

EUROPEAN IDENTITY THROUGH PRACTICES OF ENUMERATION: THE FORMATION OF EU CITIZENSHIP AND EUROPEAN MIGRATION POLICY

Marinko BANJAC¹

COBISS 1.01

ABSTRACT

European Identity through Practices of Enumeration: The Formation of EU Citizenship and European Migration Policy

The paper analyzes the function and the role of enumerative practices within European migration policy and practices of managing and regulating borders and (illegal) immigration. By employing enumerative practices, illegal immigrants are constructed and represented as a threat to the European Union and as such empower and legitimize European authorities and contentious mechanisms of controlling and regulating migrations. The paper also shows that enumerative practices are paramount in the process of creating a common European identity because of their role in the formation and articulation of the idea of EU citizenship as a particular value of belonging to the European community.

KEYWORDS: Enumerative practices, EU citizenship, (Im)migration, European migration policy

IZVLEČEK

Evropska identiteta skozi prakse številčenja: Oblikovanje EU-državljanstva in evropske migracijske politike

Prispevek analizira vlogo in namen praks številčenja v evropskih migracijskih politikah in praksah nadzora ter regulacij meja in (nelegalnih) migracij. S številčenjem so nelegalni migranti konstruirani in predstavljeni kot nevarnost in grožnja Evropski uniji in kot taki omogočajo ter legitimirajo evropske mehanizme nadzora in regulacij migracij. Prispevek pokaže, da so prakse številčenja pomembne v procesih nastajanja skupne evropske identitete, saj imajo pomembno vlogo pri oblikovanju in artikulaciji ideje EU-državljanstva kot specifične vrednote pripadanja evropski skupnosti.

KLJUČNE BESEDE: številčenje, EU-državljanstvo, (i)migracije, evropske migracijske politike

INTRODUCTION

EU citizenship is one of the most propagated and fostered ideas in the European Union. Since the 1970s¹

I Bachelor in Political Science, Assistant, Faculty of Social Sciences, Kardeljeva ploščad 5, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia. Marinko.Banjac@fdv.uni-lj.si.

¹ The initial steps towards the formation of European citizenship were taken at the Copenhagen foreign ministers' meeting in 1973. In the Declaration on European Identity the concept of European citizenship is not explicitly referred to, but it is possible to identify terminology on which subsequent articulations of European citizenship were made. For example, the Declaration urged for the need to nurture the shared "heritage" of the Community, its countries and the potential new members (CEC 1973).

it has been promoted through greatly diverse campaigns, strategies and policies in various policy areas, ranging from culture to education and migration (Banjac 2011; Mitchell 2006; Fernández 2005; Delgado Moreira 2000). In fact, it is possible to identify certain phrases through which EU citizenship is advanced and nurtured. The 'People's Europe', 'Unity through Diversity' and 'Cultural Mosaic' have all become catch-phrases within the official European narratives striving to develop "a stronger sense of European identity and citizenship above the level of the nation-state while simultaneously contributing to the 'flowering' of local, regional and national cultures and identities below it" (Shore 2004: 28).

Although EU citizenship has been institutionalized through various legal acts and is an important instrument or discourse in the official European parlance and in diverse European policies and practices, its evolution has hardly been a straightforward process. As Olsen (2007: 41) concisely states, it is a phenomenon which is not conjured up *ex nihilo*, but one which emerges, evolves and changes within concrete practices. Indeed, a number of scholars have shown that EU citizenship is not only a body of rights and duties ascribed to the citizens of the EU Member States and is not only used and perpetuated to create a distinct European identity, but is also inherently connected with the processes of creating boundaries and the marking of the European space (Geddes 2005; Walters 2002; Paasi 1996).

Moreover, in creating a common European space and space(s) of EU citizenship, the issue of immigration from non-European countries is particularly important. Catherine Wihtol de Wenden (1999) states that immigration has an immense impact on EU citizenship, both in terms of its effect on the legal formulation of European citizenship and in terms of content. While de Wenden identifies an exclusive logic inscribed in the idea of EU citizenship, Henk Van Houtum and Roos Pijpers (2007) as well as Anssi Paasi (1996) argue that European collective identity is constructed through European migration policy, deterring illegal or undocumented² migrations and border controlling.

Building on these valuable insights on the intricate relationship between migration and the idea of EU citizenship, the paper analyzes enumeration and other calculative practices within the European governmental mechanisms of regulating migration flows. While a significant amount of research (Dover 2008; Huysmans 2006; Ceyhan and Tsoukala 2002; Bigo 1998) has been conducted regarding the diverse, often violent, exclusive and racially-based regulatory policies, mechanisms and practices of (illegal/undocumented) migration and their function in constructing a common European space and identity, there is little (practically none) on the role and function of enumeration and calculative practices within migration policies. As this paper will show, calculative practices and enumeration understood as the specific formulation, instrumentalization and implementation of programs, mechanisms and policies (Inda 2006; Rose 1991, 1999) are intrinsic to modern governmental technologies³ and are, as such, integral to monitoring and managing migration flows. Mitchell Dean (1999) argues that new governmental approaches, including enumeration practices and other statistical technologies (Rose 1996) used by the state and other governing actors or bodies target individuals as members of a population. Gathering knowledge about the individuals and populations so that they could be fostered and optimized has become one of the primary objectives of governing authorities.

