consciousness

of being a nation rather than a state in Dunkerley's definition of the nation-state: "A nation-state is not just a physical space and the institutions that govern it. It is also a broad set of cultural and social practices that generate a popular sense of national identity" (2002, 25). Jurgen Habermas in a Hegelian reading says that "a historical structure is doomed to disappear as soon as it reaches maturity." (Habermas 2012, 14). The nation-state was once a necessary tool, enabling integration against fragmentation and successfully fulfilling its function. On the other hand, the global world challenges this reality every day. According to Bertrand Badie, "The world now belongs to those who overcome the phenomenon of distance and know how to move, as well as those who succeed in constructing networks and get involved in them" (as cited in Sevim 2006, 105). Today, what is in question is not the disappearance of the nation-state, but only the change in the way of intervention in the relevant areas within the state in the face of the phenomenon of globalization (Hibou 2004, 2). According to Giddens, the dialectical nature of globalization and the common attitude among states increase national influence in the global system of states while reducing sovereignty (as cited in Morris 1997, 192-209). James H. Mittelman, on the other hand, draws attention to the fact that the state can be studied as one of many other actors and says that in the relationship between globalization and the state, the state's sovereignty does not lose its meaning, but the meaning of multi-level systemic environment in which the state carries out its actions change (Mittelman 2002, 6). Subalternist Appadurai (2008, 21) similarly emphasizes that globalization caused "*the idea of a stable territory with national sovereignty, the idea of a limited and countable population,*

the idea of a reliable census, and the idea of stable and transparent categories" to fail. The nation-state is stuck somewhere between the past and the present. Discussions about the fate of the nation-state to the past linked especially to colonialism (Berger 2007, 1203-1214).

So, how did this change between the past and the present, makes the nation-state a matter of discussion? Post-war developments in Europe revealed contradictory processes. Globalization has caused the movement of capital, businesses, factories, and people across borders. Intense human migration has increased the number of permanent foreign residents in host societies and their rights have led to debates (Sevim 2006, 192). For states that protect their lands like a temple, globalization means an increase in the permeability of borders, in other words, the relative loss of territorial sovereignty. So much so that for many states, the capital within or outside their borders, has a vital meaning, but it has the power to shape state policy directly or indirectly, that is, to undermine the sole power of the nation-state within the country. All these developments have created an external crisis of the sovereignty of the modern nation-state and an internal crisis of legitimacy (Sevim 2006, 193).

Although nation-states began to exist in 1648, the international order we live in today began to form at the end of the Second World War. It is necessary to evaluate the post-war period by keeping in mind the irony that the migrants of this period took part in the foundation of the post-World War II order. The contemporary international system is based on the sovereignty of states. Although this idea dates back to 1648, many nation-states emerged in the twentieth century as a result of the collapse of European empires, especially after the Second World

War. Since then, nation-states have been seen as natural members of international relations. Many academic studies on the subject "Is the end of nation-states coming?" contain or may have emerged from the fear of the uncertainty of the next international order. However, the existence of migrants and even the reactions and measures against their existence prove that the nation-state is fiction. The contradiction here is in the definition of migrants in terms of their relations with a nation-state. A migrant is an individual who has somehow moved outside of his or her nation-state and is unable and/or not willing to be placed under their own state's protection. Perhaps the contradiction of the nation-state is that the terms nation and state are often used interchangeably. We can see the biggest example of this in the name of the United Nations, which is a community of states (Habermas 2012, 13). Politically, the nation and the people of the state are considered as one. The fear of losing their unity and homogeneity (!) (the word homogeneous should be used very carefully because the homogenization process of nations is very controversial and artificial) in the face of migrations[2] and suddenly turning into a concern for the

