

BORDERS, MOBILITY AND TECHNOLOGIES OF CONTROL

Borders, Mobility and Technologies of Control

Edited by

Sharon Pickering,

Monash University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

and

Leanne Weber

University of New South Wales, NSW, Australia

 Springer

A C.I.P. Catalogue record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN-10 1-4020-4898-X (HB)
ISBN-13 978-1-4020-4898-2 (HB)
ISBN-10 1-4020-4899-8 (e-book)
ISBN-13 978-1-4020-4899-9 (e-book)

Published by Springer,
P.O. Box 17, 3300 AA Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

www.springer.com

Printed on acid-free paper

All Rights Reserved

© 2006 Springer

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

Printed in the Netherlands

*This book is dedicated to the
world's vagabonds:
for Stephen, who made it, and
others who didn't.*

Contents

Contributing Authors	ix
Acknowledgments	xi
Borders, Mobility and Technologies of Control SHARON PICKERING AND LEANNE WEBER	1
The Shifting Frontiers of Migration Control LEANNE WEBER	21
Border Narratives SHARON PICKERING	45
Global Flows, Semi-permeable Borders and New Channels of Inequality NANCY A. WONDERS	63
Biometrics, Borders and the Ideal Suspect DEAN WILSON	87
Borders, Belonging and Homeland (In)security MONA J. E. DANNER	111
Control, Protection and Negligence ALICE HILLS	123

State Crime Beyond Borders PENNY GREEN	149
The Gender of Control JAN CARPENTER	167
Law and Order on the Border in the Neo-colonial Antipodes KERRY CARRINGTON	179
De-territorialising Criminology SHARON PICKERING AND LEANNE WEBER	207
Index	213

Contributing Authors

Jan Carpenter is a PhD student in history at Northern Arizona University, studying immigration, race and gender in the United States–Mexico borderlands. Her first doctorate, in which she investigated motivations for corporate lobbying behaviour, is from Texas A&M University.

Professor Kerry Carrington Chair in Sociology in the School of Social Sciences at University of New England in northern New South Wales, has a wide variety of research interests in criminology, sociology, social policy and gender studies. She is author of *Offending Girls: Sex Youth & Justice* (1993) and *Who Killed Leigh Leigh?* (1998); co-author of *Policing the Rural Crisis* (2006) and co-editor of *Critical Criminology: Issues, Debates & Challenge* (2002), *Travesty! Miscarriages of Justice* (1991) and *Cultures of Crime and Violence* (1995). In 2003, she worked as a senior researcher for the Australian Parliament and wrote a number of social policy briefs about immigration crime, border control, trafficking and the sex industry.

Mona J.E. Danner is Associate Professor of Sociology and Criminal Justice at Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Virginia. Social inequalities, justice policy and globalisation comprise her primary research interests.

Penny Green is Professor of Law and Criminology at the University of Westminster, London. She has written widely on the subject of state crime, Turkish criminal justice; state organisational deviance and ‘natural’ disasters; European asylum policy and drug trafficking. Her publications include *State Crime: Governments, Violence and Corruption*, *Criminal Policy in Transition*, *Drugs, Trafficking and Criminal Policy* and *The Enemy Without*. She is

currently researching the market in looted antiquities, and the role of civil society in controlling state crime, particularly illegal logging.

Alice Hills is a senior lecturer at the University of Leeds where she directs the program in conflict, development and security. The core of her research focus is to develop a comparative framework for analysing why police forces evolve as they do, and what explains their interaction with governments, militaries and civil society in fragile states. Relevant publications include *Border Security in the Balkans: Europe's Gatekeepers*, (Adelphi paper No. 371).

Sharon Pickering is a senior lecturer in Criminology at Monash University, Melbourne. Her previous titles include *Refugees and State Crime* (2005); *Global Issues, Women and Justice* (2004 edited with Lambert) *Critical Chatter: Women and Human Rights in South East Asia* (2003 with Lambert and Alder); and *Women, Policing and Resistance* (2002).

Leanne Weber teaches in the School of Social Science and Policy at the University of New South Wales, and previously coordinated a Bachelor of Policing program at the University of Western Sydney. She has an interest in the intersection between criminal justice practice and human rights and has researched and written about the detention of asylum seekers and the policing of migration.

Dean Wilson lectures in Criminal Justice and Criminology in the School of Political and Social Inquiry, Monash University, Melbourne. His research interests include surveillance and social control, media representations of crime, and histories and cultures of policing. His current research is focused upon discourses of security in the Australian media and the socio-political significance of contemporary surveillance technologies.