Following the main arguments discussed above, the paper is structured as follows: the first part provides a brief theoretical reflection on the role of numbers and statistical data in constructing the European space/territory⁴ and its (external) borders, while the second part considers how the two are re-

2 For a clear explanation of the difference between illegal and undocumented migration see Jørgen Carling (2007).

3 For a historical analysis of the rise of modern governmental mechanisms and diverse modes of political decision-making connected with the rise of heterogeneous strategies, programmes and political practices rooted in numbers and calculative practices see Cole (2000), Rose (1999, 1996), Urla (1993), Hacking (1991), Alonso and Starr (1987), and Porter (1986).

4 The concept of territory rarely receives critical treatment, which means that it is not seen and perceived as unproblematic even within academic discussions. For more on territory, its modern specifics and political usages see Elden (2005; also Elden 2010).

lated and conceptualized within the continuously evolving European migration policy. With the analysis of the historical development of European migration policy, we aim to show how exclusionary governmental technologies in the field of migration are employed in diverse historical contexts. Furthermore, we also consider how these practices are fundamental for the process of community-building and shaping of the European identity in the European Union.

In the third part, the paper proceeds to argue that enumeration is a specific governmental technology through which illegal or undocumented immigrants are constituted and imagined as a threat. The rationale for governing through numbers is, as we will show, at least twofold. On the one hand, immigrants, in particular illegal or undocumented, are constructed as a threat to the security and quality of life within the European Union and are, as such, represented as anti-citizens (Inda 2000), while European citizens, on the other hand, are seen as responsible, economically (self-)sufficient and 'normal' (Van Houtum and Pijpers 200: 295). Through this specific technology, the image of a common and safe ordered European space based on the prevalence of order is constructed, and at the same time the idea of EU citizenship as a particular value of belonging to the European community is fostered and advanced. Furthermore, we examine the case of EU's agency Frontex, a specialized body tasked to coordinate the activities of Member States in the field of (external) border security. We show that Frontex as a calculative authority (see Inda 2006) utilizes statistical data to construct illegal immigrants as a threat and justifies its activities formally aimed at securing EU citizens and the common European space.

CREATING BORDERS AND THE EUROPEAN SPACE/ TERRITORY: THE POLITICAL ROLE OF NUMBERS

Borders are commonly and predominantly perceived as something physical, demarcating specific geographic spaces which encompass different communities living within these bounded territories. Within this perception borders are something which hardly – if ever – change and are, as such, universal and constitutive for each and every population, regardless of their historical and socio-political context (Elden 2005; Agnew 1994). At the same time, borders are paradoxically perceived as relatively fluid in a sense that they are subjected to changes in different historical moments and are the object of political disputes (Duchacek 1986).

Borders do not only exist in the material sense but are also constructed through symbols. At the same time they are geographically based and bearers of historical memories, representations, images etc. As James Anderson and Liam O'Dowd (1999: 595) argue, borders are often seen as encapsulating a history of struggle against 'outside' forces and as marking the limits of the community or society. They appear inherently contradictory and multifaceted because they are at once gateways and barriers to the 'outside' world, inclusionary and exclusionary, zones of cooperation and conflict, and spaces where identities are constructed and differences are asserted. In the latter sense, borders are inherently violent because they function as a (biopolitical) process of normalization. They constitute norms through which specific individuals and communities are recognized as normal and healthy, while other individuals and populations are constructed as abnormal, septic and potentially dangerous (see Foucault 2003). As Foucault argues, the process of normalization, also within (spatial) b/ordering practices (see Van Houtum, Kramsch, and Zierhofer 2005), produces "a whole range of degrees of normality indicating membership of a homogenous social body but also playing a part in classification, hierarchization, and a distribution of rank" (Foucault 1995: 184). The expansion of this normalizing power also proceeds through statistics, which enables knowledge of individuals and communities under a type and becomes, as such, knowledge about how to manage diverse economic and social issues and affairs (2007; 1991). And, as Julian Neylan (2008: 14) also clearly states, "statistics made it possible [to] quantify these specific characteris-

tics so that information about the population could be maintained, thereby enabling the populace to be managed and controlled”.

The violent nature of borders and their exclusivity are present within the process of European integration and formation of a common European space (Paasi 2001). As Pissareva (2010) states, “the extensive spread of bureaucracy coupled with statistics, surveys, social sciences and other calculative practices, has helped the European Union to acquire the needed infrastructural power”. At the European level subjects and diverse collectivities are thus classified and quantified in order to construct them as populations and administrable categories such as ‘unemployed’ or ‘immigrant’, and thereby to rationalize European integration as a manageable process. Although the integration process is predominantly seen as an act of dissolving of (national) borders, leading to more efficient communication and cooperation between different actors at local, national, regional and global levels, they remain an important political mechanism; a specific governmental technology, through which specific (parts of) populations are excluded and migratory flows are controlled, regulated and managed. Specific images of European external borders and their management are crucial for regulating migrations of different populations and communities. Regulatory machinery for controlling immigration is commonly based on statistics (see Rose 1999: 220–221). The statistical data are collected and employed at national and European level while at the same time statistical monitoring is interpreted through (population) maps, so that boundaries are depicted and, through this, the existence of bounded territorial spaces is effectively reified (Paasi 2005).