---

[2] We can find one of the sources of the homogenization of the nation-state, namely the nationalization, in the state's preference for the national education model. In Europe, the state has assumed the responsibility of centralized and systematic education, has made education a tool for raising cultural unity by using the language of "nation" in education, and has provided the concrete existence of the state in the lives of ordinary people (Dunkerley et al. 2002, 27). When we look at this claim, it is clearly seen that the attitude of the state does not originate from national culture, as is assumed, but from a pragmatist reason. In short, it has been possible by bringing people together, spreading the idea of unity, and adopting the phenomenon of war, and it has been seen that the educated individual will be beneficial in reducing the rising costs. However, this did not prevent politicians from using national concerns as a tool and the formation of major nationalist movements. The centralized education system has had a particularly serious impact on speakers of minority languages, especially those who speak only minority languages. The number of speakers of vernacular languages in Europe declined sharply from the beginning of the nineteenth

survival of the power/state is again due to the use of these two terms interchangeably. David Dunkerley argues that searching for the origin of the nation-state is a hoax since the pure nation-state does not exist. The idea of the nation-state is quite strong in European political history, as governments and political movements aim to put theory into practice. According to Dunkerley, what should be considered is that the nation-state is the process of state transformation and the formation of the popular definition of the state and the nation, rather than being an entity (Dunkerley et al. 2002, 26). Therefore, it is possible to see that there is a conflict between the nation-state and the migrant and that the source of this conflict is the definition of the nation-state.

In summary, the nation-state is constantly being pushed to be reshaped by globalization. On the other hand, the resistance of the nation-state can also be seen through migrants. This resistance stemming from the definition of the nation-state makes itself visible through nationalist debates. The subjection and marginalization of migrants to nationalist discourses pushes migrants to a subaltern position.

In the light of this information, when we look at the deconstructive perspective of the subalternists, how can we accept the nation-state, whose essence is so controversial, as a healthy concept for the IR discipline, when it is so problematic on its own and is constantly being eroded by migration? Especially when the impossibility of a

---

century (Dunkerley et al. 2002, 29). It is not a coincidence that fascism started to rise in this period. Many of the problems experienced between the state and the nation in the interwar period were tried to be resolved with policies ranging from the oppression of minorities to their forced migration.

homogeneous nation concept is widely accepted according to the discussions given above, won't it cause new subalternities to insist on keeping the nation-state alive, as it is? Answering these rhetorical questions, Nelson (2013, 263) argues that having language-minoritized populations itself causes "hegemonic language ideologies" to reproduce the colonial relations of power.

4.2. Nationalism

When nationalism is mentioned, one of the first names that comes to mind will be Benedict Anderson. Benedict Anderson, who stated that nationalism, unlike other "isms", could not reveal its own thinkers, said in 1983 that nations are imaginary communities and conveyed that a scientific definition cannot be made for the nation (Anderson 2007, see also Dunkerley et al. 2002, 44). In the most general definition, the imaginary community consists of people who do not know each other but think they know each other. Anderson called it a "type of cultural construction" for the nation as well as of nationalism and showed the end of the eighteenth century as its creation date (Anderson 2007, 18). Benedict Anderson shows that nations are not the mere result of sociological factors such as language, race, or religion. In Europe or elsewhere nations are envisioned to exist.

Otto Bauer defines the nation as a community of destiny, culture, and emotions, on the other hand, Herder defines it as a language community (as cited in Özkırımlı 2008, 54-55). The main claim of Elie Kedourie in his book "Nationalism" is that nationalism was invented in Europe in the nineteenth century which is a doctrine that offers us an object (nationalism), a category (doctrine) to which this object belongs,

a process from which nationalism arises (invention), a space (Europe), and time (19th century) (as cited in Breuilly 2000, 105). In this context, Anderson and Kedourie determined approximately closer dates. According to Habermas, there is a conceptual gap in the European nation-state (here, he means the Eurocentric nation-state structure), and since the end of the colonial system and communism in the nineteenth century, this gap is filled with the practice of nationalist ideology by influencing state formations (Benhabib 2006, 26). Therefore, the definition of a nation is as artificial as the nation-state, and the self-evident artificiality and even ambiguity of the definition make its manipulation possible.

Gurminder K. Bhambra, a post-colonial theorist, a subalternist, emphasizes that the modern age did not precede its own interpretation and that the interpretation of modernism produced modernity, if not formed it. The definition of modern society is what we derive from the Western experience of what it means to be modern. The thought of modernism, which does not explain what it means to be European, implicitly codes others as non-Western (2015, 4). Under the scope of the same dualism, everyone who is not a westerner (migrants) is the "other". Bhambra explains the invisibility of colonialism, which is inherent in the contemporary order in which dominant academic forms of examination are created, with the silence and marginalization of other experiences and voices. Well, why shouldn't this silence be carried over to European lands through migrants? Didn't the denial of cultures, societies, and their histories outside of Europe cause humiliation of the "others" by marginalizing them? So, is there any reason why this shouldn't continue on European soil? On which

theoretical foundations can we build the walls built by Hungary, for example, against the migrations caused by the economic and political effects of imperial capitals over the states?