Dr. Nancy A. Wonders is Professor of Criminal Justice at Northern Arizona University. She is internationally recognised for her research on inequality and justice, sex tourism, feminist criminology, and globalisation, migration and border performativity.

Acknowledgments

It has been a pleasure to work with the outstanding academics who have contributed to this collection. They have been patient and supportive and come together across a number of geographical and interdisciplinary borders.

We are indebted to Trish Luker for transforming our manuscript into a camera-ready document.

John Gaffey uncovered a wealth of material through his online voyages which contributed to the first two chapters.

This volume was improved by the comments of three anonymous reviewers as well as by valued colleagues at home and abroad including Dr. Jude McCulloch and Professor Ray Michaelowski.

Welmoed Spahr has been an enthusiastic and committed publishing editor and we are grateful for her openness to our project and the publication of this work.

Sharon has been generously supported by Tom throughout the life of this collection, and its completion has been all the more exciting and wonderful with the arrival of Wesley.

Chapter 1

BORDERS, MOBILITY AND TECHNOLOGIES OF CONTROL

Sharon Pickering and Leanne Weber
Monash University and University of New South Wales

Borders, Mobility and Technologies of Control focuses on borders and the significance, from a criminological point of view, of the activities which take place on and around them. For many, the border is an everyday reality; a space in which to live; a land necessary to cross once, twice or many times; a space of sanctuary; a dangerous space. Often the border can be many or all of these things at once. For states, the border space increasingly requires protection and defence. It is also increasingly at the centre of state ideology and performance, the site for investing significant political and material resources, and is ultimately ungovernable.

In a rapidly globalising world, territorial borders are taking on a new significance, the implications of which are relatively unexplored within the discipline of criminology. Traditionally, criminology has aligned its own disciplinary boundaries with those of the nation-state, concerning itself with behaviours defined as criminal by state or national governments and with the institutions and enforcement practices of state actors confined within territorial boundaries and compared across territorially-bounded spaces. This approach is increasingly recognised as inadequate in the context of greatly increased levels of traditional cross-border crime, innovative technologies which create new opportunities both for criminal exploitation and new techniques of state control, and a widespread climate of fear and insecurity arising from global economic and political threats, transnational terrorism, and changing conceptions of the powers and responsibilities of the nation-state.

Borders, Mobility and Technologies of Control is specifically interested in how physical borders are impacting on the mobility of people. Concomitantly, it is concerned with how the state exercises its authority at and around the border and how it is experienced and understood by those

involved in processes of exclusion. Criminalisation of ‘unauthorised’ border crossing has been a primary border control strategy in Europe, North America and Australia. Indeed, processes of criminalisation have largely come to reconstitute the circumstances and experiences of those who transgress borders. In turn, criminalisation has become central to the re-enforcement of territorial borders when, on many other levels, the role of national borders has been in decline. This collection will cover both how the border has been used in the construction of ‘new’ crimes, ‘new’ forms of law enforcement and processes of criminalisation, as well as how state practices at the border may themselves be considered criminally suspect.

1. BORDERS

The border itself has been the focus of wide-ranging concern for social theorists and there is a growing body of literature that examines borders not simply as lines on maps, but rather as spaces of political, cultural and security significance. Heyman et al. (2002: 62), for example, conceives of borders as ‘simultaneously structures and processes, things and relationships, histories and events’. Miller and Hashmi (2001) make a fundamental distinction between informal, social boundaries which are maintained by cultural and ethnic distinctions, and formal, territorial boundaries within which property and authority relations are exercised. They argue that modern states have attempted to dissolve this distinction by absorbing ‘nationality’—the pre-eminent social boundary—within the concept of the nation-state, a process which they now observe is breaking down. They examine the justification for borders from a range of political and moral perspectives, including international human rights law, classical and egalitarian liberalism, Islam and Christianity.

One of the most comprehensive reviews of the treatment of borders within contemporary social thought comes from Donnan and Wilson (1999). They review how new conceptions of the border are emerging within the disciplines of geography (increasingly conceiving of borders in terms of function rather than form or place); history (where they argue causal links between territory, identity and sovereignty are being called into question); political science (where statist views of borders are being displaced by accounts of multidimensional frontiers where states exercise only limited control); cultural and comparative studies (where borders are viewed primarily as signifiers of culture and identity); and sociology (assessed by Donnan and Wilson in 1999 as still treating borders as a peripheral theme). Notably, criminology is not identified in this review as a discipline which has produced any significant literature on the subject of borders.