Furthermore, as Van Houtum and Pijpers (2007: 294) note, issues of immigration and minority integration have topped the political agenda in all of the Member States. Therefore, at the European level, border management and political practices related to the regulation of migratory flows are tightly connected with the rise and development of a common European migration policy (Pikalo, Ilc, and Banjac 2011). Additionally, it must be stressed that this bordering process through which the European space and identities are created is not straightforward in terms of a conventional inside/outside model, and therefore the categories of internal/external are also increasingly seen as problematic. Nevertheless, through European migration policies and concrete practices, strategies and technologies, the European Union excludes subjects whose entry to the EU area is deemed to be illegal (Vaughan-Williams 2008).

EUROPEAN MIGRATION POLICY: HISTORICAL CONTEXTS OF THE EXPANSION OF EXCLUSIONARY MECHANISMS AND PRACTICES

As an evolving field, the European migration policy is extremely important because it concerns the integration of different national migration policies and their discretion over the entry and residence of non-citizens in their territory. Andreas Ette and Thomas Faist (2007: 4) argue that harmonization of immigration policy defines the finality of Europe, its outer borders and how they are controlled. Although there is a prevailing discourse on the need to harmonize different national Member States’ migration policies at the European level, this tendency is far from uncontested. The European migration policies are, as Christina Boswell (2003) argues, in flux, because harmonization of these policies has faced political blockages despite, as noted above, being seen as necessary (Givens and Luedtke 2004).⁵ Growing⁶

5 For a more in-depth analysis of the reasons behind the blockages and stalemates of the common EU migration policy see Givens and Luedtke (2004) and Boswell (2003).

6 This growing tendency needs to be addressed critically because, as De Haas (2008) reminds us, the image of a “tidal wave of desperate people [...] trying to enter the European El Dorado” is often based on fundamentally flawed assumptions about the magnitude, historicity, nature and causes of this migration.

levels of illegal migration and migrant-trafficking have also triggered doubts whether states are “capable of protecting *their citizens from outsiders*” (Boswell 2003: 1, emphasis added). For this reason, immigration policies have for the most part remained under national control (Ette and Faist 2007), while the main dilemma of to what extent European Member States should abdicate decision-making interests to forge a common immigration policy at the European level remains a crucial one.

Despite this ambivalence between the tendency of harmonization and keeping migration policy within national jurisdiction, it is possible, following Andrew Geddes (2003), to identify four distinct phases of integration of the European migration policy. The first period, from 1957 to 1986, is characterized by the fact that immigration policies remained firmly within the national prerogative, which means that European involvement in this field was quite clearly minimal. Geddes (2003: 131) identifies initiatives by the European Commission towards a more intense EU cooperation in the field of migration which were regularly rebuffed. Despite the negative trend during this period, a number of cooperation initiatives were undertaken; however, they were not formally part of the EU institutional framework. The so-called Schengen Agreement of 1985, which laid the foundation for the abolishment of internal border controls and harmonization of internal security measures, is one important example. The Agreement was signed between five members of the European Economic Community. The rules adopted under the Agreement were separate from the EU *acquis* until 1997, when the Amsterdam Treaty was adopted and the Agreement was incorporated into European Union law.

These forms of cooperation were shaped and intensified during the second period, from 1986 to 1993. This period was marked by closer cooperation among the representatives of Member States’ administrations. The result of this informal intergovernmental collaboration was a set of concrete mechanisms for cooperation in the field of migration.⁷

The third period begins with the Maastricht Treaty, which came into force in 1993 and lasted until 1999. If the second period was characterized by informal cooperation among the European countries, in the third period the cooperation became increasingly more formal. The Treaty offered a framework within which the Member States could define (im)migration as a field of common interest and, on this basis, deepen their cooperation. The field of migration was integrated under the third pillar of the European Union, which meant that, because of the decision-making structure, the cooperation remained intergovernmental (Ette and Faist 2007).

Finally, the fourth period begins with the Treaty of Amsterdam, which entered into force in 1999, amending the Treaty on European Union. Among the substantial changes implemented were increased powers for the European Parliament, development of a common foreign and security policy, formation of the Community area of freedom, greater emphasis on citizenship and the rights of individuals, and, in the context of migration policy, the possibility of the European Union to legislate on immigration and incorporation of the previously mentioned Schengen Agreement in the *acquis communautaire*. The incorporation of the Agreement should be understood, as William Walters and Jens Henrik Haahr (2005: 94) argue, not only as another step in the formalization of security measures but also as the generalization of security and mobility practices “across the geographical and institutional space of the European Union and beyond”. The construction of a borderless Europe has become transfixed by the specific mobilities of undocumented and illegal migrants, refugees and people traffickers which need to be controlled. (External) borders need to be regulated and, through the implementation of Schengen, these precise borders are manifested as vulnerable coastlines, permeable land borders and always-insufficiently managed airports. What is produced is a space where (European) citizenship is constructed as a right to protection from alien threats (Walters and Haahr 2005: 111).

