
Introduction

Emma Mc Cluskey

Department of War Studies,
King's College London,
Strand, London WC2R-2LS, UK
Email: emma.mc_cluskey@kcl.ac.uk

The relationship between freedom of movement and security within scholarly research has, for some time, moved away from the idea of definitions based around the border as territory and instead moved towards conceptualisations which emphasise their technical and diffuse dimensions. The most important research in this regard has taken place around a broad practice-based approach to border security (Côté-Boucher et al., 2014; Squire, 2011) which draws particular attention the digitisation and datafication of borders, highlighting the shift from integrated border management to integrated data management and its social and human effects (Amoore, 2006; Follis, 2017; Bigo, 2010; Jeandesboz, 2016; Andersson, 2014).

The European Union (EU) has been at the forefront of these discussions as the most advanced developments concerning technological and digital moves to border security and the management of freedom of movement have taken place within 'Schengenland'; a phenomenon which built-up over the past 30 or so years, but which can no means be read as monolithic or some sort of grand strategy by political elites or security professionals (Bigo, 2014; Jones, 2017). The EU also cannot be viewed as exceptional in this regard however, with the transatlantic space, the USA, Canada and Australia also adopting similar practices and surveillance technologies aimed at managing the circulation of people (see Salter, 2010; Côté-Boucher, 2002; Little and Vaughan-Williams, 2017).

The framing of freedom of movement, technology and surveillance of people on the move-within a specific configuration in the field of EU internal security, is thus but one case study of such a phenomenon. However, this case is a particularly telling one, as a result of its highly institutionalised framework. The lifting of Europe's internal borders agreed in the 1985 Schengen Agreement came with specific compensatory or 'offsetting' measures. In a nutshell, the former was made conditional on the latter (Druke, 1993). Long considered a success story, Schengen has now been seen in terms of 'crisis'; a very different articulation referring to the same set of practices (Jeandesboz and Pallister-Wilkins, 2016). Instead of thinking in these binary terms, the approach put forward by this special issue thinks instead in terms of a series of *paradoxes*, traced back to the initial ambiguities within the birth of Schengen. Disagreements about the status of a 'federal Europe', Schengen could be seen as a way to create the conditions under which centralisation and federalisation was not necessary (Andersson, 2014; Druke, 1993). With this, Schengen also saw the introduction of technology as a way to mediate this ambiguity; framing the problem of the (in)security of freedom of movement as though it were an issue of internal vs. external, between citizens and foreigners (later called 'third country nationals'). The aim of this special issue is to denaturalise and destabilise these neat and tidy narratives of Schengen history. We shed light on the actors, practices and

institutions involved in this history and the transformations which took place; particularly the role of digital technology professionals and their recruitment into the EU security apparatus. We examine how surveillance technologies were introduced through the terminology of ‘smart borders’ and the practical forms of violence that this has generated.

This special issue thus puts forward the conceptual apparatus of ‘freedom-technology-surveillance paradoxes’ as a new and original way to critically engage with these dynamics; paradoxes which we have traced back to the very birth of the concept of internal EU security cooperation with the Schengen Agreement of 1985 when the ‘insecurity’ of freedom of movement was first framed as needing to be ‘balanced’ by greater surveillance of people on the move (Oelgemöller, Ansems de Vries and Groenendijk). Paradox captures perfectly this seemingly contradictory disjuncture and entanglement. Just another inconsistency in what Handy (1994, p.10) has called *The Age of Paradox*:

“[S]o many things, just now, seem to contain their own contradictions, so many good intentions have unintended consequences.....Paradox has almost become a cliché of our times. The word crops up again and again as people look for a way to describe the dilemmas facing governments, businesses and increasingly, individuals. Sometimes it seems like the more we know, the more confused we get; the more we increase our technical capacity, the more powerless we become.”