Operating from an anthropological perspective, Donnan and Wilson conceptualise borders as ‘politicised boundaries’ which are ‘sites and symbols of power’ that may be reinforced or neglected by states depending on the circumstances. Far from merely lines on a map, borders are understood as institutions, processes and markers of identity, and subject to competing definitions by the state and borderland populations. This is exemplified in the work of Ortiz (2001), who argues that the contested borderland between Mexico and the United States is best defined in terms of its ambiguity. He notes that local concerns compete with, but are generally subsumed by, imperatives arising from the region’s status as a transit zone, leading to deeply asymmetrical experiences of borderland dwellers on either side.

Donnan and Wilson (1999: 15) propose that a border is constituted by three elements: a juridical borderline; the actions of state agents who operate in border areas but ‘who also often penetrate deeply into the territory of the state’; and associated frontiers which are ‘negotiated spaces which stretch across and away from state borders’. With borders no longer fixed and settled, the concept of frontierlands becomes more salient, denoting a space on and around the juridical border where power relations are uncertain and contested. These dimensions correspond to the different entities described by Nevins (cited in Pickering 2004) of the boundary (conceived as a strict line of separation); the border (a zone of gradual division and interaction); and the frontier (defined as a sparsely controlled zone of contact).

Writing in a slightly different context, geographer Howitt (2001: 234) proposes a transcendence of the limitations of both borders and frontiers, by drawing on the indeterminate and shifting concept of ‘edges’: ‘I want to shift Australians’ geographical imaginings away from the oppositional zoning of ‘frontiers’ and the categorical separateness of ‘borders’ to a liminal, multi-dimensional, real-world idea of edges as places with a more solid and changeable engagement with complexity’. Unlike the imagery of ‘sharp edges’ as used by Gready (2004) in his discussion of ‘violently policed borders’, Howitt’s conception of edges recognises the possibility of peaceful coexistence, while frontiers imply lawlessness and conquest, a space beyond the rule of law where power prevails.

Donnan and Wilson (1999) argue that the concept of borders as sites for the expression of state power (which is prime analytical terrain for criminologists) has been relatively unexplored by anthropologists who favour analyses in terms of cultural meaning and identity. The theme of borders as sites for the expression of state power has been taken up in a study by Parsley (2003). Writing from a critical legal studies perspective, Parsley conceptualises the border as a ‘narrative performance of nationalism’, representing the organised power of the nation expressed through the decisions of border officials, and to be understood both as a site of great force and great weakness.

Primarily, criminologists have understood the border as increasingly the focus of securitisation and crime control. The nation-state has depended upon the border as a marker of territory and of inclusion and exclusion. The changing nature of borders, the occupation of the border space and border crossing increasingly brings the very nature of the state, and the state system, into question. Such border anxiety, and the increasing consideration of border crossing as a 'crime', has captured some criminological imagination and prompted critical forays into discussions of sovereignty and the terrain of traditional international relations.

Sovereignty has powerfully marked the boundaries between inside and outside and the debates covered in this collection engage with the ways the border has been an important marker of sovereign expression (see particularly chapters by Pickering and Carrington). As Devetak (1995) has argued, industrialisation, militarisation and colonialism have informed the powerful sovereign marking of inside from outside. Territorial sovereignty has been established and accepted as the normalising and cohering force from which life flows (Soguk 1999), a pre-existing state that is bordered and discernible. International relations traditionally conceived of the border in such ways that enabled criminology to continually domesticate its concerns within national borders, crossing borders only to study international crime and law enforcement where borders continued to be self-referential and unchallenged. However, new bodies of international relations thought unshackle the criminology of this volume to argue, in a similar fashion to Reus-Smit (2001), that borders are never self-referential but are always justified in relation to specific formations of legitimate statehood and state action. Such work problematises the notion of territorial sovereignty as absolute (Hoffman 1998) particularly in relation to understandings of human rights which no longer simply require the state to mediate their recognition and application. The work of Sassen (1996) clearly articulates how, for example, women have become important legal actors as they cross borders and challenge traditional versions of sovereignty. In this sense, sovereignty and territorial borders can be read as potentially emancipatory spaces. Moreover, statist expressions of territorially sovereign borders have also produced malleable borders where politically convenient, and unlock powerful new expressions of jurisdictionally-free political power. For criminologists, the increasing interdependencies of a globalised world are simultaneously challenging the bearers and enforcers of social order (Loader and Sparks 2002) to which criminology has traditionally adhered.