In 1999, the European Council summit in Tampere, Finland, made crucial steps towards a common European asylum and immigration policy. The objective defined in the Conclusions of the Tampere European Council is that there should be a harmonized policy for immigrants and asylum seekers to

7 For more see Mathew J. Gibney and Randall Hansen (2005).

seek and obtain entry to all EU Member States. The Council defined four separate elements of a common European immigration policy: partnership with countries of origin, a common European asylum system, fair treatment of third-country nationals, and management of migration flows (Caviedes 2004: 294). A need for a concrete move towards a common European immigration policy, outlined in the Tampere Conclusions, was emphasized in the Hague Programme, prepared by the European Commission in 2005. As Van Munster and Sterkx (2006) show, these novel recent attempts to develop a common European immigration policy are based on increased emphasis on security and control and driven by the distribution of danger and the political principle of fear. Furthermore, through this, EU seeks to mould the conduct of freedom between itself and the external environment and manage of the “improper and dangerous” exercise of freedom.

The European integration of migration policy is not, as we argue, important only in terms of the institutional development of the migration policy field at the European level, but also in terms of how dilemmas or issues concerning immigration to the European Union and responses to it are integral to advancing the ideas of a common European civilization and identity. It is possible to identify specific political practices, mechanisms, strategies and regulations of migratory flows, through which migrants are portrayed as (biopolitical) (Sparke 2006; Fassin 2001) targets, and notions of common European space and identity are imagined, created, fostered, urged and advanced.

PRACTICES OF ENUMERATION, (IM)MIGRATIONS AND EUROPEAN IDENTITY/CITIZENSHIP

Institutional arrangements, ideas about borders, (im)migrants and specific political practices within the evolving field of European migration policy are in numerous ways connected with statistics and other calculative practices. The enumerative basis of the European migration policy and practical responses to immigration issues are explicitly brought up in the Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on Community Statistics on migration and international protection, adopted in 2007. The regulation states that “harmonized and comparable Community statistics on migration and asylum are essential for the development and monitoring of Community legislation and policies relating to immigration and asylum, and to the free movement of persons” (EU 2007). The European Union clearly emphasizes the significance of numerical data for the development of migration policy and its implementation, while further stressing that statistical data should be categorized, accessible, comparable and mutually compatible across the European Union.

As noted above, the development of the European migration policy is particularly affected by the dilemma of whether, if at all, Member States should transfer powers to the European level with the aim of forging a common migration policy. The European Union strives to solve this through a calculative logic, which is also declared in a statement of the Council of the European Union expressed in the European Pact on Immigration and Asylum:

The European Council considers that legal immigration should be the result of a desire on the part of both the migrant and the host country to their mutual benefit. It recalls that it is for each Member State to decide on the conditions of admission of legal migrants to its territory and, where necessary, to *set their number* (Council of the European Union cited in Duca 2011: 159, emphasis added).

By introducing statistical estimates, the European Union therefore endeavours to establish control over the circulation of individuals and immigrating populations, allowed or permitted to stay only if it is beneficial for the Member States. On the other hand, it is equally if not more important to calculate the number of illegal or undocumented immigrants. In order to obtain this data, the European Parliament and the

Council adopted a decision which calls on the Member States to provide the Commission with statistics, among others, on the numbers “of third-country nationals refused entry to the Member State’s territory at the external border [and] third-country nationals found to be illegally present in the Member State’s territory under national laws relating to immigration” (EU 2007). It may seem that statistics are merely an objective tool for measuring the phenomenon of illegal immigration, but in the political discourse, immigrants, particularly illegal and undocumented, are constituted through enumerative practices as a problem which needs to be addressed and resolved at the national as well as the European level.

By labelling the immigrants in terms of statistical observations and estimates and by presenting them through quantitative data, specific characteristics are assigned to them. In this light, immigrants are perceived and imagined as a specific population which exploits social benefits and are, as such, perceived as a burden to European society. Through numbers, immigrants are portrayed as a threat to existing order and a threat which could potentially undermine the stability of the European socio-political environment (Huysmans 2006: 47–51). This specific governmental technique of producing a threat of overpopulation is not a modern invention but historically originates from the end of eighteenth century, when ideas that overpopulation of a specific territory can be detrimental for the social cohesion and welfare of a specific society or community emerged. Following this line of reasoning, statistical knowledge needs to be obtained and accumulated in order to prevent the detrimental effect to the welfare of the population. Thus, using enumerative practices, which serve as a justification and rationalization for collecting statistical data, immigrants are constructed as a threat in order to maintain and regulate the (European) population. It is in this context that immigration flows are continually portrayed as a security problem (Bigo 1998), while the European Union – with its formative steps towards the common European migration policy – establishes itself as a force capable of delivering security for all and of creating a common European space; a space of free and secure Citizens: “The ‘security-oriented’ vision of the area of freedom, security and justice inevitably feeds the profound disquiet on civil liberties grounds [...]” (Shaw 2000: 308).