This paradox of Schengen has multiplied, been extended and amplified with the extension of the definition of ‘security’ by European agencies to increasingly define their function in terms of ‘protecting societies’ (see EU, 2003; ESRIF, 2009) and the increasing use of technology to frame relations between ‘freedom’ and ‘security’. Paradoxes can now be seen to manifest themselves in a multiplicity of ways, across different scales and social universes. These transformations of the provision of security in the so-called area of justice, freedom and security of the EU are now resulting in moves towards technologies of anticipation, prevention and risk management deployed by the professional networks and institutions involved in ‘securing’ European societies (see European Commission, 2018).

At stake in contemporary times, we thus have these relations between freedom, security and fear of global threats evolving into a vision of ‘solutions’ to insecurity based on technological tools and a different economy of surveillance, restructuring the idea of criminal justice and presumption of innocence towards a preventive, pro-active, predictive episteme of ‘security’ (Bourne et al., 2015; Neal, 2009; Guild, 2017).

What is absolutely central to examine are the forms of symbolic violence which have been, and continue to be carried out in the name of managing freedom of movement through surveillance technologies. We cannot think of this phenomenon in terms of single case studies of particular events, snapshots within time, specific technologies or focusing on individual institutions or security actors. Necessary is to analyse instead is the much broader picture of how ‘technology’, increasingly defined in terms of surveillance, has increasingly become seen as a go-to ‘ultra-solution’ (Watzlawick, 1988) to the supposed insecurity of freedom of movement. How have these logics been constituted politically? Which questions and issues have been erased from the conversation with these moves towards increasing digitisation? How can we render visible again the political struggles between EU members, institutions and actors, and their transatlantic partners (all of whom having very different approaches to migration) which were settled and expunged by a seemingly ‘neutral’ technological solution?

What we call these *paradoxes* within Schengen-land are therefore constituted by the relations between freedom of movement of persons and EU citizenship rights, technologisation of border controls and digitisation of documents enacting forms of preventive policing at distance, and the development of a political imaginary of suspicion. Often framed as efficient and even ‘humane’ (Pallister-Wilkins, 2015; Gabrielsen Jumbert, 2013), this imaginary of suspicion serves to multiply the ‘reasons’ for vertical and horizontal forms of surveillance. In this vein, suspicion becomes an organising principle of managing freedom of circulation (cf. Huysmans, 2014).

Schengen, once a symbol of free movement of people inside the area, including the third country national living there, can be argued to have been reversed in contemporary times into the symbol of tough border controls, de-humanising individuals, and rejecting people in need of help (Garelli and Tazzioli, 2018; Hess and Kasperek, 2017). It is seen, along with the Dublin agreements on asylum, as a set of disciplinary techniques that do not comply with human rights, presumption of innocence and privacy (see EDPS, 2018; Carrera et al., 2018). (Il)liberal practices transform the governmentality of ‘border management’ and encourage the generalisation of large-scale intrusive forms of surveillance affecting persons, money and information (De Goede et al., 2014).

This socio-technical complex has linked many heterogeneous databases within the EU; the Schengen information system, visa information system, European dactyloscopy and the European criminal records information system (SIS-VIS-Eurodac-ECRIS). It has the ambition to expand in order to easier facilitate the monitoring of different international travellers coming in and out the ‘transatlantic’ space, encompassing the new entry-exit system, the European travel information and authorisation system and the EU-US and EU-Canada passenger name records (EES-ETIAS-EU-US PNR-EU-Canada PNR).

This special issue examines the central mechanisms at work in these developments and how embedded the logics of technology, surveillance and freedom are in these ambitions. How has the relationship between these concepts evolved in the last 30 years from the first database of SIS to contemporary times? What kind of regime of justifications has been proposed? And what are the effects of this multiplicity of practices on the ‘targets’ of these technologies?

Clearly, some actors continue to value ‘smart borders’, privileged and speedy access to flights and customs, and consider that they enact their freedom (see European Commission, 2016). Others however are questioning the logic at work during all these years, pointing out function creep, erosion of privacy, and even more centrally a transformation of how to assess security and how to frame it, if security is connected with technological ‘progress’ (Bigo et al., 2016; Brouwer, 2016).