Borders, Mobility and Technologies of Control moves criminology into this challenging terrain to ascertain the intersections of legitimacy, force, sovereignty and resistance at the border. The contingency of sovereign territorial borders requires a rethinking of criminology's historical understanding of its

core business being primarily inside the bordered nation-state. The contributions refute the marking of inside from outside that has historically occurred at the sovereign territorial border—both to document an alternate criminological account of the past and to consider possible futures—futures which will require states to come to terms with border crossing.

2. MOBILITY

According to the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), the mobility of people across borders in ‘unauthorised’ ways is increasing. The foreign-born population of the United States has been growing at an unprecedented rate since the 1990s, and up to one third of that growth has been attributed to unauthorised arrivals (Passel et al., cited in Cornelius 2005). In a statement released on 21 May 2004, the International Labour Organization (ILO) argued that ‘the number of people crossing borders in search of work and financial security will increase rapidly in the next decades as globalization fails to provide them with jobs and economic opportunities’ (United Nations 2004). Although the numbers of people arriving at the borders of affluent states via irregular means is still miniscule compared with the massive volume of commercial and recreational traffic, it is asylum applicants and other unauthorised arrivals who are defined as ‘immigration problems’, delaying the passage of ‘legitimate’ passengers at busy ports as they occupy the time of border officials, and threatening the economic and social fabric if allowed to remain within the community.

Unwanted border crossing is not, of course, a new phenomenon. In pre-industrial Britain (to draw on one of the best documented examples), the ‘masterless men’ and ‘valiant beggars’ who wandered from parish to parish in search of alms or work as agricultural labourers were greeted with similar suspicion to today’s ‘unauthorised arrivals’ and ‘bogus asylum seekers’. The perceived danger of their uncontrolled mobility was met with measures aimed to prevent free movement, justified ‘by the belief that poverty, vagrancy, the spread of the plague, idleness, immorality, irreligion and crime were linked together’ (Rawlings 2002: 45). Personal mobility of the newly ‘emancipated’ labouring classes did not fit with a system of government which rested on land, and so, according to Rawlings, was recast in terms of the ‘sin of idleness and the crime of vagrancy’. In uncertain and changing times, mobility had come to connote disorder, especially in relation to the very sections of the population dislocated by the economic upheavals.

Then, just as today, efforts were made to separate the ‘deserving’ from the ‘undeserving’ in order to reconcile harsh treatment with the Christian (now humanitarian) duty to meet their needs. Relief for the deserving

(immobile) poor was provided at parish level, while increasingly harsh punishments were scheduled for those who could not establish a link to any 'respectable' community, and were defined as vagrants. By Elizabethan times, Romany Gypsies, who were once reputedly welcomed at imperial courts as exotic and noble raconteurs, and whose nomadic way of life was valued for the services and entertainment it provided to rural villagers, faced execution or exile on the basis of both their ethnic identity and their itinerant habits (Acton 1974; Fraser 1992). This signified a racialisation of the measures to suppress mobility, and a shift towards defining the apparent enemy as originating from 'without' although residing 'within'.

At the same time, the British empire was redrawing borders and, by the forced deportation of many citizens to colonies around the globe, created and recreated states through the colonial project that similarly depended upon state-sponsored forced mobility based on social exclusion. In the modern British state, the cultural and administrative boundaries defined by parishes and counties which were once so vigorously defended hold diminished significance (although the early-modern attempts to control unwanted movements across local boundaries have resurfaced in contemporary public housing policies, which seek to eliminate applicants without a historic link to the local area). But what is different about the contemporary anxiety about border crossing is the global scope of mass population movements, the borders that are crossed, and the elimination of the state from the decision-making process. The borders being breached are now territorial boundaries, through which the modern state has come to define its identity and express its sovereign power. Viewed from a state-centred perspective, the 'problem' of uncontrolled border crossing signals the emergence of an army of 'global vagrants' who represent disorder on a global scale and embody the many insecurities arising from globalising trends in late modernity. In a world increasingly differentiated by access to mobility, Bauman describes two 'postmodern types': the tourists who 'pay for their freedom; the right to disregard native concerns and feelings, the right to spin their own meanings' (Bauman 1993: 241) and the vagabonds, for whom, more often than not, 'it will not be for him to decide when the stay will come to an end' (240).