Another political function of enumerative practices not to be overlooked is the simplification of the socio-political complexity (Latour 1987; Pikalo and Trdina 2009), which has important consequences for regulative practices of various forms of migrations. Statistical data serve as a mechanism of assessing which immigrants are desirable and beneficial to the European community, while, on the other hand, the illegality of specific migrants is materialized, providing legitimacy to the European Union’s preventive and regulative measures which hinder such migrations. Reduction of the socio-political complexity not only allows but enables the creation of arbitrary categories through which different types of immigration are classified, arranged and sorted. And this, in turn, enables the authorities to more efficiently and effectively manage and administer the immigration processes and the immigrating individuals and populations.⁸ Rens Van Munster (2005) scrupulously shows how intensively heterogeneous are the political practices and administrative measures aimed at preventing illegal immigration. These practices and measures, formulated, authorized and legitimized through statistics and other quantitative data, are – precisely because the effect of enumerative practices is, presumably, objectivity – seen as unproblematic, legitimate and appropriate. They are perceived as effective and appropriate because it is through these measures and practices that safety, freedom and the good life (of European citizens) are guaranteed, ensured and protected (Van Houtum 2002; Van Houtum and Van Naerssen 2002).

This idea of a European space as an “area of freedom, security and justice” is one of the EU’s more explicit objectives, formally deriving from Title V of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.⁹

8 As stressed earlier, the statistics were incorporated in the apparatus of government and, as such, developed as a specific knowledge on how to govern various socio-political affairs. In this context the European level is no exception, as management and regulation of migration through quantitative data and statistical reasoning are co-constitutive not only of authorities but also specific governmental practices. On different modes of governing Europe see Walters and Haahr (2005).

9 The challenge of creating the area of freedom, security and justice is already set out in the Amsterdam Treaty and is also based on the Tampere, Hague and Stockholm programmes.

One of the fundamental rights in this area is the free movement of people, realized through abolishment of all internal borders and, according to the EU, securing and guaranteeing this right to citizens of the European Union requires a strengthened management of the Union's external borders. This, in turn, calls for the management and regulation of entry and residence of non-EU nationals and includes a common asylum and immigration policy. Furthermore, the creation of the area is not intended to "re-invent democracy but to allow *citizens* to enjoy their long-standing democracies in *common*" (European Commission 1998, emphasis added) and thereby bring the European Union "closer to the *people*" (CEU 1999). Therefore, it is clear that the management and regulation of immigration at external borders is a crucial task for the formation of the common European area and also for nurturing, supporting, sustaining and reinforcing the idea of a common European citizenship.

One of the important institutional arrangements at the EU level, created specifically to manage and control (illegal) immigration is the Frontex agency (from French: *frontières extérieures*) set up in 2004. It is a specialized body established by Council Regulation (EC) 2007/2004 and tasked to coordinate the activities of the national border guards in the field of border security (see Carrera 2007). It is intelligence-driven and can be seen, using Jonathan Xavier Inda's (2006) phrase, as a specific calculating authority. As a calculating authority Frontex is not only involved in activities in the field, but also formulates and designs these activities through systematic studies and research. The agency gathers information from partner countries within and beyond the EU's borders, as well as from other research and academic publications and the media in order to estimate and assess the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats at the external borders. This enables Frontex to balance resources and risks (Frontex 2011a). Its research activities and assessments are based mainly (although not exclusively) on statistics and other quantitative data. A clear example is Frontex's evaluation of the situation on external borders in 2010 (Frontex 2011b). The situation is presented through quantitative estimates of illegal migrations. The statistical data is not used solely to present objective facts, but is used as a specific governmental technique which exposes, exhibits and displays the threat of illegal immigrants in order to secure a common European space (Neal 2009). The important effect of this is the strengthening of the authority not only of the agency but of the European Union as a whole. As Mladen Dolar (2004) argues, the threat of 'external' forces is one of the sources of power of the authority. The authority must always rely on the anticipation of a threat that can be realized anyplace and anytime. "The power of the Authority becomes organized as a defence against the invisible threat which is posed by a ubiquitous foe. The Authority presents itself as a victim of the invisible threat" (Dolar 2004: 124). Frontex must constantly produce new estimates and new statistical data on possible danger from illegal immigrants as the bearers of this threat. In this context, Frontex emphasizes the rapidly changing reality on the ground as a rationale for its existence and for the European Union to support an institutionalized body which is able to react swiftly to new dangers that can present an imminent threat to its external borders (Leonard 2010): "Frontex strengthens the *freedom and the security of the citizens of the EU* by complementing the national border management systems of the Member States" (Frontex, emphasis added). Therefore, Frontex is a specialized body for managing and controlling illegal immigration and, through enumerative practices and activities, advancing the idea of a safe common European space where its citizens must be protected.

CONCLUSION

The paper has sought to analyze the function and the role of calculative practices understood as specific governmental technologies within the European migration policy, European monitoring and managing strategies as well as practices of regulation of borders, migration and illegal immigrants.

As means of the specific formulation, instrumentalization and implementation of programmes, mechanisms and policies, calculative practices are intrinsic to modern governmental technologies and

are furthermore firmly incorporated in controlling and managing migration flows. Enumerative practices are intimately incorporated and utilized within the evolving field of the Common European migration policy and practices of regulating immigrations at the European level. By employing governance through numbers, immigrants, particularly illegal or undocumented, are constructed, imagined and represented as a threat to the security and quality of life within the European Union. While we show that this represents a reduction of the socio-political complexity of immigration processes and migration phenomena in general, it is precisely through this simplification that European authorities and specific governmental agencies such as Frontex are legitimized. The idea that illegal immigrants are a threat to the existing order and an economically efficient European environment authorizes and empowers European political bodies in their quest to decide and determine which immigrations are (economically) acceptable and which are detrimental to the European Union. Furthermore, the construction of immigrants as a threat represents a political strategy which seeks to justify diverse, contentious, even violent and exclusive, mechanisms and techniques of controlling and regulating migrations.

