Geoforum 91 (2018) 97–107

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Geoforum

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/geoforum

Migration and pastoral power through life course: Evidence from Georgia

Adrian J. Bailey[a,*], Dusan Drbohlav[b], Joseph Salukvadze[c]

[a] Department of Geography, Hong Kong Baptist University, 12/F Academic and Administration Building, 15 Baptist University Road, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong, China
[b] Department of Social Geography and Regional Development, Charles University, Albertov 6, 128 43 Prague 2, Czech Republic
[c] Department of Human Geography, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, 1, Chavchavdze Avenue, 0179 Tbilisi, Georgia

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
Governmentality
Life course
Migration
Foucault
Religion
Georgia

ABSTRACT

This article advances critical migration theory by exploring how pastoral power works through relational life courses. Extending governmentality accounts, we posit and trace the circulation of use, exchange, and surplus values across the life courses of migrants from the former Soviet republic of Georgia. Field evidence shows how practices of migration, remitting, and familyhood are associated with dependent social relations and concealment, and negotiated through tests of truth of prayer, biographical management, and family remitting. This conduct of everyday life simultaneously invokes life courses as registers of resources and possibilities and subjects of the multiple governmentalities associated with recent discourse and European and Georgian migration policy initiatives, including "Safe Migration" and migration management systems. We conclude that studying how pastoral power works through relational life courses expands understanding of migration and, in the case of Georgia, highlights the importance of gender, family, and religious organisations for contemporary migration issues.

1. Introduction

While migration has long transformed society in contemporary times this relationship is intricate, complex, even fraught (GCIM, 2005, United Nations, 2016). Modes of migration regulation and policy initiatives are diversifying and becoming more experimental (Nance and Cottrell, 2014). Theoretical explanations continue to stress economic and social factors (Massey, 2004) while accenting scalar and spatial realignments of migration regulation, including hardened border controls (for example, Wunderlich, 2012, Cardwell, 2013, Jones and Johnson, 2016). Acknowledging the presence of this multi-dimensional external context, an alternative body of migration theory has looked to the everyday experiences of migrants to study micro-power relations. Analyses reveal complexity in terms of multiplication in forms of migrant strategy, attachments, and memberships (for example, Smith, 2005, Topol, 2011, Bailey et al., 2014).

This paper contributes to critical migration theory by going beyond what Jessop characterises as "the dichotomy of micro- and macro-power, the antimony of an analytics of micro-powers and a theory of sovereignty, and the problematic relation between micro-diversity and macro-necessity" (2007: 39, also Smith and King, 2012). We do this in two steps. First, and recognising that governmentality is a useful platform from which to study the complexities and intricacies of power (cf Hoang, 2016), we interface Foucault's discussion of pastoral power with recent scholarship on relational life courses to argue that studying how pastoral power works through life courses provides a richer, intersectional and constitutive account of power. Second, we illustrate this argument using the exceptional case of the overseas migration of Georgians. Apart from being understudied, the case is important because the migration and return migration of Georgians is a long standing social process with profound economic, social, geopolitical, and cultural implications for Georgia (Badurashvili, 2004, IOM, 2008, ICMPD, 2015). For example, net migration rates have been negative for 17 of the 22 years up to and including 2012 (Salukvadze and Meladze, 2014, Table 2). Despite significant inbound remittances there is demographic pressure on the internal labour market (European Training Foundation, 2013) and fractious debate about the nature of the family given the increased incidence of split families (GIZ, 2014, GYLA, 2014).

2. Governmentality, pastoral power and life course

Governmentality offers a broad platform from which to study complex relations between migration and society. It focuses attention on how different forms of power are involved in the organisation and experiences of everyday life and the organisation and conduct of conduct (Rabinow and Rose, 2006, Rose and Miller, 2008). Power has been described in terms of modalities, including disciplinary, sovereign, neoliberal, socialist, and pastoral (Fletcher, 2017). However, some

* Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: bailey@hkbu.edu.hk (A.J. Bailey), drbohlav@natur.cuni.cz (D. Drbohlav), joseph.salukvadze@tsu.ge (J. Salukvadze).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.02.023
Received 22 July 2017; Received in revised form 15 February 2018; Accepted 21 February 2018
0016-7185/ © 2018 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

applications of governmentality are criticised for eliding the role of ideology, mis-specifying the position of the subaltern, and not providing a sufficiently nuanced account of the complexity of power (Spivak, 1988; Cheah, 2007). One such lack of nuance concerns the treatment of spatial, scalar, and temporal relations which "may not accommodate the range of negotiations involved in the gatherings, coherences, and dispersions of social change" (Bailey, 2013: 204). We argue that applications of governmentality which assume spatial and temporal relations can be taken as an *a priori* condition or setting through which power works ignore the constitutive nature of society, and impoverish the theorisation of agency (Chakrabarty, 2009, Minca, 2015). As Fletcher notes (2007: xx) we need analyses of how "different forms of governance…articulate with different levels and scales".

We turn to scholarship on everyday life to better specify articulation and constitutive relations (for applications to migration see Ley, 2004, Reeves, 2012). Everyday life is where, when, and how individuals experience and negotiate a "messy 'scenography' of numberless power-laden confrontations" (Philo, 2012: 502). Crucially, practice theorists argue that the acts, social practices, orientations, and practical consciousness of everyday life do not just reflect difference, but produce diversity through the mutual constitution of social, spatial and temporal relations (for example, Schatzki, 2002). Indeed, Jones and Jessop (2010) contend that scenographies and intersections of power render the multiple possibilities and compossibilities of everyday life. We take from this scholarship the idea that, through everyday life, power does not simply flow in finite and path dependent ways but works intersectionally and constitutively, variably and restlessly.

To open the governmentality framework to this intersectional and constitutive reading we feather Foucault's "all-but-unknown" (in the geographic literature) study of pastoral power (Philo, 2012: 508) into recent work on relational life courses (for example, Hörschelmann, 2011, Stratford, 2015). We join with Blake (1999: 85) who notes: "the anatomy of governmentality …must… evoke pastoral power…for it lies at the intersection of these [sovereign power; disciplinary power; biopower etcetera] forms". While detailed exegeses of Foucault's discussion lies beyond the scope of this article, we emphasise how its relational ontology implies a constitutive view of conduct by drawing on his Colège de France lectures (for example, 22 February 1978 lecture, Foucault, 2009: 164–185), "The Hermeneutics of the Subject" (Foucault, 2005), "The Government of Self and Others" (Foucault, 2010) and, in particular, "The Courage of Truth" (Foucault, 2012: 231–289).

Foucault assumes everyday life has interior (for example, matters of philosophy and ethics) and exterior domains (for example, social practices). Pastoral power is about how truth-seeking conduct occurs across these domains, that is "through life not just through speeches and rhetoric" (Foucault, 2012: 233–4). Because "the practice of telling the truth about oneself relies upon and appeals to the presence of the other person who listens and enjoins one to speak, and who speaks himself" (2012: 4–5) conduct implies a dependent relationship between what Foucault describes as "care of the self" and "care for others" (Foucault, 2012: 234). His relational notion of conduct means "there is no establishment of truth without an essential position of otherness" and further implies that conduct reproduces spatial relations that can distinguish between self and other (340). Similarly, as conduct is "a (repeated) training for the soul of the listener" (2012: 64) it reproduces temporal relations. In summary, Foucault implies that spatial and temporal relations (of interior and exterior domains, of self and other, of training) are intersectional and mutually constitute (dependent) social relations linking care of the self and care for others. The ontology accompanying pastoral power supports an intersectional and constitutive reading of everyday life. We therefore follow Foucault's "pastoral" move in shifting analysis of the everyday from a sole/soul concern with "the question of what this *being* I must care for is in its reality and truth" onto the broader problematic of "what this care must be and *what a life must be* which claims to care about self" (2012: 246; 270, italics added).