Mobility is, therefore, once again both a serious and important topic for social analysis, and a basis for implementing exclusionary and criminalising policies. Urry is one commentator who has given mobility a central place in the development of his 'post-societal' sociology (Urry 2000a). His concern is to develop an analytical method which is applicable to an emergent 'global civil society', rather than provide an analysis or critique of the current plight of the globally mobile poor and insecure. Urry's forward-looking theorising imagines mobility as constitutive of a self-reproducing global order, and foresees the 'social as society' being transformed into the

‘social as mobility’ (186). On this view, contemporary social life is not merely fractured and transient, as described by many post-modern and late-modern theorists, it is fundamentally constituted by a range of mobilities of people, goods and information, including an unprecedented level of personal fluidity. On the most positive reading, this increasingly mobile world is tending towards some new equilibrium where mobility no longer signals instability, and where some form of mobile citizenship is possible. A special issue of the *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* (Conradson and Latham 2005), has advanced this analysis through the concept of ‘transnational urbanism’ which is intended to convey both the inescapable emplacement of day to day life, and the possibility of achieving order through mobility.

On the journey to this possible new world, the opportunities of global mobility are not opening up equally to all the occupants of the planet. Urry refers to, but does not elaborate, what he calls the ‘various kinds of disabling processes which limit or constrain the mobilities of many’ (Urry 2000b: 50), and acknowledges that any ‘full blown sociology of travel’ would have to tackle these issues of inequality of access. Yeoh (2005: 412), commenting on the special issue of the *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* referred to above, also challenges the tendency within the emerging field of transnational studies to assume that ‘traversing of transnational space is smooth, painless and almost instantaneous’. In the same volume, Rogers (2005: 404), identifies an important question not addressed by the contributors, namely, how and why the ‘transnational mobility of some is achieved at the cost of the relative immobility or entrapment of others’.

Empirical research into the motivations and constraints on border crossing by citizens from the ‘suspect populations’ of the world, such as a study by Carling (2002) on the gap between the desires and possibilities for foreign travel amongst Cape Verdeans, gives us concrete examples of the ‘involuntary immobility’ of those populations. Bauman provides a more general account in his theorising about the human consequences of globalisation, of the contrast between the ‘extraterritoriality of the new global elites and the forced territoriality of the rest’ (Bauman 2000: 221). In fact, Bauman (1998: 87) has argued that the capacity or incapacity to move has become the dominant new form of social stratification in a globalising world, and a powerful mediator of social inclusion and exclusion:

The present-day combination of annulment of entry visas and the reinforcement of immigration controls has profound symbolic significance. It could be taken as the metaphor for the new, emergent, stratification. It lays bare the fact that it is now the ‘access to global

mobility' which has been raised to the topmost rank among the stratifying factors.

Moreover, the same processes which are arguably producing an immobilised 'global underclass', continue to provide the imperative for them to cross borders in search of physical and economic security. In large part, of course, the immobilisation is a direct response to the unwanted mobility, in the face of security and employment needs which governments in host countries are unwilling or unable to address in relation to non-citizens. It is easier, of course, to focus on the mobility itself as the threat, than to come to terms with the underlying reasons for it. It is perhaps no coincidence that Romany asylum seekers, excluded from the contemporary exercise of nation-building in the ever-expanding 'European project' (Green and Grewcock 2002), and seemingly assigned a permanent status as itinerant and shiftless outsiders, continue to be singled out for particular vilification, as reflected, for example, in views expressed to one of the present authors by British immigration officers (Weber and Landman 2002). At the same time, Schuster's (2005) research with undocumented foreigners in Italy, and the analysis by Cornelius (2005) of unauthorised border crossing at the United States–Mexico border, reveal a variety of migration patterns, including what Schuster describes as 'shuttle migration', where stays in the host country are interspersed (border conditions permitting) with frequent returns to the country of origin. This flies in the face of official presumptions about the intentions of unauthorised entrants to stay permanently and 'milch' the host state.

In the face of inescapable changes associated with globalisation, affluent states and their inhabitants can either embrace a more mobile and inclusive world; seek to minimise and manage population movements through structural reform to create 'decent work' where people live, as argued by the ILO, or through conflict resolution and 'burden sharing', as proposed by the UNHCR; or attempt to pre-empt and expel unwanted arrivals. Juss (2004) has made the case that freedom of movement between territories is a fundamental human right, increasingly central to the realisation of other human aspirations, and could be incorporated into positive international law through an incremental process concentrating initially on employment-related mobility. Although engaged through international mechanisms in some of the migration management activities mentioned above, governments in the affluent world have overwhelmingly opted for restrictive measures, mobilising all the technologies of sovereignty at their disposal to defend their borders. As Bauman (2000: 214) argues: 'In the ever more insecure and uncertain world the withdrawal into the safe haven of territoriality is an intense temptation'.