We argue within this special issue that it is necessary to avoid a presentist approach in analysing these phenomena or to view the European as some kind of global exception. Indeed, this logic of framing freedom in relation to surveillance technologies is a paradox which is manifesting globally, through transversal fields of power (Martin-Mazé; Bigo) and the circulation of specific ‘civil’ technologies (Larsson).

We aim, through an international political sociological approach, to re-transcribe these paradoxes into a transversal framing, looking instead at how they came to be, how they multiply, travel, are translated and become ‘stuck’. This re-transcription also looks to what paradoxes *do*; their political and social effects and the way in which they re-configure human values. Necessary for this analysis is thus a collective research;

emerging through ‘the transdisciplinary work of different researchers who have studied in detail specific arrangements between intermingled fields of power of different scales’ (Bigo, 2016).

This special issue thus has a clear line of argumentation running through the papers, making it much more than a general forum where authors who write on similar topics are loosely connected. We take the idea of freedom, technology and surveillance paradoxes and use it to weave together a set of studies which illuminate different facets of these entanglements.

Thinking in these terms enables us to examine how these disjunctures and contradictions come to the fore in different ways. We are able to see how paradoxes circulate and become entangled with other, related, sets of practices. Questions of neutrality and efficiency, suspicion and reliability – become central, not only within original Schengen negotiations (Oelgemöller, Ansems de Vries and Groenendijk), but also within the paradoxes that pop up in the practices of Swedish arms companies (Larsson), EU security research power elites (Martin-Mazé), European Commission counter-terrorism proposals (Bigo; Bigo, Ewert and Mendos Kuşkonmaz) and in the everyday practices of migrants at Europe’s borders (McCluskey).

Acknowledgements

This editorial was written with the input of Didier Bigo. This special issue is based on research undertaken for the project source: Societal Security Network, which received funding from the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no 313288.

References

- Amoore, L. (2006) ‘Biometric borders: governing mobilities in the war on terror’, *Political Geography*, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp.336–351.
- Andersson, R. (2014) *Illegality, Inc.: Clandestine Migration and the Business of Bordering Europe*, Univ. of California Press, Berkeley.
- Bigo, D. (2010) ‘Freedom and speed in enlarged borderzones’, in *The Contested Politics of Mobility*, pp.51–70, Routledge, London and New York.
- Bigo, D. (2014) ‘The (in)securitization practices of the three universes of EU border control: military/navy – border guards/police – database analysts’, *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 45, No. 3, pp.209–225.
- Bigo, D. (2016) ‘International political sociology: internal security as transnational power fields’, in Bossong, R. and Rhinard, M. (Eds.): *Theorizing Internal Security Cooperation in the European Union*, OUP, Oxford.
- Bigo, D., Guild, E. and Walker, R.B.J. (2016) ‘The changing landscape of European liberty and security’, in *Europe’s 21st Century Challenge*, pp.23–50, Routledge, London and New York.
- Bourne, M., Johnson, H. and Lisle, D. (2015) ‘Laboratizing the border: the production, translation and anticipation of security technologies’, *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 46, No. 4, pp.307–325.
- Brouwer, E. (2016) ‘Data surveillance and border control in the EU: balancing efficiency and legal protection’, in *Security Versus Freedom?*, pp.151–168, Routledge, London and New York.