According to Hartsock being in the position of the oppressed in society makes it easier to see the truth of the society. This is, in short, called perspective epistemology. According to perspective epistemology, the way to critically question all social relations is to find the appropriate perspective (Hartsock 2019, 1-5). Looking at nationalism from the perspective of domination, subalternity creates a different critical perspective, but also enables us to see the postcolonial structure of nationalism. Frankly, nationalism in Europe carries the traces of past colonialist practices and attracts migrants in Europe to the position of colonialist subalterns.

For this reason, we propose to use the subalternist perspective and the new racism to understand the migration-induced marginalization, which is the result and cause of today's international society. Partha Chatterjee sees nationalist thought, which is the main form of resistance in India against Western colonialism, as a product of Orientalism as a derivative discourse and accepts it as "an inverted orientalism that works into categories produced against orientalism" (Chatterjee 1998, 62; Keyman 2000, 255). From this point of view, we can deduce that the rising nationalist discourse in Europe is also an orientalist mask, and we can interpret nationalism as an enthusiasm for the re-creation of the past on the intellectual level. According to Fuat Keyman, orientalism is not only engaged in the process of orientalizing "the orient" but also theorizing about accepting the other as the other (2000, 257). In other words, seeing different forms of nationalism inherent in orientalism

means revealing the relationship between power, knowledge, culture, and change. Ultimately, what we are trying to do is to try to ensure that difference is not the institutionalization as the "other" but theorization as difference within the discipline of International Relations.

4.3. Citizenship

Today, the nation-state is the dominant form of political organization in the international arena and derives its legitimacy from its claim to represent the wishes of its people and citizens (Toksöz 2006, 41). These foundations of the nation-state, based on citizenship, are deeply shaken by immigration. Because, while migrants are citizens of another state, they live, work and exist in a country where they are not citizens, and on the other hand, being legally bound to more than one state by citizenship, raises questions about how to define the national identity of the individual.

Fanon has some implications for the concept of citizenship. Fanon argues, for example, that dual citizenship is a punishment for the colonized. Because in this way, the colonized person realizes that the life they live, their breath, and their heartbeat are the same as those of the colonizer. He realizes that "*the colonizer's skin is not more valuable than his own"*. These determinations will also lead to significant turmoil in the inner world of the colonized (Fanon 1984, 53). We can resemble Fanon's analysis to the relative deprivation theory. Migration is a two-way situation. It affects migrants and local people, albeit in different ways. Perhaps the same constitutes the base of xenophobia of the people in the receiving region: realizing that the skin of the migrant is not worth less than his own. At this very point, the provocation of

right-wing agitative comes true: unemployment, falling wages, etc. Because, to xenophobes, migrants are not strangers, it is frightening to be an equal individual. For xenophobes, this is a loss of comfort. Restoration of comfort may be possible by pushing the migrant into the subalternity.

Citizenship as a status distinguishes citizens and *others* in the eyes of the state. Being an official state member and exclusion of non-members are determined by the status of citizenship. This status is closely related to the use of citizenship as a right. Access to government facilities is defined as a right to individuals with membership status. For example, in many countries, being covered by social security to access health services, which is one of the main human rights, is directly related to the citizenship status of the individual. Likewise, political participation and engagement in civil society can be possible with active citizenship (Türkmen 2018, 17). The fact that migrants do not have equal rights with citizens automatically excludes them from the system and feeds their subalternity.

4.4. EU Migration Policies

Another phenomenon showing that migrants in Europe are post-colonial subalterns is the immigration policies of the EU. The European Union may be the most enlightened political formation in the post-national world, although its nature is ambiguous and even controversial, it is also possible to say that two different European Unions exist at the same time: the inclusive and multicultural EU and the xenophobic EU dominated by anxiety (Appadurai 2008, 22). For this reason, the necessity of establishing a common migration policy in the EU has

arisen and it is possible to read the efforts to create a common migration policy in the EU through the EU acquis.

