**STS-MIGTEC & Processing Citizenship Workshop**
**21-22 March 2023**

**Department of Philosophy and Communication Studies,**
**University of Bologna & Online**

## Program

(Times in CET)

Tuesday, 21st of March 2023

9:30-9:50

Welcome by Processing Citizenship & STS-MIGTEC (Room A)

10:00-12:00

| Panel 3.1 (Room A) | Open Panel 1 (Room B) |
|---|---|
| **Law, Technology and Border Control** <br><br> **Convenors: Francisco Pereira Coutinho, Emellin de Oliveira** (*NOVA School of Law, Portugal*) | **Viapolitics, knowledge production, and migratory appropriations** <br><br> Moderators: **Nina Amelung** (*University of Lisbon, Portugal*), **Silvan Pollozek** *(European University Viadrina, Germany*) |
| **Samuel Singler** (*University of Oxford, UK*) Post-imperial influence and the right to privacy: The IOM's Migration Information and Data Analysis System (MIDAS) in Nigeria | **Lorenzo Olivieri** (*University of Bologna, Italy*) Temporalities of resistance: a time-based perspective on data infrastructures for migration management and reaction to them |
| **Mirko Forti** (*Tuscia University, Italy*) Addressing algorithmic errors in data-driven border control procedures | **Mirjam Wajsberg** (*Radboud University, Netherlands*) The unspectacular border? Intra-Schengen border controls and mobility inequality in the Danish-German borderlands |
| | **Romm Lewcowicz** (*Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Germany*) Rethinking Biometric Subversion: How Migrant Bodily Reactions to Biometric Surveillances Unsettle the Resistance-compliance Paradigm |
| | **Vasilis Argyriou & Aristotle Tympas** (*National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece*) Borders, Big Data, No Data: Recent Datafication Odysseys in Migration through the Aegean |

12:00-13:30

Lunch

13:30-15:30

| Panel 3.2 (Room A)<br><br>**Law, Technology and Border Control**<br><br>**Convenors: Francisco Pereira Coutinho, Emellin de Oliveira** (*NOVA School of Law, Portugal*) | Panel 4.1 (Room B)<br><br>**Situating long-term implications of registering and identifying practices**<br><br>**Convenors: Chiara Loschi, Annalisa Pelizza, Paul Trauttmansdorff** (*University of Bologna, Italy*) |
|---|---|
| **Sara Bellezza** (*Free University Berlin, Germany*)<br>Migrant Protection Protocols in the U.S.-Mexican Borderlands: The (non) digital bordering technologies of a policy | **Arantxa Ortiz** (*Brandeis University, USA and Leiden University, Netherlands*)<br>Partial Recognition: Residence Permits, Municipal IDs, and Bureaucratic Inscription |
| **Frendehl Sipaco Warner** (*University of Canterbury, New Zealand*)<br>Revolution in Military Affairs, NATO and the surveillance of the EU's maritime borders in the Mediterranean: Digital technology at the centre of "war" against hybrid threats and NATO's transformational capacity to respond to contemporary security and strategic needs | **Enrico Gargiulo** (*University of Bologna, Italy*)<br>Registration as a battlefield: a genealogy of the Italian population registers |
| **Priscila Azevedo** (*NOVA School of Law, Portugal*)<br>EU digital border control and fundamental rights of third country nationals | **Daniela Trucco** (*French Collaborative Institute on Migrations-ICM and the University of Côte d'Azur, France*)<br>Making the Italians through screen-level bureaucracy? Re-shaping European citizenry through the digitalized implementation of a national citizenship law |
| | **Chiara Loschi, Annalisa Pelizza** (*University of Bologna, Italy*)<br>"Do not give street-level officers the possibility to make mistakes": Data infrastructures for migration management as revealing epistemological tensions |