Asides from its enabling ontology, Foucault's discussion of pastoral power also notes that social, spatial, and temporal relations work constitutively through exchange value. To show how the exchange necessary for the dependent relationship between care of the self and care for others works he introduces the principle of "revaluing (exchanging) currency" using the metaphor of coinage. He notes that for two people to engage in a currency exchange requires a symbol that can guarantee and legitimise the exchange. This legitimacy has a temporal and spatial component in that value has to be able to hold long enough and over a secure enough territory. While a monarch's head was often used to securitise currency exchange, Foucault contends it is *parrhesia* which secures the exchange necessary for care of self and care for others. *Parrhesia* is the repeated demonstration of truth to self and others through conduct in everyday life. He notes that because the "currency of one's own life comes to represent true value" (2012: 242) the exchange needed for care of self and care for others is legitimised by conduct. This reinforces the idea that social relations arising from exchange are enabled by the spatial and temporal relations of everyday life.

Moreover, Foucault implies that conduct is both enabled by, and reworks spatial and temporal relations through tests of truth in everyday life. Examining the interior and exterior domains of Cynic life, he notes idealised Cynic life was exclusively conducted in an exterior domain in an open and unconcealed manner. Its essential un-concealment implies that, as nothing could be concealed, a fully exterior life demonstrated truth (2012: 253). Thus, everyday life, necessarily conducted across exterior and interior domains, carries the potential for concealment and, in his terms, the potential for less than truth, i.e. sin. The crucial point is that *parrhesia* and the pursuit of truth seeking conduct necessary to exchange value has to be somehow socially monitored, tracked, and proven. Such events of demonstration he refers to as "tests of truth". One test of truth took the form of religious confession across Europe circa the Fifteenth century. Here, repeated acts of confession of sin by a member of a Christian congregation to a pastor/priest figure enabled individuals to demonstrate their orientation to truthful conduct. This test re-constitutes spatial and temporal relations. Its promise of absolution of sins provides a bridge between a concealing and contingent everyday and a universal afterlife. This means that it is the repeated act of confession that constitutes spatial and temporal relations as variously permanent (in the sense that the bridge of absolution is always available) and temporary (in the sense that sin will re-appear, Foucault, 2012: 243-4). Of course, repeated acts of confession and religious adherence also re-constitute social relations between a shepherd/priest and their flock/congregation (Foucault, 2012: 239).

While generative of an intersectional and constitutive account of power, it seems that Foucault's account of pastoral power relies on the *a priori* assertion that everyday life is partitioned into interior and exterior domains. To avoid imposing such a binary we recognise recent life course scholarship that advocates a relational ontology (for example, Andrucki and Dickinson, 2014: 208). The concept of life course has long provided a vocabulary and grammar for considering interdependent relationships between acts (including migration, family status changes, deportation, confession, etc), projects, pathways, and practices (including familyhood and remitting), biographies (including the curation of experiences, memories, imaginations, and sequences) and enacted lives (for example Elder, 1994, Wright, 2016). Recent research on relational life courses recognises interdependence but, crucially, does not assume its pre-existence (for example, Marcu, 2016, Bailey et al., 2016, Garcia-Lamarca and Kaika, 2016). For Eleveld (2010), the case of the Dutch Life Course Arrangement shows how the conduct of workers is governed by the enabling of a life course to be a technology or down payment for future career breaks where "workers… come to experience themselves as active responsible life planners" (132).

We argue that pastoral power works through relational life courses

by circulating use, exchange, and surplus values. Use value arises as individuals invoke and enact life course to curate resources and strategize possibility. By resources we mean material and symbolic stocks and flows, like income, education level, and marital status. People manage their biographies through selective remembering, imagination, and sequencing everyday acts (Mas Giralt and Bailey, 2010, Collins and Shubin, 2015) and by linking and de-linking lives (Coulter et al., 2016). Because life course is not just invoked, but meaningfully lived, experienced and practiced, it also has an unconditional (inherent) and conditional (located and imminent) capacity to generate exchange value. Its capacity (potentiality) for use and exchange values which reconstitute social, spatial, and temporal relations gives life course surplus value is a vis structural transformation (Hardt, 2011, Clough and Willse, 2011). As such, we posit it becomes subject to multiple governmentalities which, in the case of migration, may arise from social, cultural, religious, and political discourse, formal and informal policy, and modes of regulation.

In summary, we argue for an intersectional and constitutive account of power that attends to the macro necessities of regulation and the micro-possibilities of everyday life by examining how pastoral power flows through relational life courses. These are invoked as a register of resources and possibilities through the truth-seeking conduct of everyday life while being subject to multiple governmentalities. To illustrate our argument, our results first discuss how the conduct of everyday life invokes life course as a register of resources and possibilities and, second, how multiple governmentalities work through life course.

3. Research design

Our case study focuses on Georgian migration. The Georgian diaspora is large and multi-dimensional and includes economic migrants, students, displaces, asylum seekers, and those with historic connections. Estimates of the size of the diaspora vary from 350,000 (Labadze and Tukhashvili, 2013), 770,000 (Migration Policy Centre, 2013) to over 1.06 million (World Bank, 2010). In the 1990s, nearly all emigrés were men going to Russia. Although Russia is still the main destination, its share of all out-migrants continues to decline. Similar to other former Soviet societies, migration has become more feminized (Vanore and Siegel, 2015). By 2014, 42% of all emigrants were women, with many moving to Greece and Turkey to seek employment as domestic workers (Hakkert, 2017). The proportion of all emigrants going to Ukraine, Italy, Azerbaijan, Spain, and the United Kingdom has more than tripled in the last decade while the destinations of those 55,000 Georgians who sought official asylum after the 2008 Russo-Georgian war have also diversified (Salukvadze and Meladze, 2014).

Georgian migration and diaspora relations are the subject of social and geopolitical discourse. The highly influential Georgian Orthodox Church (GOC), with over 3.5 million members, frequently intervenes in diaspora affairs. Aligned with the Russian Orthodox Church it has levels of access to Georgians in Russia that the Georgian government and many NGOs do not. Geopolitical interest in regulating migration grew as Georgia gained a reputation as a porous transit country for persons from Iran, Armenia, Russia, and Ukraine coming into Europe (Labadze and Tukhashvili, 2013: 28), as Europe sought to standardise its external border protocols (Carrera, 2007), and as Georgia sought closer ties with Europe (Van Selm, 2005). Against such social and geopolitical scrutiny the country developed its first unified Migration Strategy (MS) after 2000. Studying the development and early introduction of the MS, signed into law in 2012, gives us an opportunity to study multiple governmentalities and to trace how use, exchange, and surplus values circulate through life course.

Our research design had two linked field components. First, we considered the practices and experiences of migrants and family members remaining in Georgia. We defined migrants as those Georgian nationals currently living overseas or recently returned to Georgia and used the term diaspora in sympathy with Georgian law, which refers to the integrity of compatriots/expatriates residing abroad, and includes the historical diaspora, economic migrants, seasonal workers, asylum seekers, students, dual citizens, and displaced persons who have left Georgia. We conducted long interviews and asked a series of prompts about social practices, experiences of everyday life, and belonging. The interviews were conducted in Tbilisi and, for some migrant families, in Dusheti, a town of 6200 (2014 census) about 60 km north of Tbilisi. These interviews took place between September 2014 and December 2014 in Georgian, and were transcribed and translated into English by a native Georgian-speaker.

Second, we collated relevant statistical, policy, and scholarly literature, and conducted a series of semi-structured interviews with key informants working in Georgia. These lasted from thirty to ninety minutes. The interviews were structured around career, professional role and activities in Georgia, and reflections on policy development and discourses on migration. To build critical migration theory we followed a grounded truth approach to analyse the transcribed interviews. For migrants and their family members we open coded information pertaining to social practices and experiences of everyday life. We interpreted these in light of our key informant interviews, field observations, extant literature, and secondary data. We then re-read the transcripts for deeper insights into, for example, how respondents negotiated and changed their practices, and again interpreted these patterns against extant literature.