- Carrera, S., Stefan, M., Luk, N.C. and Vosyliute, L. (2018) 'The future of the Schengen area: latest developments and challenges in the Schengen Governance Framework since 2016', *European Parliament, Policy Department for Citizens' Rights and Constitutional Affairs, Study For the LIBE Committee*, PE 604.943 EN, 2018, [Policy Department for Citizens' Rights and Constitutional Affairs] [online] [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2018/604943/IPOL_STU\(2018\)604943_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2018/604943/IPOL_STU(2018)604943_EN.pdf) (accessed 7 February 2019).
- Côté-Boucher, K. (2002) 'The diffuse border: intelligence-sharing, control and confinement along Canada's smart border', *Surveillance & Society*, Vol. 5, No. 2, <https://doi.org/10.24908/ss.v5i2.3432>.
- Côté-Boucher, K., Infantino, F. and Salter, M.B. (2014) 'Border security as practice: an agenda for research', *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 45, No. 3, pp.195–208.
- de Goede, M., Simon, S. and Hoijsink, M. (2014) 'Performing preemption', *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 45, No. 5, pp.411–422.
- Druke, L. (1993) 'Refugees protection in the post Cold War Europe: asylum in the Schengen and EC harmonization process', *Les Accords de Schengen. Abolition des Frontières intérieures*, European Institute of Public Administration, Maastricht Google Scholar.
- European Commission (2016) *Stronger and Smarter Information Systems for Borders and Security*, Communication to the Council and the European Parliament COM(2015) 10 final, Brussels.
- European Commission (2018) 'Secure societies – protecting freedom and security of Europe and its citizens', *Horizon 2020* [online] <http://programmes/horizon2020/en/h2020-section/secure-societies-%E2%80%93-protecting-freedom-and-security-europe-and-its-citizens> (accessed 2 February 2019).
- European Data Protection Supervisor (EDPS) (2018) *Opinion 4/2018 on the Proposals for Two Regulations Establishing a Framework for Interoperability Between EU Large-scale Informations* [online] https://edps.europa.eu/sites/edp/files/publication/2018-04-16_interoperability_opinion_en.pdf (accessed 17 August 2018).
- European Security Research and Innovation Forum (ESRIF) (2009) *ESRIF Final Report*, Brussels.
- European Union (EU) (2003) *A Secure Europe in a Better World – European Security Strategy*, European Union, Brussels.
- Follis, K.S. (2017) 'Vision and transterritory: the borders of Europe', *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, Vol. 42, No. 6, pp.1003–1030.
- Gabrielsen Jumbert, M. (2013) 'Controlling the Mediterranean space through surveillance. The politics and discourse of surveillance as an all-encompassing solution to EU maritime border management issues', *Espace Populations Sociétés (Space Populations Societies)*, Vol. 2012, No. 3, pp.35–48.
- Garelli, G. and Tazzioli, M. (2018) 'The humanitarian war against migrant smugglers at sea', *Antipode*, Vol. 50, No. 3, pp.685–703.
- Guild, E. (2017) *Controlling Frontiers: Free Movement into and within Europe*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Handy, C.B. (1995) *The Age of Paradox*, Harvard Business Press, Boston.
- Hess, S. and Kasperek, B. (2017) 'Under control? Or border (as) conflict: reflections on the European border regime', *Social Inclusion*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp.58–68.
- Huysmans, J. (2014) *Security Unbound: Enacting Democratic Limits*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Jeandesboz, J. (2016) 'Smartening border security in the European Union: an associational inquiry', *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 47, No. 4, pp.292–309.
- Jeandesboz, J. and Pallister-Wilkins, P. (2016) 'Crisis, routine, consolidation: the politics of the Mediterranean migration crisis', *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp.316–320.
- Jones, C. (2017) *Market Forces: The Development of the EU Security-Industrial Complex*, Vol. 25, TNI and Statewatch.

- Little, A. and Vaughan-Williams, N. (2017) 'Stopping boats, saving lives, securing subjects: humanitarian borders in Europe and Australia', *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp.533–556.
- Neal, A.W. (2009) 'Securitization and risk at the EU border: the origins of Frontex', *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 47, No. 2, pp.333–356.
- Pallister-Wilkins, P. (2015) 'The humanitarian politics of European border policing: Frontex and border police in Evros', *International Political Sociology*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp.53–69.
- Salter, M.B. (2010) 'The North Atlantic field of aviation security', in *Mapping Transatlantic Security Relations*, pp.74–86, Routledge, London and New York.
- Squire, V. (2011) *The Contested Politics of Mobility: Mobilizing Politics*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Watzlawick, P. (1988) *Ultra-solutions: How to Fail Most Successfully*, WW Norton & Co., London.