15:30-16:00

Coffee Break

16:00-18:00

| Panel 2.1 (Room A) | Panel 4.2 (Room B) |
|---|---|

| Mediatizing claim making, publics, and citizenship. On ambivalent technologies for migrants on the move<br><br>**Convenors: Silvan Pollozek** (*European University Viadrina, Germany*), **Maria Ullrich** (*University of Bonn, Germany*), **Olga Usachova** (*University of Padova, Italy*) | Situating long-term implications of registering and identifying practices<br><br>**Convenors: Chiara Loschi, Annalisa Pelizza, Paul Trauttmansdorff** (*University of Bologna, Italy*) |
|---|---|
| **Koen Leurs, Kinan Alajak, Rianne Dekker** (*Utrecht University, Netherlands*)<br>Automating asylum: reconstructing the Athene pilot program | **Anna Finiguerra** (*Queen Mary University of London, UK*)<br>Forensic Identification as Governance of Migratory Movement: Reifying the Gaze of the State in the Forensic Laboratory |
| **Ivan Josipovic (***University of Vienna, Austria***)**<br>Inscribing border control into smartphones: the legitimatory language and infrastructure of dataveillance in Austrian, German and Swiss refugee governance | **Mert Cangönül** (*Koç University, Turkey*)<br>Visa Applicants as Performers of Border Surveillance |
| **Michelle Pfeifer** (*Dresden University of Technology, Germany*)<br>Border Forensics: Documentation of Border Violence along the Balkan Route | **Nina Dewi Toft Djanegara** (*Stanford University, USA*)<br>Face the Nation |
| | **Wouter Van Rossem** (*University of Twente, Netherlands, University of Bologna, Italy*)<br>The biography of an identification software system |

---

19:00 Evening Event

---

**Workshop Aperitivo** at "NOI" - Mercato delle erbe, Via San Gervasio 3

Wednesday, 22nd of March 2023

---

09:45-10:45

---

Roundtable session with Q&A: "Establishing an academic career: grant applications, international networks, publication strategies" (Room A)

with **Annalisa Pelizza**, (*University of Bologna, Italy*), **Aristotle Tympas**, *(National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece)*, **Koen Leurs** *(Utrecht University, Netherlands), moderated by* **Olga Usachova**  *(University of Padova, Italy) and* **Nina Amelung** *(University of Lisbon, Portugal)*

---

10:45-11:15

---

Coffee Break

11:15-13:15

| Panel 2.2 (Room A) | Open Panel 2 (Room B) |
|---|---|
| **Mediatizing claim making, publics, and citizenship. On ambivalent technologies for migrants on the move**<br><br>**Convenors: Silvan Pollozek** (*European University Viadrina, Germany*), **Maria Ullrich** (*University of Bonn, Germany*), **Olga Usachova** (*University of Padova, Italy*) | **Data assemblages, algorithmic governance, and migrant re-presentations**<br><br>Moderators: **Ivan Josipovic** (*University of Vienna, Austria*), **Paul Trauttmansdorff** (*University of Bologna, Italy*) |
| **Georgios Glouftsios** (*University of Trento, Italy*)<br>Making Pushbacks Public: Secrecy, Material Witnesses and Devices of Dis/appearance. | **Margarita Boenig-Liptsin** (*ETH Zürich, Switzerland*)<br>Identifying the Human: Representations of migrants in international migration data projects |
| **Nina Amelung** (*University of Lisbon, Portugal*)<br>Unsettling Material Publics of Biometric Databases in Migration Control: and if Things Would Matter? | **Zeynep Mentesoglu Tardivo** (*LUISS University, Italy*)<br>Becoming Citizens in a Global Pandemic: Implementation Constraints and Innovative Measures |
| **Luděk Stavinoha** (*University of East Anglia, UK*)<br>Unruly subjects: Arts of resistance in the Aegean archipelago | **Eline Wærp** (*Malmö University, Sweden*)<br>Frontex in Wonderland: Banal Securitization and Normalization in the Field of EUropean External(ized) Border Management |
|  | **Marianna Poyares** (*The New School for Social Research, Zolberg Institute on Migration and Mobility, USA*)<br>The new crimmigration continuum: ATDs and the algorithmic governance of immigrants. |

13:30-14:00

Wrap Up & Closing Session (Room A)

*The organizers of the workshop together with the panel conveners have opted for rescheduling panel 1 due to the situation of strike action taking place at UK universities throughout the workshop days of March 21-22. The solution should express solidarity with the struggle against precarious working conditions at universities and in academia, in the UK and beyond.

12:00-14:00

Panel 1 (online)

**Models of Digital Identity in Migration Governance, Humanitarian Aid and Development Assistance**

*Convenors:* **Aaron Martin** (*Maastricht University & Tilburg University, Netherlands*), **Margie Cheesman** (*King's College London, UK*), **Emrys Schoemaker** (*The Graduate Institute Geneva, Switzerland; London School of Economics, UK; Cornell Tech, USA*), **Keren Weitzberg** (*Queen Mary University of London, UK*)

**Margaret Cheesman** *(King's College London, UK)*
How not knowing how blockchain works in humanitarian aid

**Sophie Bennani-Taylor** (*University of Edinburgh, Scotland*)
Processing payments, enacting alterity: slow violence and financial control in the everyday lives of ASPEN card users