Enumerative practices as a governmental technology within migration policies and practices are paramount also in the process of creating a common European identity. If illegal immigrants are portrayed as a population invading the European Union and, as such, a threat to the existing order, the statistical data exhibits and displays its actions as rational, pragmatic, efficient and operative measures to secure a common European space in which European citizens are seen as responsible, economically (self-)sufficient and 'normal'. Therefore, the enumerative practices are a key and fundamental element in the formation and articulation of the idea of EU citizenship as a particular value of belonging to the European community.

REFERENCES

- Agnew, John** (1994). The Territorial Trap: The Geographical Assumptions of International Relations Theory. *Review of International Political Economy* 1(1): 53–80.
- Alonso, William and Paul Starr** (1987). *The Politics of Numbers*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation Publications.
- Anderson, James and Liam O'Dowd** (1999). Borders, Border Regions and Territoriality: Contradictory Meanings, Changing Significance. *Regional Studies* 33(7): 593–604.
- Banjac, Marinko** (2011). "Enotnost v različnosti": Multikulturalizem kot oblastna tehnologija in konstitucija evropskega multikulturnega sebstva. *Razprave in gradivo* 64: 86–111.
- Bigo, Didier** (1998). Frontiers and security in the European Union: The illusion of migration control. *The Frontiers of Europe* (eds. M. Anderson and E. Bort). London: Pinter, 148–164.
- Boswell, Christina** (2003). *European Migration Policies in Flux: Changing Patterns of Inclusion and Exclusion*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Carling, Jørgen** (2007). Unauthorized Migration from Africa to Spain. *International Migration* 45(4): 3–37.
- Carrera, Sergio** (2007). *The EU border management strategy: FRONTEX and the challenges of irregular immigration in the Canary Islands*. Brussels: Centre for European Policy Studies.
- Caviedes, Alexander** (2004). The open method of co-ordination in immigration policy: A tool for prying open Fortress Europe? *Journal of European Public Policy* 11(2): 289–310.
- CEC (1973). *Declaration on European Identity (Copenhagen, 14 December 1973)* Vol. December 1973, *Bulletin of the European Communities*. Luxembourg: Office for official publications of the European Communities.
- Council of the European Union (CEU) (1999). *Action Plan of the Council and the Commission on How Best to Implement the Provisions of the Treaty of Amsterdam on an Area of Freedom, Security and Justice*, 3 December 1999. Brussels: CEU.

- Ceyhan**, Ayse and Anastasia **Tsoukala** (2002). The Securitization of Migration in Western Societies: Ambivalent Discourses and Policies. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 27: 21–40.
- Cole**, Joshua (2000). *The Power of Large Numbers: Population, Politics, and Gender in Nineteenth-century France*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- De Haas**, Hein (2008). The Myth of Invasion: The inconvenient realities of African migration to Europe. *Third World Quarterly* 29(7): 1305–1322.
- De Wenden**, Catherine Wihtol (1999). Post-Amsterdam Migration Policy and European Citizenship. *European Journal of Migration & Law* 1(1): 89–101.
- Dean**, Mitchell (1999). *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society*. Sage Publications: London.
- Delgado** Moreira, Juan M. (2000). Cohesion and Citizenship in EU Cultural Policy. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 38(3): 449–470.
- Dolar**, Mladen (2004). Moč nevidnega. *Problemi XLII* (1–2): 113–132.
- Dover**, Robert (2008). Towards a Common EU Immigration Policy: A Securitization Too Far. *Journal of European Integration* 30(1): 113–130.
- Duca**, Rita (2011). The dark side of European immigration policy. *Journal of Money Laundering Control* 14(2): 158–169.
- Duchacek**, Ivo D. (1986). Across Boundaries: Transborder Interaction in Comparative Perspective. *Across Boundaries: Transborder Interaction in Comparative Perspective* (ed. O. J. Martínez). El Paso, Tex.: Texas Western Press, 11–28.
- Elden**, Stuart (2005). Missing the Point: Globalization, Deterritorialization and the Space of the World. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30(1): 8–19.
- Elden**, Stuart (2010). Land, terrain, territory. *Progress in Human Geography* 34(6): 799–817.
- Ette**, Andreas, and Thomas **Faist** (2007). The Europeanization of National Policies and Politics of Immigration: Research, Questions and Concepts. *The Europeanization of National Policies and Politics of Immigration: Between Autonomy and the European Union* (eds. A. Ette and T. Faist). Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 3–31.
- Fassin**, Didier (2001). The Biopolitics of Otherness: Undocumented Foreigners and Racial Discrimination in French Public Debate. *Anthropology Today* 17(1): 3–7.
- EU (2007). Regulation (EC) No 862/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 July 2007 on Community statistics on migration and international protection and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 311/76 on the compilation of statistics on foreign workers. Official Journal L 199, 31/07/2007 P. 0023 – 0029. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32007R0862:EN:HTML> (1. 12. 2011).
- European Commission (1998). Communication from the Commission. Towards an area of freedom, security and justice. COM(1998) 459 final. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:1998:0459:FIN:EN:PDF> (12. 12. 2011).
- Fernández**, Oscar (2005). Towards European Citizenship through Higher Education? *European Journal of Education* 40(1): 60–68.
- Foucault**, Michel (1991). Governmentality. *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality: with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault* (eds. G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 87–104.
- Foucault**, Michel (1995). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage.
- Foucault**, Michel (2003). *Abnormal: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1974–1975*. London: Verso.
- Foucault**, Michel (2007). *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–1978*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Frontex. *More about Frontex*. http://www.frontex.europa.eu/more_about_frontex/ (16. 12. 2011).
- Frontex (2011a). *Frontex Press Pack. May 2011*. www.frontex.europa.eu/download/.../press-pack_2011-05_final.pdf (16.12.2011).