The effort to create a common migration policy in the European Union dates back before the Maastricht Agreement. The 1957 Treaty of Rome, known as the founding treaty of the European Community (EC), contains provisions regarding the free movement of employees, self-employed people, and service providers (Treaty of Rome, 1957). It is clear in the agreement that the main reason for the free movement of individuals is economic. The aim here is to make maximum use of the workforce within the European Community. However, it should be kept in mind that this right is granted to those who are citizens at the first stage. Therefore, non-citizen migrants are deprived of many rights, creating their subalternity.

1 out of every 5 registered migrants in the world is in a member state of the European Union. According to EUROSTAT data, the number of registered and non-EU citizens residing in the EU member states were over 40 million in 2021 (EUROSTAT 2022). The question we must ask in this situation is: how can we talk about European identity when so many people are not represented because they are not citizens? With the emergence of identity debates in Europe, three basic concepts that affect EU migration policies have become frequently and widely discussed: adaptation, assimilation, and multiculturalism. Below, it will be tried to show that these three concepts do not solve the socio-political problems of the EU and furthermore reinforce the subalternity of migrants.

4.4.1. Assimilation

Assimilation is defined as the migrant's abandoning his or her origin and identity, starting to belong to the country they migrated to, and adopting its culture (Öner 2016, 19). Assimilation is also defined as the dispersal and so to speak digestion of migrants within the society and becoming indistinguishable from the receiving society. On the other hand, the American version of assimilation is slightly different. In the American version, beyond the resemblance of a small minority to the majority of the society, there is the emergence of a new American nation by melting all differences in a single pot (Toksöz 2006, 37). The use of the concept of assimilation in American literature is almost the same as what we understand from the word integration today, that is, the idea that the term assimilation is considered a very bad thing is modern (Öner et al. 2016, 140). In the present world, what causes the rejection of the concept of assimilation is moving away from the unity of everyone (inclusion by taking in) such as creating an American society, as planned in the USA, but forgetting/rejecting all the differences of the foreign/different communities, as in the European example, compelling to acquire a new identity and culture. In other words, while acquiring a new identity and culture, the old one disappears.

4.4.2. Multiculturalism

Pluralist society is a term first coined by J.S Farnivall, a British-born colonial writer, to facilitate unity and cohesion during the colonial period. It defines the coexistence of two or more societies in the colonies within the same political unit without mixing in with each

other (Lee 2009, 33). We can understand that even the root of the term goes back to the colonial period as the psychoanalysis of not being able to cope with social segregation.

Öner (2016, 19) defines multiculturalism as the public recognition of cultural differences and having these differences supported by state policies, and Toksöz (2006, 37) defines it as the coexistence of different identities by tolerating or supporting ethnic and other differences. In multiculturalism, differences are accepted as they are, and there is no intervention for these differences. However, Du Bois in his book The Souls of Black Folk asks the question "How does it feel to feel like a problem?". Alana Lentin and Gavan Titley, based on the question of Du Bois, come up with a critical perspective on the crisis of multiculturalism. This criticism is based on the fact that the cultural integration of minorities has been identified as a "problem" and their lives have been reified and homogenized despite the failure of this multicultural experiment (Lentin and Titley 2011, 105). According to Lentin and Titley, racism does not exist, as the policies of multiculturalism do what racism should do instead. In the multiculturalism period, prejudice and discrimination continue, but its origin is not race but culture.

Multiculturalism and republicanism have failed to include migrants in political, social, and economic fields in the receiving countries (Kaya 2016, 41). Likewise, multiculturalism is losing its popularity. Multiculturalism, which means the institutional recognition of differences, should support or at least make it possible to experience differences freely. On the other hand, the point where this approach is criticized is that since it makes it possible for migrants to live a life

independent from the rest of the society, it also facilitates their exclusion from the society (Öner et al. 2016, 142). When there is exclusion, there is subalternity. Indeed, the reason lying behind the emergence of multiculturalism was facilitating the return of migrants as they were believed to return to their countries one day, proving that they have never been wanted. They have been tolerated because they were needed. Remembering De Bois' analogy of "feeling like a problem" causes a dual life, in which migrants are accepted as disposable and replaceable therefore their voice is also not necessarily needed and making migrants silent subalterns.

Therefore, every model in which unity and harmony within the society are not facilitated and the differences are not recognized is an unsuccessful attempt. So, what is success, how is it measured, and who decides it as success? There is certainly no objective and measurable answer to these questions.