4. Everyday life, concealment and tests of truth through life course

This section discusses how the conduct of everyday life invokes life course as a register of resources and possibilities. Secondary evidence strongly suggests that everyday life for many Georgians is concerned with social practices of migration, remitting, and family. Approximately one in every four Georgians live in diaspora (Badurashvili and Nadareishvili, 2012, GIZ, 2014, Salukvadze and Meladze, 2014: Table 2). Most diasporans remit to family members in Georgia. Economic estimates of the aggregate value of remittances suggest they comprise between approximately 10 and 12% of Georgian GDP (State Commission, 2016). Russia is the most important source for these inbound economic remittances, with close to 40% of all remittances in 2015, followed by 31% from the EU, with the largest shares from Greece (11%) and Italy (10%, see Table 1). Remittances are key to family life, making up half the household budget in receiving households (ICMPD, 2014a).

Our primary field work with key informants (Table 2a) and migrants and their family members (Table 2b) corroborate these data. Remitting

Table 1
Inbound remittances to Georgia, 2010-2015 (US$ million).

Remittances from:	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Russian Federation	555.6	655.2	747.4	801.4	709.2	432.7
Greece	103.8	144.6	159.6	198.0	204.8	117.8
Italy	76.7	109.2	102.9	110.1	121.5	109.1
USA	75.3	75.3	74.0	74.9	82.1	100.0
Turkey	33.6	27.6	30.0	41.7	64.3	68.9
Israel	12.1	14.4	16.0	19.7	23.6	32.9
Spain	27.3	31.0	27.8	25.4	28.0	26.8
Germany	14.7	13.0	13.2	17.8	24.2	26.7
Ukraine	59.0	52.4	47.4	45.6	30.8	20.9
UK	13.5	14.9	19.7	18.6	15.1	16.0
Azerbaijan	5.1	7.0	10.4	15.0	17.8	15.5
Kazakhstan	9.9	26.2	12.6	16.2	17.6	14.7
France	5.0	9.7	9.8	11.6	11.6	10.9
Canada	4.2	5.5	5.7	6.7	6.9	7.2
Armenia	6.1	4.5	5.6	7.3	7.8	6.5
TOTAL	1052.2	1268.1	1334.2	1477.0	1440.8	1080.0

Source: State Commission (2016). Brief Migration Profile: Remittances. 2016. State Commission on Migration Issues. Tbilisi; p. 7. http://migration.commission.ge/files/eng.pdf.

Table 2a
Interviews conducted with key informants.

##	Organisation	Role	Main functions and messages
1	International Organisation for Migration (IOM)	Development Officer	• Since 2001 IOM along with different government institutions collaborate in order to exchange ideas, consult and reach certain goals for regulating migration process and re-integrate return migrants; • IOM also has mobility centers for returned migrants in Tbilisi, Kutaisi, Telavi and Batumi; • IOM was involved in the development of Migration Strategy for Georgia; • IOM provides to return migrants from EU countries small business support, programs providing professional education with the further employment opportunities, etc.
2	International Organisation for Migration (IOM)	IOM National Programme Officer	
3	Office of the State Minister of Georgia for Diaspora Issues	Minister's Advisor	• Georgia counts around 600 diaspora organizations overseas. The Ministry systematically works with more than 230 active diaspora organizations; • The Ministry works since 2008 with the aim to provide Georgian migrants with different consultations and services (e.g. protection of human rights). • Georgian government institutions started working on different projects that will help migrants contribute to the country's economy; however, those programs are mainly in their initial phases and no tangible results are seen so far; • The Ministry aims at the creating organized mechanisms that will provide representatives of Georgian diaspora overseas to invest money, to create bank accounts and make some savings for cuter businesses and simplify investing money in Georgia.
4	International Centre for Migration Policy Development	Project Staff	
5	Georgian Young Lawyers' Association (GYLA)	Migration Project Coordinator	• GYLA has been providing free legal assistance to migrants, potential migrants and returnees; • GYLA tries to contribute to the good and evidence-based policy-making, as well as to provide legal help to real people: it provided assistance/awareness to 176 villages and more than 3000 individuals in the frames of EU-funded project; • GYLA also provides trainings with participation of successful diaspora members and produces media products, aiming at informing potential migrants of the threats of illegal migration and mechanism of protecting one's rights; • Unfortunately, they cannot recall any policy that would allow the country or families to benefit from the remittances in a longer run; • Circular migration would be a perfect solution for re-integration of and support to migrants if implemented. Unfortunately, as of now, there is only a one circular migration agreement, which is not even ratified – that is with France.
6	Georgian Orthodox Church (GOC)	Priest	• GOC has strong contacts with many Georgian diasporas abroad; • According to the priest diasporas and migrants have a big energy – financial, moral, patriotic and spiritual, and overseas migrants with their new experiences can boost the development of Georgia and contribute to the circulation of non-local ideologies into Georgian economic and political systems; • At the same time migration processes are somehow "leaving people hopeless, as Georgian is feeling comfortable only in Georgia"; • 'Split families' is a big problem for migrants and the entire society/country as it ruins individuals spiritually and morally. • GOC priests give blessing to those who decide to migrate and often give them advises whom to approach and how to find a Georgian church in the countries they are leaving to; • Georgian church sends priests to some countries where Georgian diaspora is larger and active; it tries to acquire (buy or rent/share) buildings for churches, opens Sunday Schools to teach Georgia children and provides different services to families.

was a widespread social practice. A recently returned female migrant who had worked in Greece told us how remittances had become an important part of her family's livelihood and mobility plans: "My father and my brother are living in Georgia. My father has health problems but he lives in the region, my brother is currently a prisoner and I live with his family in Tbilisi in order to help them somehow. While in Greece I was remitting both to my father and my brother's family, approximately 100–200 Euros monthly. But I had periods when I couldn't remit for several months and in some cases sending this money to Georgia was very hard, because my overall income there was around 500 Euros. Now my mother is helping us financially, she remits every time she manages to do this" (interview 10). That practices of migration and remitting are strongly connected with building and maintaining social relations through an extended family, that is familyhood, is vividly illustrated by the case of the Machabeli family, for which we present field notes (Fig. 1). This family is based in Dusheti and has two overseas daughters. Our interview with the matriarch, Mrs. Machabeli, shows how non-migrants are profoundly impacted by practices of migration and remitting through familyhood (for example, remittances for building a family home, line 15).

The conduct of practices of migration, remitting, and familyhood was associated with dependent social relations. An official with the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) who had worked in Georgia for a number of years told us: "I have to say that families that have one emigrant remitting back to Georgia are less motivated to be involved in the active social and economic life of the country. [The] majority of them are not working and are only depending on remittances" (interview 2). A returned male migrant from Denmark who had regularly remitted identified how his family needed his remittances: "My family was depending on me. I was remitting 100 Euros and was keeping 200 Euros for myself to live there. Once in a week while I was there I also was sending parcels" (interview 11). Secondary evidence corroborates the breadth of dependency (Labadze and Tukhashvili, 2013, Migration Policy Centre, 2013). Such accounts are consistent with the dependent nature of social relations Foucault posited (2002: 234).

Respondents characterised their conduct and the dependent nature of social relations in both positive and negative ways. A GOC priest referred to migration as having: "a big energy – financial, moral, patriotic and spiritual" (interview 6). As a "big energy" migration may

Table 2b
Interviews conducted with migrants and family members.