- Frontex (2011b). Hermes extension 2011. Background information. http://www.frontex.europa.eu/hermes_2011_extended/background_information/ (16. 12. 2011).
- Geddes, Andrew** (2003). *The politics of migration and immigration in Europe*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Geddes, Andrew** (2005). Europe's Border Relationships and International Migration Relations. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 43(4): 787–806.
- Gibney, Matthew J. and Randall Hansen** (2005). *Immigration and asylum: From 1900 to the present*. Santa Barbara, Calif.: ABC-CLIO.
- Givens, Terri and Adam Luedtke** (2004). The Politics of European Union Immigration Policy: Institutions, Saliency, and Harmonization. *Policy Studies Journal* 32(1): 145–165.
- Hacking, Ian** (1991). How Should we do the History of Statistics? *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality: with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault* (eds. G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 181–195.
- Huysmans, Jef** (2006). *The politics of insecurity: Fear, migration, and asylum in the EU*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, New York: Routledge.
- Inda, Jonathan Xavier** (2000). Foreign bodies: Migrants, parasites, and the pathological nation. *Discourse* 22(3): 46–62.
- Inda, Jonathan Xavier** (2006). *Targeting immigrants: Government, technology, and ethics*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Latour, Bruno** (1987). *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Leonard, Sarah** (2010). EU Border Security and Migration into the European Union: FRONTEX and Securitization through Practices. *European Security* 19(2): 231–254.
- Mitchell, Katharyne** (2006). Neoliberal governmentality in the European Union: Education, training, and technologies of citizenship. *Environment and Planning D* 24(3): 389–407.
- Munster, Rens and Steven Sterkx** (2006). Governing Mobility: The Externalization of European Migration Policy and the Boundaries of the European Union. *European research reloaded: Cooperation and europeanized states integration among europeanized states* (eds. R. Holzhaecker and M. Haverland). Dordrecht: Springer, 229–250.
- Neal, Andrew W.** (2009). Securitization and Risk at the EU Border: The Origins of FRONTEX. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 47(2): 333–356.
- Neylan, Julian** (2008). Social Policy and the Authority of Evidence. *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 67(1): 12–19.
- Olsen, Espen D. H.** (2007). The origins of European citizenship in the first two decades of European integration. *Journal of European Public Policy* 15(1): 40–57.
- Paasi, Anssi** (1996). *Territories, boundaries, and consciousness: The changing geographies of the Finnish-Russian boundary*. Chichester, England; New York: J. Wiley & Sons.
- Paasi, Anssi** (2001). Europe as a Social Process and Discourse. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 8(1): 7–28.
- Paasi, Anssi** (2001). The Changing Discourse on Political Boundaries: Mapping the Backgrounds, Contexts and Contents. *B/ordering Space* (eds. H. Van Houtum, Olivier Thomas Kramsch and Wolfgang Zierhofer). Aldershot: Ashgate, 17–31.
- Pikalo, Jernej and Andreja Trdina** (2009). Depoliticisation of the Political: Dealing with Political Issues in Slovenian Dailies. *Javnost-The Public* 16(5): 41–61.
- Pikalo, Jernej, Blaž Ilc and Marinko Banjac** (2011). *Meje globaliziranega sveta*. Ljubljana: Založba Sophia.
- Pissareva, Lora** (2010). European security governance: Analysing a Regime of Practices on the basis of Michel Foucault's Governmentality Theory. http://essay.utwente.nl/60353/1/BSc_L_Pissareva.pdf (15. 2. 2012)
- Porter, Theodore M.** (1986). *The Rise of Statistical Thinking, 1820–1900*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