4.4.3. Integration

Social integration, in general political discourse, involves the question of how easily or how hardly the ethnic minority groups defined as "foreigners" can be incorporated into the mainstream community through social mixing or other means. Confusion over the specific goals of social integration arises from the lack of an agreed measurement criterion for measuring the effectiveness of social interventions. According to Phillips, this situation stems from the ambiguity and contradictions of the policies followed, and he cites France as an example. In France, achieving the aim of a "good social mix" is a situation that is frequently mentioned in political texts and legal

regulations, but its definition is not clearly defined according to the reports of the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (RAXEN). Likewise, in Belgium, for example, although public debates on the balance of social mix in neighborhoods have been going on for a long time, there is no measurement criterion for how successful coexistence is (Phillips 2010, 211).

A country's social and spatial integration approach towards newcomers not only reflects the social rights dimension of migrants in general but also has an impact on their national identity and belonging (Phillips 2010, 212). Especially when the differences in the policy-making of France and Germany towards migrants are considered, the aforementioned impacts will get clearer. Because France's assimilationist policy of inclusion can also be seen in the fact that migrants do not live in segregated neighborhoods. Similarly, the rules that the proportion of migrants living in Germany's neighborhoods cannot be more than 12% of German citizens, although it is manifested as an effort to prevent the formation of migrant neighborhoods and ghettos, the policies of deconcentration also contain making the migrants weak by keeping them as the minority. The fact that migrants live in migrant neighborhoods does not only occur in several forms of forcing/making migrants live in the neighborhood they may not want to live or restricting them to live in the neighborhoods they want to live in, but also may occur as the local (white) people leaving the said spaces (Phillips 2010, 220). Therefore, although integration policies are ambiguous, they seem to reinforce the silence of the subaltern, making them "unwanted", as seen in the example of Germany.

Conclusion and Analysis

In this study, migrations to Europe in the post-colonial period are examined through the Subaltern Theory, which is a post-colonial approach, and it is tried to show that the social and economic reactions that arise with increasing migrations are essentially a continuation of colonial practices. While doing this, first, the founding concepts of International Relations discipline, nation, and therefore nationalism, nation-state, and citizenship concepts should be reopened for discussion in the IR discipline, because these notions are no longer sufficient to respond to modern requirements, and these concepts themselves make migrants subalterns. In this study, it is also tried to explain that the migration politics of the EU and its sphere which occupy both political and academic agendas a lot, contribute to the subalternity of migrants as they are not as useful or beneficial as hoped.

As is known, the new economic order after the Second World War was characterized by the economic recovery efforts in Europe and as an extension of it, the European Union began to form. Thanks to the Marshall Aids provided by the USA after the war, the process of revival of the economy in the European continent started. To heal the economic wounds of the war, the demographic structure changed as the war caused industrialized countries such as the United Kingdom and Sweden, which were ready for production, to start attracting workers primarily from their neighboring countries. Other industrialized central European countries have begun to recruit workers from southern European countries (such as Portugal, Italy, Greece, Spain, and the Former Yugoslavia). However, after a while, the economy of these countries started to recover, and their own migrant worker needs

emerged due to their aging population. During this period, the process of attracting migrants from Turkey, Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia, as well as former colonies (Senegal, Mali, Caribbean, etc.) had started. De Haas (2018, 6) refers to this situation as the southward expansion of Central Europe, as well as the expansion of labor borders to the south and overseas. The colonial past and the structure of the European Union cannot be considered separately from each other, as the use of past common experiences and colonies without language problems for the need for labor, serves the economic development that the EU reached today. Therefore, the use of a post-colonial theory in order to make sense of today's dynamics in the IR discipline and the success of this theory in explaining the current situation of the EU will be an expected result.

The failure of migration management by the European Union countries, the fact that assimilation, integration, and multiculturalism policies do not bring social peace to the EU, and moreover, the fact that the increasing number of migrants is evaluated through crisis perception and crisis discourse causes biopolitical practices to come into play. The rising number of migrants, as in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks, may cause the concepts such as Agamben puts as the "state of exception" (Agamben 2006, 7), which includes justification and/or necessitation of suspension of democratic practices. The perception and discourse of crisis towards migrants serve the creation of the "state of exception" and feed the subalternity of the migrant.