##	Gender	Countries lived in outside of Georgia	Years overseas	Remitting orientations	Main findings
7	F	Non-migrant	0	Received remittances from two daughters	• Emigration to Russia started earlier (in the 1990s) than emigration to EU (the 2000s); Georgians who emigrated to Russia/Belarus tend to live overseas for longer period; • Lack of job/employment opportunities along with low salaries in Georgia is the main 'push factor' for many migrants; • People who emigrated to Russia have settled down more, than those who emigrated to EU countries; • Georgians who emigrated to EU countries are mainly living or working illegally; • Georgian migrants in EU mainly work at low paid jobs; • Georgians overseas are quite intensively engaged with other representatives of Georgian community; • Migrants are deeply concerned about their family split, however, rarely find (economically) reasonable to reunite; • Migrants who returned to Georgia from EU countries mainly received support from IOM (see also Table 2b – interview with IOM officer); • Returned migrants envision their future in Georgia, as most of them say, if they could find good jobs in Georgia, they wouldn't leave families and go to other countries; • Returned migrants from Russia are more determined to go back to Russia than migrants who returned from EU countries; • If any member of a family is living overseas and remits to Georgia, other members of the family are less active in the Georgian community both socially and economically; • Main source for money transfer is increasingly done through banking rather than personal contacts (drivers, friends who come to Georgia); • Remittances are mainly spent for the basic needs of the families and education; in certain cases they are used for financing real estate/housing needs (e.g. repairing and buying apartments); • Migrants rarely invest money into business development or savings.
8	M	Belarus, Poland, Germany, France	2	Received reverse remittances while living in Europe	
9	F	Russia	20	Remitted occasionally	
10	F	Greece	8	Remitted monthly	
11	M	Denmark	1	Remitted weekly	
12	M	Russia, Belarus	20	Remitted monthly	
13	M	Russia	7	Remitted monthly	

raise economic and ethical issues and carry capacity for structural transformation. Examples of this energy include the application of expertise acquired by overseas migrants to boost the development of Georgia, and the circulation of non-local ideologies into Georgian economic and political systems. A 2011 national survey of Georgian businesses reported that more than two thirds of employers thought the overseas experience of migrants they had hired would be "an essential part" of the expansion of their business (IOM, 2012: 55).

Respondents also associated everyday conduct with concealment from being Georgian and from traditional forms of familyhood. Concealment from being Georgian meant feeling a greater spatial and temporal distance from the country when living in diaspora. For the priest, migration meant that life in diaspora could carry a sense of hopelessness: "When migrants are distant from Georgia they may experience a loss of hope. [Being] Georgian is feeling comfortable only in Georgia. Migration processes are somehow leaving people hopeless… Hope is more or less lost when people are far from countries" (interview 6). This is revealing in two ways. First, everyday life is experienced in explicitly spatial ways ("people are far") and temporal ways ("more or less lost", that is, not being in the right place at the right time). Conduct invokes spatial and temporal relations as consequential for feeling hope or hopelessness: they matter. Second, as diaspora living connotes concealment it raises the potential for sin. In repeating the word "when" the priest emphasises the contingency of this arrangement. Similarly, being "more or less lost" is more imminent in diaspora than in Georgia and another source of hopelessness. And, as the priest makes clear, diaspora is experienced as concealment from being Georgian: "Georgian is feeling comfortable only in Georgia".

The organisation of migrants into split families was also experienced as concealment, in this case from the traditional arrangement of proximate families. In split families members may live apart for greater or lesser, but often uncertain, periods of time. Such arrangements had become increasingly normal: "many people are emigrating from Georgia; I think it's normal here to have family member or at least acquaintances working abroad" (interview 9). Mrs. Machabeli had only seen her own daughter once since she left for the US. Moreover, her younger daughter and her husband had left their children in Tbilisi for over ten years while they worked in Greece (Fig. 1, lines 16, 25–32). Split family life is riven with tough spatial experiences (for example, by maintaining two homes) and temporal experiences (for example, by facing life cycle events such as a child's first words asynchronously) that manifest as hardship. A returnee from Russia said: "I moved to Russia, Moscow, 8 years ago; my job in Tbilisi was not bringing enough income for my family needs, I was repairing watches, so I decided to move to Russia…I returned this winter, in December because it's hard to live separately from family: my wife and daughters need me here" (interview 13). Here again we see how diaspora conduct makes spatial and temporal relations matter, as in "hard to live separately", and my wife and daughters "need me here".

Respondents confronted and negotiated these variously positive and negative social, spatial, and temporal experiences through three sets of tests of truth: prayer and spiritual alignment; the management of biography; family remitting. Respondents turned to prayer, chanting, and spiritual alignment to address concealment from being Georgian. This test was widespread among migrants and visible across Georgian society. Many diasporans thought of confession as an ongoing activity, as one returnee from Denmark noted: "I also learned that there was Orthodox church in Arhus. I travelled there several times but every time I arrived late and church was already closed" (interview 11). The test mobilised Georgian language and culture and was institutionalised through missions and schools: "I tell you that, in recent years, Patriarch has sent missions of priests to the European and American countries in order to conduct worship (liturgy) in Georgian language. By the way, church is the only place where representatives of Georgian community

Our meeting was a chance encounter. Stopping by the side of a barely made up residential street with tall trees casting lengthening shadows we inquired of a man walking if he know anyone close by who had lived overseas or any families with people overseas. He immediately pointed to a large house on the corner of a block. We parked up and buzzed the intercom and, after a minimal of introduction from our researcher, an elderly but not old women came around a corner and beckoned us through the metal gate and into a side door. She sat us around a large wooden table in a traditional room with framed pictures and an overhead fan, while an older man shuffled in with glasses of water each wrapped in a paper napkin, a man who was later introduced as her husband. Having confirmed our identity and research protocols, we simply asked, have you been a migrant. She hadn't. We asked, has someone in your family been a migrant. They had. In an unbroken narrative lasting over forty minutes she recounted, with the minimum of gestures or cues from us, a rich, matter of fact, and authoritative description of what this involved. The first thing she told us was that her previous house had burned down about ten years ago. This prompted both her daughters to emigrate from Georgia to remit funds for rebuilding. Her older daughter went to New York City and has only been back once. She worked as a domestic helper and sent remittances back for several years while the house was rebuilt. Over time these dwindled, although she still sends gifts and other special items occasionally. Her daughter had some Georgian acquaintances but this was not a focus of her life in NYC. We asked how she felt about her daughter leaving and her answer was very factual, there was no choice in the matter so it was neither good nor bad, it just was. She confirmed that money comes back through banks. The woman then told us about her second, younger daughter. She moved to Greece with her husband because, as she said, her husband and his family were very poor, and it was expected that his wife would accompany him in migrating. The family's two children remained in Georgia and are now in Tbilisi as teens, having graduated school. She went to Greece because the US had become too expensive to reach and Greece was accessible. She also worked and works as a domestic helper. When she migrated she got no help or training etc from the government; her mobility was seen as a private family strategy. Recently, the financial crisis in Greece had halved her daughter's salary, and her husband had returned to Georgia, where he was currently living. The woman indicated that such living apart was an expected form of migrant adaptability and long term resilience, such that the return of her daughter may occur "if" the time was right. As her family biography drew to a close - she sat more upright and we fiddled with our glasses of water. With the daylight fading we took our leave, and made our way back out of the house and toward the gate, passing near some grape vines that some of us had not noticed on the way in. Before we got to the gate her husband came around a corner with a large carrier bag overflowing with what Mrs Machabeli remarked were the new season's grapes, which he had evidently been picking for some time, and which he now presented to us.

Fig. 1. Field Notes from site visit to Machabeli house.

(diaspora) can gather in foreign countries. Church has even set up parish schools to teach Georgian culture, chanting, iconography" (interview 6). Referring to the visibility of GOC interventions a key informant from the international policy community noted: "The [Georgian Orthodox] church plays a strong role offshore. For example, in Turkey, Georgian prayer services are held once a month with priests flying in…also in Germany" (interview 2). We read such prayer and spiritual alignment as a pastoral test of truth with the potential to shape social relations (between priests and congregations), spatial relations (the offer of universal redemption to counter the sin of living a contingent life in diaspora) and temporal relations (foreshortening redemption through periodic but repeated atonement). That migrants were incorporating prayer and spiritual alignment into their conduct through repeated acts and longer-term projects is consistent with our notion that life course is a register of possibility that can legitimise social exchange using the "currency" of diasporic conduct.