- Rose, Nikolas (1991). Governing by numbers: Figuring out democracy. *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 16(7): 673–692.
- Rose, Nikolas (1996). Governing “Advanced” Liberal Democracies. *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism and Rationalities of Government* (eds. A. Barry, T. Osborne and N. Rose). Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press and UCL Press, 37–64.
- Rose, Nikolas (1999). *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shaw, Jo (1997). The many pasts and futures of citizenship in the European Union. *European law review* 22(6): 554–572.
- Shaw, Jo (2000). Constitutional Settlements and the Citizen after the Treaty of Amsterdam. *European integration after Amsterdam: Institutional dynamics and prospects for democracy* (eds. K. Neunreither and A. Wiener). Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 290–317.
- Shore, Cris (2004). Whither European Citizenship? *European Journal of Social Theory* 7(1): 27–44.
- Sparke, Matthew B. (2006). A neoliberal nexus: Economy, security and the biopolitics of citizenship on the border. *Political Geography* 25(2): 151–180.
- Urla, Jacqueline (1993). Cultural Politics in an Age of Statistics: Numbers, Nations, and the Making of Basque Identity. *American Ethnologist* 20(4): 818–843.
- Van Houtum, Henk (2002). Borders of Comfort: Spatial Economic Bordering Processes in and by the European Union. *New borders for a changing Europe: Cross-border cooperation and governance* (eds. J. Anderson, L. O’Dowd and T. M. Wilson). London: Frank Cass, 37–59.
- Van Houtum, Henk and Roos Pijpers (2007). The European Union as a Gated Community: The Two-faced Border and Immigration Regime of the EU. *Antipode* 39(2): 291–309.
- Van Houtum, Henk, Olivier Thomas Kramsch and Wolfgang Zierhofer (eds.) (2005). *B/ordering space*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Van Houtum, Henk and Ton Van Naerssen (2002). Bordering, Ordering and Othering. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie* 93(2): 125–136.
- Van Munster, Rens (2005). The EU and the Management of Immigration Risk in the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice. *University of Southern Denmark Political Science Publications*.
- Vaughan-Williams, Nick (2008). Borderwork beyond Inside/Outside? Frontex, the Citizen-Detective and the War on Terror. *Space and Polity* 12(1): 63–79.
- Walters, William (2002). Mapping Schengenland: Denaturalizing the border. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 20(5): 561–580.
- Walters, William and Jens Henrik Haahr (2005). *Governing Europe: Discourse, Governmentality and European Integration*. New York: Routledge.

POVZETEK

EVROPSKA IDENTITETA SKOZI PRAKSE ŠTEVILČENJA: OBLIKOVANJE EU-DRŽAVLJANSTVA IN EVROPSKE MIGRACIJSKE POLITIKE

Marinko BANJAC

Prispevek analizira vlogo in namen praks številčenja v evropskih migracijskih politikah in praksah nadzora ter regulacijah meja in (nelegalnih) migracij v kontekstu procesov nastajanja skupne evropske identitete skozi oblikovanje in artikulacije EU-državljanstva kot specifične vrednote pripadanja evropski skupnosti. Kot način specifičnih formulacij, instrumentalizacij in implementacij programov, mehanizmov in politik so kalkulativne prakse intrinzične oblastnim tehnologijam ter vpete v nadzor ter upravljanje migracijskih tokov. V prispevku pokažemo, da so prakse številčenja pomemben del nastajajoče skupne evropske migracijske politike ter s tem reguliranja mobilnosti populacij na evropski ravni. Z uporabo

statističnih podatkov ter drugih praks številčenja so imigranti, še zlasti tisti, ki so označeni kot nezakoniti in/ali nedokumentirani, konstruirani in reprezentirani kot grožnja varnosti in kvaliteti življenja v Evropski uniji. S prikazovanjem in z opisovanjem imigrantov s številkami se vzpostavlja ideja o neobvladljivem številu novoprihajajoče populacije, ki načenja red in gospodarsko učinkovitost evropskega okolja. Prakse številčenja delujejo kot nevtrarno in objektivno popisovanje, ocenjevanje, kalkuliranje in evalviranje imigracijskih populacij, vendar so ravno te prakse inherentno politične, saj med drugim reducirajo družbenopolitično kompleksnost, in, kot že rečeno, vzpostavljajo podoba imigrantov kot prihajajoče grožnje. Redukcija kompleksnosti in podoba grožnje sta način zagotavljanja legitimnosti evropskim oblastnim praksam specifičnih institucij in hkrati strategija, s katero politične institucije upravičujejo različne, pogosto nasilne in izključevalne mehanizme in tehnike nadzora ter regulacij migracij. Na ta način je določeno, kateri tip imigracij je dovoljen, dopusten in toleriran, ter na drugi strani, katere migrirajoče populacije so grožnja in so kot take nedopustne in hkrati evropskemu gospodarskemu okolju nekoristne. Določanje, ki poteka prek praks številčenj o zakonitih / nezakonitih, dobrodošlih / nekoristnih ipd. imigracijah je izjemno pomembno tudi v kontekstu vzpostavljanja idej o tem, kaj je evropski prostor in kaj evropska identiteta, saj se z negativnim portretiranjem nelegalnih / nedokumentiranih imigrantov hkrati ustvarja podoba o evropskem okolju (učinkovitem, urejenem ipd.) in EU-državljanih (racionalnih, odgovornih, itd.). V tem smislu sta v nekakšnem dialektičnem procesu upravljanje in regulacija migracij prek praks številčenja ne le teren izključevanja specifičnih migrirajočih populacij in ustvarjanje grožnje na zunanjih mejah Evropske unije, temveč tudi polje formacij in artikulacij ideje EU-državljanstva kot specifične vrednote pripadanja evropski skupnosti.