On the other hand, during this study, we witnessed that nearly one million Ukrainian citizens left the country from the borders of Poland, Romania, and Moldova in the first week of the occupation, due to the

Russian invasion of Ukraine (Kingsley 2022). According to current data, the total number of migrants leaving Ukraine has reached 5 million (BBC 2022). On the other hand, although the European Union countries seem to cooperate with Ukraine, there are also reports in the international press that foreign nationals in Ukraine are exposed to discrimination and racism. Many foreign students, including African, Middle Eastern, and Indian students, managed to convey to the media that they were exposed to racism at the borders and before reaching the borders, that they could not leave the country under the same conditions as Ukrainians (Busari 2022). This situation clearly reveals that despite all the humanitarian policy efforts of the EU, racism and discrimination against the people from the historical colonies continue, but this time (which is one of the points argued by this study) right on the territory of Europe.

REFERENCES

Afacan, Serhan. 2020. "Power and Autonomy: Subaltern Studies and the History of the Subaltern Groups." *Tarihyazımı* 21: 1-12.

Agamben, Giorgio. 2006. *İstisna Hali*. Çeviri, Kemal Atakay. İstanbul: Otonom Yayıncılık.

Ahluwalia, Paul. 2012. *Politics and Post-Colonial Theory: African Inflections*. London: Routledge.

Akçapar, Şebnem Köşer. 2012. "Uluslararası Göç Alanında Güvenlik Algılamaları ve Göçün İnsani Boyutu." içinde *Küreselleşme Çağında Göç: Kavramlar, Tartışmalar,* derleyen Suna Gülfer Ihlamur Öner ve N. Aslı Şirin Öner, 563-575. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Aldcroft, Derek. 2001. *The European Economy: 1914-2000*. 4.th ed. Routledge. Doi: 10.4324/9780203021750

Anderson, Benedict. 2007. *Hayali Cemaatler; Milliyetçiliğin Kökenleri ve Yayılması*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Anderson, Gordon. L. 2006. "The Idea of the Nation-State is an Obstacle to Peace." *International Journal on World Peace* 23 (1): 75-85. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20753518

Appadurai, Arjun. 2005. *Modernity at large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. University of Minnesota Press.

Appadurai, Arjun. 2008. *Küçük Sayılardan Korkmak: Öfkenin Coğrafyası Üzerine Bir Deneme.* İstanbul: Timsah Kitap.

Balibar, Étienne. 2002. "World Borders, Political Borders." *PMLA/Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 117 (1): 68-78. Doi: 10.1632/003081202X63519

Balibar, Étienne. 2009. *We, the People of Europe?* Oxfordshire: Princeton University Press.

Balibar, Étienne. 2012. *Politics and the Other Scene*. London: Verso Trade.

BBC. 2022."How Many Ukrainians Have Fled Their Homes and Where Have They Gone?" July 4, 2022. https://www.bbc.com/news/world-60555472#:~:text=More%20than%2010%20million%20people,the%20war%2Dtorn%20country%20itself

Benhabib, Seyla. 2006. *Ötekilerin Hakları: Yabancılar, Yerliler, Vatandaşlar.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Berger, Mark.T. 2007. "States of Nature and the Nature of States: the Fate of Nations, the Collapse of States and the Future of the World." *Third World Quarterly* 28 (6): 1203- 1214

Bhambra, Gurminder. K. 2015. *Moderniteyi Yeniden Düşünmek: Post-Kolonyalizm ve Sosyolojik Tahayyül.* İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları

Breuilly, John. 2000. *"Nationalism and the History of Ideas" in Proceedings-British Academy* 105: 187-224. Oxford University Press Inc.

Brubaker, Rogers. 2010. "Charles Tilly as a Theorist of Nationalism." *The American Sociologist* 41 (4): 375-81. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40983487

Busari, Stephanie. 2022. "Foreign students fleeing Ukraine say they face segregation, racism at border." CNN, Feb 28, 2022. https://edition.cnn.com/2022/02/28/europe/students-allege-racism-ukraine-cmd-intl/index.html

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2000. "Subaltern Studies and Postcolonial Historiography." *Nepantla: Views from South* 11: 9-32.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2002. *Habitations of Modernity: Essays in the Wake of Subalterns Studies*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2007. "*A Small History of Subaltern Studies*" in A Companion to Postcolonial Studies, edited by Hendry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray. Wiley & Sons. Doi: 10.1002/9780470997024.ch25