A second test of truth concerned the management of biography. It involved purposeful organisation of memory, imagination, and sequencing of acts. In our first example, a return migrant counters concealment from familyhood and Georgian-ness by projecting their life course as a register of an unfolding motility strategy: "In the beginning [return to Georgia] it was hard. My family was not very happy at my return [to Georgia] and preferred me to be back in Greece and work there …I couldn't find a job for six months, I had no support. Later I learned about IOM from Facebook and decided to approach them…They financed my courses at the beauty centre. I really want to settle down in Georgia but I don't see any prospect, I can't earn as much as I need to live. But I don't have any plans in leaving yet. In case I shall migrate again I will go [back] to Greece because I know the lifestyle, the people, the language and I have practice of living there, but I think it is pointless to migrate there at this point as it has no prospect" (interview 10). We see how the respondent resists concealment from being

Georgian ("I really want to settle down in Georgia") by using life course to register the possibility of subsequent mobility (i.e., motility) when the time is right ("I don't have any plans in leaving yet", "it is pointless to migrate there at this point").

A further and double example of biographical management concerns the priest's blessing of outbound migrants. The complex and multidimensional nature of migration (i.e., its big energy) led him to take a non-judgmental position on migrant remitting, even though this seemed at odds with speeches made by the Patriarch: "Look, I don't want to judge. People can't work here, so they are using money that their family members are sending from overseas. Remittances might deactivate people to work and rely only on remittances, but unemployment is also a reason for inactivity" (interview 6). His ethical position emerges from his repeated conduct and shows how interior and exterior domains are implied in care of self. His juxtaposition of the economic, social, cultural, and ethical dimensions of migrant remitting problematises any *a priori* confinement of matters of the moral and spiritual to the interior domain, and the patriotic and financial to the exterior domain (cf Foucault, 2012: 233-4). Moreover, these experiences and memories somehow inform his decision to desist from doctrine and intervene in migrant life courses by offering pre-departure blessings: "In the beginning I was not blessing people who were leaving, but now I give my blessings, and even tell them whom to approach and how to find [a] Georgian church in the countries they are leaving to" (cf Foucault, 2012: 242). His care for others invokes migrants' life course as a register for the possibility of an unconcealed life in diaspora and, ultimately, back in Georgia. That is, his pre-departure blessings are a kind of down payment secured by the potentiality of migrants' life courses. This securitisation involves a re-imagination of the temporal relations of migration from permanent to temporary, with redemption and salvation to be found (once the migrant is) back in Georgia. This is a double invocation in the sense that his actions to care for others (though their life courses) enable him to care for self (through a life course combining exterior (material) and interior (ethical) practices).

Third, our respondents understood family remitting as a test of truth that could help atone for the concealment of split family living. By family remitting we refer to the project of linking/delinking lives in order to flexibly deploy symbolic and material resources across scattered family members and re-imagine that familyhood. We saw much evidence of remittances from diasporans to families and, in reverse, from families to overseas members. For example, one returnee from Poland had received reverse remittances while overseas: "I didn't remit. I had no chance and finances to help my family here…I guess I was in need of help, rather than my family here. I had periods when I didn't settle so I needed financial support. My family was remitting me several times, 200 Euros approximately, when I was living in Poland" (interview 8). Some families discussed remitting in confessional terms, as illustrated by one of our respondents who had successfully remitted to his family during his first year of residence in Denmark but, fearing deportation and criminalisation, had been forced to return: "My family and especially my brother were hoping that I would settle in Denmark, and change my life for the best, but I failed. That was somehow disappointment" (interview 11). Confessing to his brother implies it is the family that adjudicates the truth of his conduct. The excerpt also suggests the basis of the test is his ability to meet spatial ("hoping that I would settle") and temporal ("somehow disappointment" from returning too soon) expectations surrounding imagined familyhood.

The Machabeli family provide a further example of how life course is invoked by the test of truth that is family remitting. Mrs. Machabeli had received remittances from her daughters. That she expected such remitting is suggested by her non-neutral remarks on her daughter's remitting behaviours, noting how funds from her first daughter had "dwindled" (Fig. 1, line 18) and attaching a subtle but unmistakable condition to her second daughter being able to return to Georgia ([only] "if the time was right", line 33). This family remitting was financial and social in nature and involved Mrs. Machabeli's managed immobility. That is, a project of re-imagined familyhood was materialised and anchored by ongoing investments in the family home which awaited, for "the right time", her daughters' return (line 33). In intersecting immobility with social remitting the family home recalls Hyde's earlier observation that gift exchanges often combine both interior economies (including kin and moral commitments) and visible economies (bricks and mortar, 1979: 58). Moreover, family remitting reconstitutes social, spatial, and temporal relations. Mrs. Machabeli evidences care of self by managing remittances which link "other lives" through an enabling spatial and temporal experience of permanent temporariness. This permanently temporary sense of familyhood offers an alternative form of hope to the imagination of national belonging demonstrated by members of the GOC and, in Viriasova's terms, a break from normalisations of the city (2016: 228). Like the priest, Mrs. Machabeli acknowledges but then "refuses poverty" in how she conducts her life to balance care of self with care for others (cf Viriasova, 2016: 224). Family remitting is a test of truth adjudicated on the basis of the space time expectations of familyhood re-imagined by family members through life course.

In summary, tests of truth of prayer and spiritual alignment, the management of biography, and family remitting are enacted and lived responses to care of self and care for others that are part of the conduct of everyday life. They intersect and re-constitute social, spatial, and temporal relations as they invoke the pastoral life course as a register of resources and possibilities. Life course comes to represent use values and exchange values through, for example, demonstrating the principle of revaluing currency. This enables transactions necessary for the care of self and care for others, and supports the conduct of truth. Because life courses involve widely repeated and institutionalised acts, projects, and linked lives, expectations arise about use and exchange values, with implications for surplus value as below.

5. Multiple governmentalities through life course

This section considers how multiple governmentalities work through life course in ways that circulate use, exchange, and surplus value. Social and political discourse concerning the relationship between migration, diaspora, and Georgian society hardened in the mid and late 2000 s. For example, Patriarch Ilia II's sermon on October 3, 2010 at the Holy Trinity cathedral in Tbilisi directly addressed the issue of going abroad and splitting families: "In most of the cases it will harm a child…People should not be leaving to earn a living…when Georgians are sending young people abroad for education purposes [they] are not strong spiritually, culturally…so we should refrain very much from sending young people, especially children, abroad" (Civil Georgia, 2010). Such thinking is significant because of the wide dissemination and high approval rating of the GOC in Georgian society. Political discourses stressed closer relations with Europe, partly to boost its economic growth. Such alignment took place as relations with Russia worsened and as European migration management strategies shifted from a Global Approach to Migration (GAM), that generally took an aspirational approach to deliver a wide range of geopolitical, economic, developmental, and humanitarian objectives to Georgia, to the Global Approach to Migration and Mobility (GAMM), which emphasised a more rigid relationship between migration, mobility, border control and securitisation (European Commission, 2004, 2009, 2015a, 2015b, Council of the European Union, 2009a, 2009b).

Georgia's first Migration Strategy (MS) refracts and translates these discourses into policy and regulation. Its purpose is: "to improve the management of migration processes, which implies providing national security, fighting irregular migration and human trafficking, ensuring the defence of migrants' rights and their social protection, and state development through positive impact of migration" (State Commission on Migration Issues, 2012: 3). The main concerns of the MS include the promotion of ordered and orderly migration, safety, social protection, and economic development for Georgia. It is organized around 11 broad

Table 3
Principles of Georgia's Migration Strategy in relation to GAMM Pillars.