3. TECHNOLOGIES OF CONTROL

In fact, state responses to uncontrolled mobility continue to become more sophisticated and far reaching, employing highly technical, increasingly punitive and innovative methods of border control. The contributions in this volume seek to analyse these border technologies from a range of perspectives (see chapters by Carpenter, Carrington, Green, Hills and Pickering), and the chapter by Weber describes how the border *itself* has been manipulated as a technique of border control. Wonders points out the selectivity of these border technologies which are aimed at facilitating the travel of global elites while screening out unwanted arrivals and the chapters by Danner and Wilson stress their potential ubiquity when applied internally to citizen and non-citizen alike. Taken together, these measures produce an emerging class of the ‘mobility poor’ who seem destined, like the ‘masterless men’ and ‘valiant beggars’ of previous centuries, to shoulder the generalised anxieties of insecure and turbulent times. This network of selective controls designed to protect the secure and developed world from the incursions of the poor and insecure has been graphically described by Richmond (1994) as ‘global apartheid’.

The techniques adopted to effect this separation align with other developments in the regulatory-yet-punitive state, where the means of social control are becoming increasingly automated and asocial (Braithwaite 2000), and operate through a variety of ‘switch point(s) to be passed in order to access the benefits of liberty’ (Rose 2000: 326). Wilson’s chapter in this collection highlights the implications of the application of biometrics as the quintessentially asocial border technology. Furthermore, these information-based switch points increasingly apply not only at the physical border but reach both inwards and outwards from it. Health and welfare workers, teachers, employers and the general public are increasingly recruited in a web of surveillance aimed at identifying those who do not belong, and stand to be excluded not only from the provision of services but also from the physical territory (see chapters by Danner and Weber). And the actuarial logic of risk management, which pervades the governance of developed states under globalisation, has also pushed border controls outwards, both legally and physically, through visa regimes, carrier sanctions, overseas liaison officers, transnational disruption operations and information exchange networks, all aimed at preventing unwanted arrivals. These extra-territorial expressions of sovereign power (discussed most explicitly in the chapters by Carrington, Green and Weber) clearly rely on the doctrine of pre-emption which has made an emphatic appearance elsewhere on the global stage. The chapter by Hills highlights the complex, and often conflicting, demands being made in the name of border security.

As the concept of physical borders—the ultimate switch point governing movements between nation-states—is being reinterpreted, fragmented and manipulated, governments have also sought to reinforce the *symbolic* and *discursive* importance of borders as impenetrable barriers and have elevated border protection as the ultimate political objective (see chapter by Pickering). The political rhetoric about ‘bogus asylum seekers’ and ‘illegal immigrants’ which has accompanied coercive measures such as indefinite detention and forced deportations, has effectively redefined the act of border crossing as a ‘crime of arrival’ (Webber 1996). It has been widely observed that these policies have forced would-be border crossers into more irregular and dangerous modes of travel (see chapters by Carpenter and Green). This, in turn, has only heightened suspicions about their identity and intentions, thereby fuelling a cycle of ‘deviancy amplification’ (Weber and Bowling 2004) and a relentless procession of deaths at the literal and virtual border (Fekete 2003). It is notable that, while increasingly automated and information-based technologies are being employed at concentrated border points, such as busy commercial ports—where efficiency considerations often conflict with security demands in terms of passenger processing—less governable frontierlands, where the border dynamic is overwhelmingly one of the global south seeking access to the global north, have been subject to heavy militarisation and surveillance.

As a result of these attempts to make borders impenetrable, unauthorised border crossers have asphyxiated in lorries, been blown-up in minefields between Greece and Turkey, been crushed to death in the undercarriages of trains and frozen in the wheel compartments of planes. They have leapt to their death from balconies trying to elude immigration authorities, and their bodies are now washed ashore with casual regularity on Mediterranean beaches. They have perished in the Arizona desert, risking the most dangerous of crossings to avoid armed border patrols and vigilante groups, taken their own lives in detention centres, and have died at the hands of border guards, police, people smugglers, private security guards, immigration authorities and violent racists. Cornelius (2005) estimates that the fortified border between the United States and Mexico has been ten times deadlier over the last nine years for those attempting to enter the United States without permission, than was the Berlin wall to those attempting to leave East Germany during the entire 28 years of its existence. Not only this, but the United States border strategy has manifestly failed in its objective to curb unauthorised border crossing, and has, according to Cornelius (2005: 782), ‘been more effective in bottling up unauthorised migrants inside the US than in deterring them from coming in the first place’.