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2012. *Avrupa'yı Taşralaştırmak, Postkolonyal Düşünce ve Tarihsel Farklılık*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları

Chatterjee, Partha. 1998. *"Beyond the Nation? Or within?" Social Text* 56: 57-69. Doi: 10.2307/466770

Chibber, Vivek. 2016. *Post-Kolonyal Teori ve Kapitalizmin Hayaleti*. Çev, Afife Yasemin Yılmaz. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Croucher, Sheila . 2004 . *Globalization and Belonging: The Politics of Identity in a Changing World (New Millennium Books in International Studies)*. Lanham, Boulder and New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Currion, Paul. 2016 "Age of Migration: The Fiction of the Nation-State." News Deeply, March 28, 2016 https://www.newsdeeply.com/refugees/community/2016/03/28/age-of-migration-the-fiction-of-the-nation-state

Dasgupta, Rana. 2018. "Demise of the Nation State". The Guardian, April 5, 2018. https://www.theguardian.com/news/2018/apr/05/demise-of-the-nation-state-rana-dasgupta

De Haas, Hein., Castles, Stephen., and Miller, Mark J. 2014. *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*. London: Palgrave MacMillan

De Haas, Hein., Simona Vezzoli, Alice Szczepanikova and Tine Van Criekinge. 2018. *European Migrations: Dynamics, Drivers,*

and the Role of Policies. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Phillips, Deborah 2010. "Minority Ethnic Segregation, Integration and Citizenship: A European Perspective." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36 (2): 209-225.
Doi: 10.1080/13691830903387337

Dedman, Martin. 2009. *The Origins & Development of the European Union 1945-2008: A History of European Integration*. London: Routledge.

Donnan, Hastings, M. Wilson Thomas ve Zeki Yaş. 2002. *Sınırlar: Kimlik, Ulus ve Devletin Uçları*. Ankara: Ütopya Yayınları.

Dunkerley, David, Lesley Hodgson, Stanislaw Konopacki, Tony Spybey, Andrew Thompson. 2003. *Changing Europe: Identities, Nations and Citizens.*, London Routledge.

Engels, Friedrich. 2003. *Ailenin, Özel Mülkiyetin ve Devletin Kökeni*. Ankara: Eriş Yayınları.

Eurostat Migration Data, 2022.
https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/product/view/MIGR_POP3CTB Erişim tarihi: 13.04.2022

Fanon, Frantz.1984. *Yeryüzünün Lanetlileri*. Çeviri, Şen Süer Diyarbakır: Avesta.

Flores, Nelson. 2013. "Silencing the subaltern: Nation-State/Colonial Governmentality and Bilingual Education in the United States." *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 10 (4): 263-287.

Gabilondo, Joseba. 2006. "Global Subalternity, Exteriority, and Independence Day: Rethinking Radical Democracy and Biopolitics. Notes on Laclau-Mouffe and Hardt-Negri." *Papeles del CEIC. International Journal on Collective Identity Research* 21: 1-51.

Galastri, Leandro. 2018. "Social Classes and Subaltern Groups: Theoretical Distinction and Political Application." *Capital & Class* 42 (1): 43-62.

Habermas, Jürgen. 2012. *Öteki Olmak, Öteki'yle Yaşamak: Siyaset Kuramı Yazıları*. 6.bs. Çeviri, İlknur Aka. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Hartsock, Nancy. C. 2019. *The Feminist Standpoint Revisited, and Other Essays*. London: Routledge.

Hibou, Béatrice. 2004. *Privatizing the State*. London: Hurst & Company

Hutchinson, John. 2003. "The Past, Present, and the Future of the Nation-State*." Georgetown Journal of International Affairs* 4 (1): 5-12. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43134436

Kaya, Ayhan. 2016. *İslam, Göç ve Entegrasyon: Güvenlikleştirme Çağı*. Çeviri, Nur Yasemin Ural. İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Kennedy, Dane. 2016. *Decolonization: A Very Short Introduction (Vol. 472)*. Oxford University Press.

Keyman, E. Fuat. 2000. *Küreselleşme, Devlet, Kimlik/Farklılık: Uluslararası İlişkiler Kuramını Yeniden Düşünmek*. İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları.

