Globalisation, migration & asylum: The peril of the alien and the safety of the familiar.
Editors' Introduction

Jane Callaghan and Rose Capdevila

This issue of the *Annual Review of Critical Psychology* is devoted to critical work around globalisation and two of its emergent progeny: migration and asylum. The papers in this issue engage with the questions that arise around how we might theorise, understand and engage with the varying instantiations and positionings of these phenomena critically. The point of departure for us as editors is that traditionally dominant psychological approaches offer little to an understanding of the transgressive movements that are associated with transnational communication, migratory lifestyles and hybrid identities. Rather, we would argue, the modernist project of psychology, characterised as it is by categorisation (the processes of differentiation and distinction along with the symbolic construction of boundaries) serves to reinforce hegemonic ideologies of nation state, the tenaciousness of ethnic identity, and reified constructions of culture. These mainstream approaches can be seen to obscure the very ways in which national identities are challenged by the shifts that emerge as a consequence of a range of boundary transgressions. By drawing on a range of theoretical and methodological resources, these articles address these transgressions and problematise the incommensurabilities that are (re)produced when Psychology brings its knowledges to bear on issues of globalisation, migration and asylum.

Globalisation has far-reaching consequences for our conceptualisation of identity and imposes complexity on our understandings of social experience. One of the limitations psychological accounts face in making sense of this context is a failure to take sufficient notice of our geography and the physical space that contains and reflects globalising identities. In an account of global and local spaces and places in Manchester, Mottram notes the importance of considering the way in which "dialogical negotiations between self and other co-create symbolic resources in the fabric of place." (p. 4) In doing so, she highlights the way in which different dialogic relations to place function to produce varying identifications, which in turn produce different kinds of spatial markers.

Whilst Altschuler and Mottram both note the importance of notions of place, and the way in which these are inextricably interwoven with notions of identity and autobiographical memory, Altschuler further argues that generalised notions of both 'family life' and 'migration' fail to take into account the varied experiences of migrant families, and that to understand the relationships of migrant siblings we need to attend closely to the intersections of the personal and the political. Pedersen, in discussing accounts of sexual coercion, similarly points out that components of these seemingly personal narratives are inextricably linked to notions of migrancy and 'ethnic' communities. She argues that it is vital that these not be reduced to independent variables, in order to avoid oversimplifying them as stories of 'difference'.

Seu further problematises the production of difference across the personal and political. In her discursive psychosocial analysis, she notes that constructs such as 'bogus' and 'real' asylum seeker have a powerful emotional content. Seu thus suggests that to engage with hostility and resistance towards the 'other', we need look at the emotional and psychodynamic manifestations thereof, as well as social and political relations.

Zavos addresses the complexity around categorisation through the discussion of constructions of migration and of migrant subjectivities. She argues that they must be understood as situated, and as produced and performed in particular contexts. The tendency in accounts to position 'The Migrant' as a generic, decontextualised category of person reproduces the tendency within psychological theorising to view people as representatives of reductionist, homogenous social categories. Zavos notes that an attempt to explore seriously the contextual and specific construction of migrant subjectivities requires that we wrestle with complex methodological and ideological concerns.

Goodman seeks to address these concerns in his discursive analysis of media texts. In his contribution, Goodman explores the way in which politicians and public figures use arguments about social cohesion to justify the harsh treatment of asylum seekers whilst simultaneously representing themselves as compassionate and socially concerned. Suggesting that tighter controls are necessary for good race relations, and with reference to well worn distinctions such as 'bogus' and 'genuine' asylum seekers (also addressed in Seu's analysis of talk) public discourses work to justify prejudicial treatment and to rhetorically constitute distinctions between 'us' and 'them'. By conflating issues around immigration and asylum, and by focusing on the importance of protecting 'social cohesion', politicians are able to both set up a view of racial prejudice as something inevitable and natural, and to avoid attributions of racism.

Also with a view to political discourse, this time in policy texts, Palmary notes the oversimplification of gender and culture, as well as the selective exclusion of gender from sections of documents like the draft convention on the rights of refugees, and the distinction consequently drawn between violence against women and the violence of war, have had far reaching implications. In her analysis of the policy documents of the UN High Commission for Refugees, Palmary explores the complex intersection of gender and culture in the construction of refugees and, primarily, of women refugees. She notes that, in these accounts, culture, particularly as expressed through the notion of 'traditional family', are implicated as both protective and oppressive of women. Oversimplified notions of culture, and views of culture as 'fixed' and 'authentic', together with women's identification as bearers of culture, operate to shut down women's options for political mobilisation. The effect of this, Palmary suggests, is that "the source of women's oppression is located in her culture and her men, rather than in a global system of inequality perpetuated through universal humanisms." (p. 132)

O'Dell is similarly troubled by the management of 'culture' in public accounts of asylum, refuge and migration. Exploring the use of images of dead and damaged children in reports of crises in the Middle East, O'Dell argues that the exclusion of 'culture' in psychological research has functioned to construct a universalised notion of 'The Child', a vulnerable entity in need of protection. Children who stand outside such constructions (such as those who live in war torn regions) are positioned as having lost or been robbed

of their childhoods. As such, these children are positioned as political tools, passive in relation to political campaigns intended to 'save' them. Palmary and O'Dell both note the problematic deployment of universalising and depoliticised notions of 'culture', 'childhood' and 'family', in ways that ultimately make politicised mobilisation harder for women and for children.

A key area highlighted by all the articles presented here is that an adequate understanding of migration requires that we take seriously the intersection of the personal and the political in our conceptions of identity. Mottram, Pedersen and Seu highlight the intricate links between the intimate and emotional and these very conceptions. Altschuler's account of migration and siblings, as well as Zavos's article about gender and social movements address the relevance of relationalities. Goodman, Palmary and O'Dell's engagements with public documents highlight how distant and dispersed from specific subjectivities the site for these constructions might appear.

Taken as a whole, we would argue that these articles have something, both dissonant and resonant, to say about the complexities of globalisation, migration and asylum and how these come into relation with critical approaches in psychology. We believe they offer a much richer and more nuanced engagement with these issues than that which might be achieved by those approaches which reject, and thus fail to theorise and engage, that which is transgressive.

Correspondence
Jane Callaghan
Psychology Division, University of Northampton
Park Campus, Boughton Green Road
Northampton NN2 7AL, UK.
e-mail: jane.callaghan@northampton.ac.uk

Rose Capdevila
Psychology Division, University of Northampton
Park Campus, Boughton Green Road
Northampton NN2 7AL, UK.
e-mail: rose.capdevila@northampton.ac.uk