The central normative question associated with border control is: ‘What actions are states entitled to take—and where can they do this—in defence of

their borders? For those who advocate a truly borderless world in the name of global justice, the answer is clear: no-one's mobility should be curtailed by state intervention, except, arguably, for the genuine and exceptional purpose of averting real and imminent harm (see, for example, Hayter 2000). Within the criminological literature, Grewcock (2003) has recently argued a radical open borders position. For those who strive to find a balance between freedom of movement and social stability within a transitional and inherently unstable global environment, the answer will be more elusive. Juss (2004) argues that legislation in favour of free movement rights is actually required in order to achieve global stability, but resiles from advocating a radical open borders agenda, in favour of an incremental achievement of positive rights within the existing system of international law. Sparrow (2003) provides a cogent discussion of the practical and philosophical difficulties from a position which is supportive of, but ultimately rejects, an open borders philosophy in favour of efforts to redress the gross inequalities in life opportunities that fuel mass population movements. Suffice to say that most contributors in this volume adopt a critical view of the coercive measures being adopted at present by states in the name of border protection, characterise them as backward-looking and based on a limited notion of the possibilities of state action, and seek to problematise the perception of 'harm' that informs governments' calculations of this balance. Indeed, the concept of balance seems ripe for serious criminological critique.

Clearly, there is also an economic dimension underpinning the legal, moral and political struggle over migration controls. The inability of states to maintain the huge costs of border protection (as detailed in the chapters by Danner and Wonders) could conceivably play a part in bringing about change. Juss (2004), for example, identifies the enormous costs of migration control as one argument for the abandonment of attempts to constrain mobility, advocating instead a 'creative accommodation' of new patterns of movement. Earlier in this discussion we drew attention to similarities between the criminalisation of the mobile poor of pre-industrial Britain and the present day reaction to unauthorised border crossing. According to Rawlings (2002), the plight of the mobile poor did not change much until they were recognised as a useful economic resource following Industrialisation. Perhaps the full resolution of the contemporary 'problem' of global mobility awaits the emergence of a truly global civil society, combining the 'fluid' society alluded to by Urry (2000b), which is constituted by individual mobility and transient membership, and the 'globalisation of labour' foreseen by Sassen (1996). In fact, it could be argued (for example, see Juss 2004), that the relaxation of migration restrictions is a necessary condition for the production of a more stable world order.

This is not to suggest that a society which has accommodated mobility is necessarily a just one, and opportunities for movement, and the degree of choice over individual mobility are likely to continue to be unevenly distributed. Moreover, opportunities for criminal activity and other security threats will no doubt continue to arise around residual borders, and challenge any utopian vision, although relaxation of border controls of itself would virtually eliminate one category of cross-border 'crime' by removing the market for 'people smuggling'. In the meantime, while nation-states persist in attempting to impose order on the emergent disorder using the traditional state-based methods that are available to them, there remains a considerable task of documenting and critiquing the changing meaning of territorial borders and contemporary state responses to border crossing.

4. THE COLLECTION

This collection is concerned with the plurality and manipulation of borders in time and space, the constitution and communication of territorially sovereign borders, the gendered, racialised and classed dimensions of borders, the application of 'high-tech' sorting and surveillance techniques at and beyond borders, the defence of borders by a range of state actors, the violent actions and inactions of border officials as potent forms of state crime, and the historically cyclical nature of border exclusion.

Borders, Mobility and Technologies of Control brings together a range of accounts of the border from local expressions with international ramifications and international expressions with decidedly local consequences. The authors take a variety of approaches to conceptually locating and arguing the border, however the following characteristics, taken as a whole, reflect a commonality in approach which sets this collection apart from other attempts at understanding the border.

First, the contributors do not understand the border as a fixed entity, but rather as a space created and recreated by states and other actors in a way that is fundamentally gendered, raced and classed. Secondly, the border is seen to have both repressive and emancipatory potential, although it is clear that in the current global moment repression has the upper hand. Thirdly, the border is identified as a key focus for a critical criminology concerned with the theoretical and pragmatic expression of state power and alternative forms of power in late-modern societies under conditions of globalisation. Fourthly, the border is viewed as a window to examine key issues between the global north and global south indicative of changing world orders and criminological spaces no longer concerned solely with the preoccupations of the global elite.