**Silvia Masiero** (*University of Oslo, Norway*)
Reimagining Biometric Identity through Platform-Mediated Surveillance

**Lucrezia Canzutti** *(King's College London, UK)*
Making digital (non)citizens: digital identity, paper documents and statelessness in Cambodia

**Kelly Bescherer** (*Leuphana Universität Lüneburg, Germany*)
On Documentation and Deportability: Senegal and the European Project of African Civil Registration Systems

Organisation Team

**STS-MIGTEC Workshop Team**: Nina Amelung, Elisa De Carvalho, Ivan Josipovic, Silvan Pollozek, Maria Ullrich, Olga Usachova

**Processing Citizenship Team**: Chiara Loschi, Lorenzo Olivieri, Paul Trauttmansdorff, Wouter Van Rossem, Annalisa Pelizza

Aaron Martin (ECPC, TILT), Margie Cheesman (KCL), Emrys Schoemaker (IHEID, LSE, Cornell Tech) and Keren Weitzberg (QMUL)

*Contact*: aaron.martin@maastrichtuniversity.nl

In the areas of migration governance, humanitarian aid and development assistance, digital identity "solutions" tend to be biometrically enabled, cloud-based and "mobile first", leading to pressing concerns about unwarranted surveillance, unauthorized access to sensitive data, and harmful discrimination and exclusion.

In response to these concerns, and spurred by growing interest in privacy-by-design and new decentralized models for data governance, innovations like digital wallets promise to empower people with cryptographically secure, persistent and self-managed means of financial inclusion and identity recognition across borders. Moreover, digital identity "trust frameworks" and other socio-technical architectures for cross-border data portability and system interoperability are emerging. These solutions promise to enable "privacy-enhancing" and "people-centric" platforms for use in migration and aid contexts, which are still heavily dominated by centralized models that prioritize the needs of government agencies and aid organizations over those of migrants, refugees and other vulnerable populations. Critical research is yet to tackle what these new digital technologies and innovative governance models mean in practice for people and institutions.

In our 2021 commentary on reconsidering digital identity in aid, we call on scholars to rethink methodological and theoretical commitments to better capture the ambivalent forms of control and agency that digital identity systems engender, and so apprehend the implications of decentralized and privacy-focused developments. The commentary also encourages STS-inspired and critical approaches to the study of digital identities in situ. We thus invite submissions from scholars working on digital identity topics in migration governance, humanitarian aid and development assistance, who seek to connect critiques of new and emergent "solutions" with ongoing debates in STS and critical border and security studies.

### How not knowing how blockchain works works in humanitarian aid

*Margaret Cheesman (King's College London)*

Blockchain is a highly complex kind of technology based on cryptography, the very science of ciphers and secrets. Claims about blockchain are vague, contested, and rapidly shifting. In migration management, blockchain is promoted as a privacy-preserving way of delivering and monitoring people's aid entitlements and mobility. Despite the hype, only a few tangible implementations exist in practice. 2019 saw the launch of a high-profile pilot project in Jordan's refugee camps. The pilot involved United Nations agencies adopting blockchain experimentally as a way of coordinating refugees' access to financial resources and economic activity. This paper is based on ethnographic fieldwork with the communities using and making the blockchain pilot in Jordan: staff at UN Gender, a women's empowerment organisation, and their aid beneficiaries, Syrian refugee women living in Za'atari and Azraq camps. These communities maintained and adapted the blockchain pilot project and incorporated the technology into their existing forms of knowledge and ways of living and working. I examine the dynamics of ignorance, confusion, and mystification around blockchain in this case study. Non-knowledge helped extend the epistemic hegemonies and strategic interests of the UN agencies. To promote the pilot as a successful product in the aid donor market, UN Gender staff were both subjected to and participated in epistemic injustice—the denial of refugees' and aid workers' subjectivities as participants in rather than objects of socio-technical change. They posited the refugee

camp as an acceptable experimental frontier in the generation of new socio-technical knowledge, at the expense of refugees' needs, priorities, and—ultimately—financial privacy. While the pilot saved UN Gender time and money overall, this did not even really require blockchain technology.