Principle	GAMM Pillar
Priority role for the national state in managing migration	A B C D
Support the fulfillment of political and economic priorities of Georgia	C
Rule of law	A B
Transparency	A B
Deepen international and regional cooperation, including cooperation with the European Union	D
Cooperate with international, regional, and non-governmental organizations	D
Fulfillment of international agreements	D
Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms with particular attention to the non-refoulement obligation	D
Zero tolerance for trafficking in human beings and smuggling of migrants across state borders	B D
Abolition of all discrimination according to race, nationality, language, religion, gender, ethnic, political, social or other aspects	D
Fight against racism and xenophobia	D

Key to GAMM Pillars.
A – Promote legal migration.
B – Prevent illegal migration.
C – Maximize development impact.
D – Promote international protection.
Source: State Commission on Migration Issues (2012: 3).

principles which, as Table 3 shows, selectively reflect an emphasis on international protection (mentioned most frequently) and de-emphasise (in relative terms) economic development. This balance of priorities is consistent with the GOC's emphasis upon social protection and the politics of securitisation.

Although the MS has a minimal judicial footprint, its early implementation has focused on the co-ordination of two broad policy initiatives concerning first, "Safe Migration" and, second, the dissemination of management systems of migration. Safe Migration refers to projects and initiatives that seek to reduce exploitation of migrants, trafficking, and illegal and irregular migration flows across Georgia's borders (Labadze and Tukhashvili, 2013). For example, pre-departure briefs on safe practices of migration are offered to migrants by the Georgian Ministry of Internally Displaced Persons from the Occupied Territories, Accommodation and Refugees of Georgia. Similarly, repatriation training received by returning Georgian migrants through IOM's programme of Assisted Voluntary Return (AVR) and delivered locally under the Targeted Initiative for Georgia via a series of so-called Mobility Centres invites returning migrants to enrol in skills courses that help them to avoid exploitation and get ready for full economic participation in Georgian society.

We found that multiple governmentalities of Safe Migration were being experienced in life course terms. The denial of entry visas for persons or groups on the basis of their legal and regularity status represents a hard form of sovereign power, while the emphasis upon the acquisition of labour market skills by individual returnees suggests migrants are being disciplined as future workers to make an economic contribution to the development and socioeconomic security of Georgia. AVR may be interpreted through the lens of pastoral power in that it promises a route by which migrants may return to Georgia and avoid the concealment of diaspora life by restituting for their lack of acquired skills in diaspora. That is, it becomes a vehicle by which a migrant can "truth test" biographical management. For example, the tellingly named "informed migration" official website (www.informedmigration.ge) notes, for example, that expert: "counsellors can … help to review your educational and professional background in order to identify and offer you the most suitable kind of reintegration assistance". Counsellors are cast as the high priests of migration policy in assuming the role of gatekeepers to a better world: "we can enrol you in a vocational education course/training and cover its costs (up to a maximum of 600 Euro) if the counsellor agrees with you that this will help you to upgrade your qualifications and find a job or better paid job…your application documents will be placed under your individual profile in the database of the registered jobseekers…our counsellors will be looking actively for suitable job offers for you and if identified, your application documents will be sent directly to employer/s and interview/s will be arranged" (cf Foucault, 2012: 279-80). We also read the preference for "legal non-concealment" in pastoral terms. As this migrant told us: "If I had the chance to go back [to Greece] I would prefer to go having some legal conditions with working contract or something like this" (interview 10). Their care of self (prefer to go) and care for others (if I had a chance) intersects and internalizes their prior life course memories and experiences of concealment with the Safe Migration discourse.

We suggest these multiple governmentalities generate surplus values through the use and exchange values of the life course. Key informants tacitly accept that broader social networks were important considerations in delivering repatriation support. An employee of IOM noted: "AVR seems to work – at least migrants seem content with the services… But it can get complicated when we start considering the broader social context of migrants' lives. For example, I was just in touch with a Georgian in Greece thinking of returning, and he asked about educational support for his children" (interview 1). The informant suggests that IOM policy has to go beyond targeting the individual, or the migrant body, and consider "the broader social context of migrants' lives", including the life course.

We asked one returnee from Germany, who had stayed outside Georgia for just over two years, why he had left Germany: "I also had a girlfriend in Germany and later the reason for me staying overseas was it. When German government learned that I was planning to marry in Germany I felt that the government was against our marriage and they thought I was trying to use my girlfriend in order to settle in Germany. But we didn't have the chance to implement our plans. One day representatives of social service with city police came to my place and told me that I had to leave, they didn't explain reasons…I came back with the financial support of the German government and I had no support from the Georgian side…with the support of IOM I have passed fast to get driving license and now I have a chance to work here. I don't know what will happen in the future but now I am trying to settle here" (interview 8). His experience of being deported is understood in disciplinary and temporal terms (i.e., "they thought I was trying to use…", "we didn't have the chance to implement our plans"). His post-return everyday life included an IOM training course which he narrated as a test of truth giving him the possibility of responding to disciplinary power and re-negotiating temporality. In fact, he felt he had passed both elements of this test, i.e., "I am trying to settle here now", and "I passed fast". Overall, his life course circulates use value (life course as a register of resource, for example, driving license, and possibility, for example, settling) and exchange value (care of the self and care for others). Moreover, by intersecting different forms of power and re-

constituting spatial and temporal relations his life course also circulates surplus value.

The second broad initiative co-ordinated through the MS provides European funding and expertise for the accelerated introduction and adoption of formal migration management systems. This includes the ENIGMMA programme ("Enhancing Georgia's Migration Management") which strengthens the analytical capacities and knowledge base of migration policy by introducing a unified migration data information system (Beltrame, 2011, ICMPD, 2014b: 4). This system continues to be incentivised through such programs as the Visa Liberalisation Action Plan (VLAP), which ties the volume of visas available to Georgians to work in Europe to the speed at which the Georgian government delivers elements of ENIGMMA, including secure forms of biometric identity documents, the integrated management of border, asylum, and migration issues, reductions in trafficking, and shared intelligence on criminal activity (EC, 2015a, 2015b).

The biopower of this "more for more" approach indexes Georgian alignment with European values of order and progress, while retaining "exceptions" when sovereign and disciplinary power can be deployed with accelerated rapidity and, presumptively, accuracy. Multiple governmentalities include a trend to the marketisation of remitting transactions, as this key informant noted: "the [remitting] service providers recognized they were missing most of the potential market because their fees were too high. So a supply/demand correction happened, fees came down, and usage of these channels increased" (interview 2). Thus, the long-standing method of migrants carrying remittances for friends and families had changed: "Five to seven years ago most remitting was informal…This is much less the case now. The reason for this is more migrants use official channels now and fewer use informal channels" (interview 1). Most generally, and according to respondents, ENIGMMA had lent order to the policy discourse by removing practices and expectations of *ad hoc* elements of management, including the alleged practice of the President handing our passports to friends.

The example of remitting further shows these multiple governmentalities of migration management at work through life course. Key informants believed that Georgian communities had "failed" Georgian society because they had not reaped the full economic benefits expected from the receipt of overseas remittances: "remittances can lead to dependency…there is great potential [of remitting] but it is not working that way. Many people have an attitude that if a road needs fixing, well that's the government's job – this goes back to Soviet mentality" (interview 1). Failure is understood as relational (unrealised potential) and ascribed to social and political dependencies. That Georgians hold a passive attitude (disciplinary power) is connected to a problematic spatial relation (i.e., adherence to a Soviet, as opposed to European, rationality) and a problematic temporal relation (i.e. the continuing persistence of outdated practices in communities). Such framings position European rationalities underlying management of migration as able to untap the potential (energy) of remitting (socioeconomic agenda) and also correct the failings of the (Soviet) past (geopolitical agenda). Family remitting, conducted in marketised ways, and approached through Safe Migration, becomes consolidated as an expected test of truth through the life course. That is, political discourse invokes life course as a register of resource (receipt of remitting) and possibility (development impact) to circulate governmentalities and space time relations that signal new forms of conduct. This is consistent with our expectation that pastoral power works through relational life courses by circulating use value (remitting), exchange value (care of the self and care for others) and surplus value (new spatial and temporal relations).