This collection begins by tracing the changing locations of migration control. In Chapter 2, 'The Shifting Frontiers of Migration Control', Leanne Weber argues that, even in the post-September 11 world, the pass-key to many of the world's borders is still freely available to those possessing the requisite financial and social capital. For the remainder, an increasingly complex and interconnected system of transnational controls is aimed at ensuring immobility and exclusion, by repelling people at borders, preventing their initial departure or, when all else fails, punishing their arrival. Her chapter examines some recent innovations in border policing strategies which indicate a dynamic and shifting balance between pre-entry, border and in-country controls, drawing primarily on British and Australian examples. She argues that governments have introduced legal reforms and enforcement practices which effectively shift immigration controls in both time and space. This creates malleable and moveable borders which can be defined and redefined—functionally, geographically and legally—in line with differing policy objectives.

In Chapter 3, 'Border Narratives: From Talking Security to Performing Borderlands', Sharon Pickering argues that borders are performed to multiple audiences and produce not only a range of words, languages and codes to communicate their location and function, but also generate the border itself. Increasingly, such border talk has involved the meshing of migration issues and the criminal justice apparatus as well as agents broadly denoted under the banner 'national security'. In this chapter, Pickering documents some of the many border languages used to convince multiple audiences as to the nature and function of borders (including the mechanisms used to erect and patrol borders) and the concomitant response of those audiences. She traces the discourses that the violent boundary inscription practices of statecraft depend upon to establish their legitimacy and the requisite reformulation of notions of territoriality and criminality.

In Chapter 4, 'Global Flows, Semi-Permeable Borders and New Channels of Inequality', Nancy Wonders notes that two of the most significant border flows in the contemporary period are migration and tourism. Importantly, these two global trends both involve the movement of people across borders, whether in search of jobs and security or leisure and luxury. Utilising the theoretical framework of 'border performativity', Wonders argues that nation-states today are engaging in border performances that ensure the semi-permeability of borders under globalisation. She analyses two technologies of control that help to ensure that borders facilitate the entry of some while limiting the entry of others: first, the social construction of 'illegals' and the criminalisation of vulnerable populations and, secondly, the 'securitisation of migration' and the creation of a border control industry that gives organisational architecture and durability to state performances of

semi-permeable borders. By comparing the way that nations construct and enforce borders differently for different border crossers, much is revealed about the new channels of inequality that are being carved under globalisation. Given the many risks and benefits of both migrant workers and tourists to nation-states participating in the global economy, Wonders argues for more flexible and fairer borders for both kinds of travellers.

In Chapter 5, 'Biometrics, Borders and the Ideal Suspect', Dean Wilson examines the rise of biometrics in the drawing and enforcement of borders. Focusing on technology, social sorting and the surveillance of exclusion, Wilson traces the expansion of biometric technologies in the monitoring of populations following September 11 and the subsequent 'war on terror'. He finds that, since 2001, there has been a significantly expanded deployment of biometric identification technologies that seek to fix individual identities through the use of physical identifiers such as iris patterns and fingerprints. This is most evident at the borders between nation-states, where biometric passports and registration systems such as INSPASS in the United States are instrumental in processes of 'social sorting'. The concept of 'social sorting' refers to the coterminous construction of 'low risk' travellers, whose movements are characterised by unimpeded access and privileged citizenship, and 'high risk' travellers—those compelled to travel without documentation or with 'low-tech' documentation from the nation-states of the global south. Moreover, biometric technologies are pivotal to emerging cultures of securitisation that are enacted both internally and externally to the nation-state. Processes of exclusion and inclusion performed at ports of entry are thus analogous to state efforts to fix identities internally, most notably through the expanding number of states either establishing or considering national identification cards embedded with personal identifiers. Wilson concludes by arguing that the efficacy of such technologies is of less importance than their powerful signifying function in suggesting the continued capacity of the nation-state to monitor and demarcate populations in the global era.

In Chapter 6, 'Borders, Belonging and Homeland (In)Security', Mona Danner argues that the September 11 attacks in the United States emphasised some of the contradictory aspects of globalisation and borders. Following September 2001, the United States engaged in a war on terror that involved significantly tightening immigration procedures and border controls, and loosening legal standards related to surveillance and detention. Danner argues that the war on terror's emphasis on 'homeland security' actually camouflages the extensive growth in the last four decades of the state control orientation and apparatus found in the criminal justice system and the military. The consequences of control-oriented state expansion include staggering costs, decreased civil rights, and increased fear and sense of