Keyman, E. Fuat. 2002. "Globalleşme, Oryantalizm ve Öteki Sorunu: 11 Eylül Sonrası Dünya ve Adalet." *Doğu Batı* 20: 11-32.

Keyman, Fuat, Mutman, Mahmut ve Yeğenoğlu, Meyda. 1996. *Oryantalizm, Hegemonya ve Kültürel Fark*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Kingsley, Patrick. 2022. "Ukraine War Sets Off Europe's Fastest Migration in Decades." New York Times, March 1, 2022; https://www.nytimes.com/2022/03/01/world/europe/ukraine-war-migration.html#:~:text=At%20least%20660%2C000%20peopl

e%2C%20mostly,since%20at%20least%20the%201990s.&text
=Sign%20up%20for%20the%20Russia%2DUkraine%20War
%20Briefing

Lee, Hock Guan. 2009. "Furnivall's Plural Society and Leach's
    Political Systems of Highland Burma." *Sojourn: Journal of
    Social Issues in Southeast Asia* 24 (1): 32-
    46. muse.jhu.edu/article/367737

Lentin, Alana, and Gavan Titley. 2011. *The Crises of
    Multiculturalism: Racism in a Neoliberal Age*. London:
    Bloomsbury Publishing.

Lune, H., and B. L. Berg. 2017. *Qualitative Research Methods for the
    Social Sciences*. Essex: Pearson.

Marks, Karl. 1976. *Louis Bonaparte'ın 18 Brumaire'i*. Ankara: Sol
    Yayınları

Mittelman, James H. 2002. "Globalization: an Ascendant
    Paradigm?" *International Studies Perspectives* 3 (1): 1-14.

Modonesi, Massimo and John Holloway. 2013. *Subalternity,
    Antagonism, Autonomy: Constructing the Political Subject*.
    London: Pluto Press.

Morris, Lydia. 1997. "Globalization, Migration and the Nation-State:
    The Path to a Post-National Europe?" *The British Journal of
    Sociology*, 48 (2): 192–209. Doi: 10.2307/591748.

Öner, Aslı Ş. ve Suna G. I. Öner. 2016. *Küreselleşme Çağında Göç*.
    İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Özkırımlı, Umut and Spyros Sofos. 2013. *Tarihin Cenderesinde: Türk
    ve Yunan Milliyetçiliği*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi
    Yayınları.

Özkırımlı, Umut. 2009. *Milliyetçilik kuramları: Eleştirel Bir Bakış*.
    Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları.

Schierup, Carl-Ulrik, Peo Hansen, and Stephen Castles. 2006. *Migration, Citizenship, and the European Welfare State: A European Dilemma, European Societies, Oxford: Oxford Academic.* Doi: 10.1093/0198280521.001.0001

Sevim, Hüseyin. 2006. "Uluslararası İlişkilerde Küreselleşme Olgusu ve Ulus-Devlet Kavramını Yeniden Düşünmek." *Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi* (3) 9: 89-124.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1996. "Subaltern Talk: Interview with the Editors" in *The Spivak Reader,* edited By Donna Landry and Gerald MacLean. New York: Routledge

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 2009. "Nationalism and the Imagination." *Lectora* 15: 75-98.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 2016. *Madun Konuşabilir mi?* Çeviri, D. Hattatoğlu, G. Ertuğrul, E. Koyuncu. Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları.

Toksöz, Gülay. 2006. *Uluslararası Emek Göçü*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Treaty of Rome (Treaty establishing the European Economic Community). 1957. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:11997E

Türkmen, Fulya Felicity. 2018. "*Rethinking citizenship, immigration and refugee admissions from an ethics of immigration perspective*." MA Thesis, Middle East Technical University.

World Migration Report, 2021, edited by McAuliffe, M. and A. Triandafyllidou. International Organization for Migration IOM, Geneva.

Zavala, Silvio. 1961. "A General View of the Colonial History of the New World." *The American Historical Review* 66 (4): 913-929. Doi: 10.2307/1845863

Zembylas, Michalinos. 2018. "*Revisiting Spivak's 'Can the Subaltern Speak*' through the lens of Affect Theory: Can the Subaltern be Felt?" *Qualitative Research Journal* 18 (2): 115-127.

Doi: 10.1108/QRJ-D-17-00048