In the Georgian context there are at least two implications of this reading. First, the pastoral nature of life courses is deepening the gendering of migration (here we acknowledge the earlier work of Vanore and Siegel, 2015). Family remitting specifically, and the ways multiple governmentalities work through life course combine to re-constitute social, spatial, and temporal relations of everyday life. We saw contradictions arising between, for example, remitting for national development, and family life. While family remitting is at odds with the pastoralism of the GOC and Safe Migration, it is consistent with the rationalities of the migration management discourse. Facing such contradiction and ambiguity, we learned that the co-ordination of split families, often associated with family remitting, was becoming extremely problematic: "I managed to get double citizenship for myself but other members of my family are not able to receive Georgian Citizenship. It is very expensive procedure for my family and we can't figure out all the legislative requirements. So, now my family is divided, my husband and older son are back to Russia, and I live with my small daughter at my sister's home" (interview 8). In this case, experiences of pain, concealment, and pastoral power seem to be becoming structurally hard wired through life course and across the diaspora in gendered ways. A returnee from Greece told us of the gendered norms being applied by her extended family: "…Mum comes back from Greece and things are great with the extended family, for two weeks. Then people start asking – "so, when are you going back" – there is an expectation that she will have to return to Greece to continue the supply of support, even if she had not intended this" (interview 10). Indeed, we found that remitting and re-migration were becoming an expectation for many mothers and daughters. A female migrant said: "I don't want to leave but I have to, because health problems of my daughter. She needs urgent medical care which is very expensive in Georgia, so I consider going back to Russia to my husband and son… My family here has its own home and I don't have my place. My relatives tell me to leave again, no one wants my kids" (interview 9).

A second implication concerns the emergence of regulation and policy. The traction of pastoral power seems to further legitimise the already dominant role of the GOC in Georgian life, at home and in diaspora. Under such conditions, the path of migration regulation reveals further complication. The institution most associated with the circulation of traditional gender norms, the GOC, appears to be getting more involved in the economic relations of diaspora life: "I think our church [GOC] has more contacts with diaspora than the government… more jobs might be the solution. Patriarch of Georgia promotes and tells bishops to support and start more small businesses so that church could employ people" (interview 6). If this is a trend, it may suggest that migration policy development and regulation has less to do with governmental experimentation (Nance and Cottrell, 2014) and more to do with how multiple governmentalities in general, and pastoral power specifically, work through life courses.

6. Conclusion

We have argued that considering how pastoral power works through relational life courses provides a deeper understanding of the complexities of migration. We acknowledge that the demonstration of this proposition involving the exceptional case that is Georgia cannot present the full diversity and heterogeneity of power and everyday enactments, including across the variegated locations of diaspora, or historically. That said, our primary data suggest that the conduct of everyday life by Georgian migrants and family members invokes life courses which circulate use, exchange, and surplus values. Social practices, including migration, remitting, and familyhood are associated with dependent social relations and concealment, and negotiated through sets of tests of truth, including prayer, biographical management, and family remitting . Discourse alleging the porosity of Georgian borders and territory to terrorists, smugglers and traffickers and intimating the corrosive effect of migration upon the fabric of Georgian society, together with recent policy initiatives flowing from the country's first Migration Strategy, subject life course to multiple governmentalities.

Our paper makes two contributions. The notion that relational life courses are somehow pastoral life courses, to greater and lesser extents, provides for an open reading of migration society relations that transcends the limiting categories of macro-necessity and micro-diversity

and interior/exterior domains of thought and action. It better specifies the mutual constitution of social, spatial, and temporal relations in everyday life. Second, for the case of Georgia, the circulation of use, exchange, and surplus values through relational life courses means that migration and family remitting are increasingly gendered. As such, we believe it is important that critical migration theory further nuance accounts of migrant families, which are often reduced to the role of "instrument" and technology of contemporary governmentality. We also call for greater attention to the role of organized religion in the securitization of migration (cf. Karyotis and Patrikios, 2010).

Acknowledgements

This research is based on fieldwork conducted in Georgia partially funded by Hong Kong Baptist University Faculty Research Grant FRG1/13-14/052. Mari Geletashvili, Natalia Davlianidze and Zdenek Cermak provided invaluable field assistance. The cooperation of our informants is gratefully acknowledged. Veronika Stepkova provided insightful commentary which greatly benefitted the paper. We thank the anonymous reviewers and editor for their very constructive comments. Errors and omissions remain our responsibility.

References

Andrucki, M.J., Dickinson, J., 2014. Rethinking centers and margins in geography: bodies, life course, and the performance of transnational space. Ann. Assoc. Am. Geogr. 105 (1), 203–218.
Bailey, A.J., 2013. Migration, recession and an emerging transnational biopolitics across Europe. Geoforum. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2012.09.006.
Bailey, A.J., Mupakati, L., Magunha, F., 2014. Misplaced: language, remitting, and development practice among Zimbabwean migrants. Globalisation Soc. Edu. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2014.937404.
Bailey, A.J., Canagarajah, S., Lan, S., Powers, D., 2016. Scalar politics, language ideologies, and the sociolinguistics of globalization among transnational Korean professionals in Hong Kong. J. Sociolinguistics 20 (3), 312–334.
Badurashvili, I., 2004. Determinants and consequences of irregular migration in a society under transition: the case of Georgia, Caucasus. Available at: http://paa2004.princeton.edu/papers/41960 (accessed 20 October 2016).
Badurashvili, I., Nadareishvili, M., 2012. Social impact of emigration and rural-urban migration in Central and Eastern Europe: final country report Georgia. Available at: < http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=8862&langId=en > (accessed 20 October 2016).
Beltrame, D., 2011. Best practices of establishing a national migration information management system: Consultancy Report Georgia. IOM, Tbilisi.
Blake, L.A., 1999. Pastoral power, governmentality and cultures of order in nineteenth-century British Columbia. Trans. Inst. Brit. Geogr. 24 (1), 79–93.
Cardwell, P.J., 2013. New modes of governance in the external dimension of EU migration policy. Int. Migr. 51 (6), 54–66.
Carrera, S., 2007. Building a common policy on labour immigration: towards a comprehensive and global approach in the EU? Centre for European Policy Studies, Working Paper 256, Brussels.
Chakrabarty, D., 2009. Provincializing Europe. Princeton University Press, Princeton NJ.
Cheah, P., 2007. Biopower and the new international division of reproductive labor. Boundary 2 34 (1), 90–113.
Georgia, Civil, 2010. Patriarch: Refrain from Sending Kids Abroad for Education. Available at. http://www.civil.ge/eng/article.php?id=22722.
Collins, F.L., Shubin, S., 2015. Migrant times beyond the life course: the temporalities of foreign English teachers in South Korea. Geoforum 62, 96–104.
Clough, P.T., Willse, C., 2011. Beyond Biopolitics: the Governance of Life and Death. In: Clough, P.T., Willse, C. (Eds.), Beyond Biopolitics. Duke University Press, Durham NC, pp. 1–18.
Coulter, R., van Ham, M., Findlay, A., 2016. Re-thinking residential mobility: linking lives through time and space. Prog Hum Geogr 40 (3), 352–374.
Council of the European Union., 2009a. Joint Declaration of the Prague Eastern Partnership Summit. EU, Brussels, 8435/09, May 2009.
Council of the European Union. 2009b. Joint Declaration on a Mobility Partnership Between the EU and Georgia. EU, Brussels, 16396/09, November 2009.
EC (European Commission), 2004. EU/Georgia Action Plan. Available at < http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/action_plans/georgia_enp_ap_final_en.pdf > .
EC., 2009. Mobility Partnerships as a tool of the Global Approach to Migration. Brussels: SEC 1240.
EC., 2015a. Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council. Brussels: COM(2015) 199 final.
EC., 2015b. Commission Staff Working Document Accompanying the Document Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council. Brussels: SWD (2015)103 final.
Elder Jr, G.H., 1994. Time, human agency, and social change: perspectives on the life course. Soc. Psychol. Quart. 4–15.
Eleveld, A., 2010. Government through freedom: the technology of the life course arrangement. In: Dominello, F. (Ed.), State Power and the Legal Regulation of Evil. Inter-disciplinary Press, Oxford, pp. 127–136.
European Training Foundation, 2013. Migration and skills in Georgia: results of the 2011/12 migration survey on the relationship between skills, migration and development. European Training Foundation. Available at: < http://www.etf.europa.eu/web.nsf/pages/Migration_and_skills_Georgia > .
Fletcher, R., 2017. Environmentally unbound: multiple governmentalities in environmental politics. Geoforum Epub ahead of print 28 June 2017 < http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.06.009 > .
Foucault, M., 2005. The Hermeneutics of the Subject. Picador, New York.
Foucault M., 2009. Security, Territory, Population. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
Foucault, M., 2010. The Government of Self and Others. Palgrave, London.
Foucault, M., 2012. The Courage of Truth. Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
García-Lamarca, M., Kaika, M., 2016. 'Mortgaged lives': the biopolitics of debt and housing financialisation. Trans. Inst. Brit. Geogr. 41 (3), 313–327.
Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM), 2005. Migration in an Interconnected World. United Nations, New York.
Georgian Young Lawyers Association (GYLA) 2014. Promoting well managed migration between EU and Georgia. Available at < http://gyla.ge/eng/raising_awareness/migration_project > .
GIZ. 2014. Georgian Diaspora Study. Available at: < http://diaspora.gov.ge/files/GIZ%20For%20web.pdf > .
Hakkert, R., 2017. Population Dynamics in Georgia. An Overview Based on the 2014 General Population Census Data; p.49. file:///H:/03-E-Library/3.%20Population%20Dynamics_ENGL%20_print_F.pdf.
Hardt, M., 2011. The militancy of theory. South Atlantic Quarterly 110 (1), 19–35.
Hoang, L.A., 2016. Governmentality in Asian migration regimes: the case of labour migration from Vietnam to Taiwan. Popul. Space Place. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/psp.2019.
Hörschelmann, K., 2011. Theorising life transitions: geographical perspectives. Area 43 (4), 378–383.
Hyde, L., 1979. The Gift. Vintage, New York.
International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD), 2014a. Georgian diaspora and migrant communities in Germany, Greece, and Turkey: transnational realities and ties with Georgia. Vienna: ICMPD. Available at: < http://www.icmpd.org/fileadmin/ICMPD-Website/ICMPD-Website_2011/ICMPD_General/News/Georgia_Study/Full_Version_web_en.pdf > .
ICMPD, 2014b. Enhancing Georgia's migration management (ENIGMMA). Available at: < http://www.enigmma.ge/overview-3/ > .
ICMPD, 2015. The State of Migration in Georgia. Available at: < http://migration.commission.ge/files/enigmma-state-of-migration_e_version_1.pdf >
International Organisation for Migration (IOM), 2008. Migration in Georgia: a Country Profile. IOM, Geneva.
IOM, 2012. Support re-integration of Georgian returning migrants and the implementation of the EU-Georgia Readmission Agreement: labour market survey. IOM Georgia, Tbilisi.
Jessop, B., 2007. From micro-powers to governmentality: Foucault's work on statehood, state formation, statecraft and state power. Polit. Geography 26, 34–40.
Jones, M., Jessop, B., 2010. Thinking state/space incompossibly. Antipode 42, 1119–1149.
Jones, R., Johnson, C., 2016. Border militarisation and the re-articulation of sovereignty. Trans. Inst. Brit. Geogr. 41 (2), 187–200.
Karyotis, G., Patrikios, S., 2010. Religion, securitization, and anti-immigration attitudes: the case of Greece. J. Peace Res. 47 (1), 43–57.
Labadze, L., Tukhashvili, M., 2013. Costs and benefits of labour mobility between the EU and the Eastern Partnership partner countries: Georgia country study. European Commission, Brussels.
Ley, D., 2004. Transnational spaces and everyday lives. Trans. Inst. Brit. Geogr. 29, 151–164.
Marcu, S., 2016. Tears of time: a Lefebvrian rhythmanalysis approach to explore the mobility experiences of young Eastern Europeans in Spain. Trans. Inst. Brit. Geogr. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/tran.12174.
Mas Giralt, R., Bailey, A.J., 2010. Transnational familyhood and the liquid life paths of South Americans in the UK. Global Networks 10, 383–400.
Massey, D.S., 2004. Social and economic aspects of immigration. Ann. New York Acad. Sci. 1038, 206–212.
Migration Policy Centre, 2013. Georgia: The demographic-economic framework of migration. Available at: < http://www.migrationpolicycentre.eu/docs/migration_profiles/Georgia.pdf > .
Minca, C., 2015. Geographies of the camp. Polit. Geogr. 49, 74–83.
Nance, M.T., Cottrell, M.P., 2014. A turn toward experimentalism? Rethinking security and governance in the twenty-first century. Rev. Int. Stud. 40, 277–301.
Philo, C., 2012. A 'new Foucault' with lively implications–or 'the crawfish advances sideways'. Trans. Inst. Brit. Geogr. 37 (4), 496–514.
Rabinow, P., Rose, N., 2006. Biopower today. BioSocieties 1 (2), 195–217.
Reeves, M., 2012. Black work, green money: remittances, ritual, and domestic economies in southern Kyrgyzstan. Slavic Review 71 (1), 108–134.
Rose, N., Miller, P., 2008. Governing the Present. Polity, Cambridge.
Salukvadze, J., Meladze, G., 2014. Georgia: Migration a Main Risk Toward Sustainable Demographic Future. In: Eross, A., Karacsonyi, D. (Eds.), Discovering Migration between Visegrad countries and Eastern Partners. Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, pp. 150–169.
Schatzki, T., 2002. The Site of the Social. Penn State Press, University Park.
Smith, D.P., King, R., 2012. Editorial introduction. Re-making migration theory. Population, Space and Place 18(2), 127–133.

Smith, M.P., 2005. Transnational urbanism revisited. J. Ethnic Migr. Stud. 31, 235–244.
Spivak, G.C., 1988. Can the Subaltern Speak? In: Nelson, C., Grossberg, L. (Eds.), Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture. University of Illinois Press, Urbana, pp. 21–55.
State Commission on Migration Issues, 2012. The Migration Strategy of Georgia 2013-2015. available at: < http://migration.commission.ge/files/migration_strategy_of_georgia_2013-2015.pdf > .
State Commission on Migration Issues, 2016. Brief Migration Profile: Remittances. Tbilisi. < http://migratuon.commission.ge/files/eng.pdf > .
Stratford, E., 2015. Geographies, Mobilities, and Rhythms over the Life-course. Routledge, London.
Topol, C., 2011. Necropolitical surveillance: Immigrants from Turkey in Germany. In: Clough, P.T., Willse, C. (Eds.), Beyond Biopolitics. Duke University Press, Durham NC, pp. 238–257.
United Nations, 2016. International Migration Report 2015. United Nations, New York.
Van Selm, J., 2005. Georgia looks west but faces migration challenges at home. Migration Policy Institute, available at: < http://www.migrationinformation.org/feature/print.cfm?ID = 314 > .
Vanore, M., Siegel, M., 2015. The evolution of gendered migration trajectories from Moldova & Georgia. Comp. Migr. Stud. 3 (4). http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40878-015-0001-z.
Viriasova, I., 2016. The refugee's flight: homelessness, hospitality, and care of the self. J. Global Ethics 12 (2), 222–239.
World Bank, 2010. Georgia Summary. Available at: < http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPROSPECTS/Resources/334934-1199807908806/Georgia.pdf > .
Wright, K., 2016. Intergenerational transfers over the life course: addressing temporal and gendered complexities via a human well-being approach. Prog. Dev. Stud. 16 (3), 278–288.
Wunderlich, D., 2012. The limits of external governance: implementing EU external migration policy. J. Eur. Public Policy 19 (9), 1414–1433.