**Processing payments, enacting alterity: slow violence and financial control in the everyday lives of ASPEN card users**

*Sophie Bennani-Taylor (University of Edinburgh)*

Despite the promotion of financial technologies as enablers of digital and social inclusion for displaced migrants, recent research has elucidated their role in engendering data extractivism (Tazzioli, 2019) and entrenching inequality within refugee camps (Bhagat and Roderick, 2020). This paper contributes to this discussion to examine how the Asylum Support Enablement (ASPEN) card – a prepayment card provided to UK asylum seekers – enrols displaced migrants into compulsory circuits of data surveillance which control their access to social and financial welfare. Drawing on a background analysis of 53 documents and 21 interviews with a combination of asylum seekers, refugees, advocacy organisation staff and technology providers, I explore how the ASPEN card's materiality, discourses and functionality produce asylum seekers as governable subjects. I do this in three ways. First, I build on Pelizza's (2021) concept of 'alterity processing' to examine how the UK Home Office discursively co-constructs asylum seekers as 'deviant subjects' and its bureaucratic entities as protective and indispensable. Next, I analyse how this co-construction is used to justify asylum seekers' exclusion from mainstream banking, thus rendering them dependent on the ASPEN card. Finally, I elucidate how the ASPEN card's production and circulation of data implicitly and explicitly controls asylum seekers' behaviours. In doing so, I problematise the techno-optimist narrative of the ASPEN card as a promoter of financial and social inclusion. Instead, I illustrate how the surveillance and social control engendered by financial technologies manifest their application as instruments of migrant governmentality.

**Reimagining Biometric Identity through Platform-Mediated Surveillance**

*Silvia Masiero (University of Oslo)*

Biometric identity systems have been increasingly conceptualised as intertwined with logics of profiling and surveillance. In social protection schemes, the right to assistance is built-in as subordinated to registration of biometric data, making biometric identity a tool to police and profile rather than assist. Yet, the design properties of biometric identity platforms find limited space in the surveillance discourse, while playing two functional roles within it: first, enabling the construction of complements in biometric identity platforms is the availability of boundary resources made accessible to third parties. Second, through the generative properties of platforms, third-parties enact interoperability building complements on the platforms' core using boundary resources. Based on such design properties, this paper contributes to biometric identity research by developing the concept of platform-mediated surveillance. I use 12-year qualitative data on India's Aadhaar, the world's largest biometric identity platform, to illuminate how interoperability with public service systems, ranging from food security to essential public health provisions, affords undue surveillance of vulnerable groups, leading users into the binary condition of either registering and becoming profiled, or giving up essential state provisions. Implications of this reflection are drawn for recent issues of post COVID-19 social protection and vaccine distribution, illuminating how the design properties of biometric identity platforms are interlinked with exacerbation of extant inequalities. The concept adds to existing platform literature by reconceiving surveillance as an embedded feature, rather than an unintended effect, of the architecture of biometric identity platforms.

**Making digital (non)citizens: digital identity, paper documents and statelessness in Cambodia**

*Lucrezia Canzutti (King's College London)*

Since the introduction of the UN's Sustainable Development Goals, and particularly SDG 16.9 calling for 'legal identity for all' by 2030, digital identification programmes have proliferated across the world - especially in low and middle-income countries of the 'Global South'. What do these systems mean for stateless persons? How do they reconfigure or reinforce the boundaries between citizenship and non-citizenship? This paper answers these questions by exploring the case of Cambodia, which hosts one of the largest stateless populations in Southeast Asia. Since 2017, the Cambodian government has embarked on a digital identification programme purportedly aimed at improving service delivery, promoting human rights and, crucially, reducing statelessness. However, Cambodia's main stateless population, the ethnic Vietnamese minority, has so far been excluded from these digitisation efforts. Instead, ethnic Vietnamese families who have been living in Cambodia for generations have continued to be given temporary, paper-based immigration documents that are routinely confiscated, substituted, or invalidated by Cambodian authorities. This paper excavates the entanglements of digital and nondigital documents and records that underpin Cambodia's process of 'digital transformation'. It argues that, rather than being the inevitable by-product of an 'in-between' phase, these parallel and overlapping bureaucracies benefit authorities by creating new spaces for informality and discretion, ultimately reinforcing citizen/non-citizen divides. In attending to digital-nondigital entanglements, the paper pays attention to both ruptures and continuities between past and present boundary-making mechanisms, highlighting how Cambodia's history of colonialism, conflict, territorial disputes and illiberalism shape (non)identification practices today.

**On Documentation and Deportability: Senegal and the European Project of African Civil Registration Systems**

*Kelly Bescherer (Leuphana Universität Lüneburg)*

A push for civil registration databases and biometric technology abroad plays an ever more significant role in the German and European deportation regime. The EUTF for Africa, the centerpiece of the Valetta Action Plan, has – amongst other projects – devoted significant levels of funding towards creating pilot civil registration and vital statistics databases in a number of African countries; Though humanitarian language is in part also employed to justify the need for intervention, this relatively vast and invasive project of social reorganization and technologization is linked explicitly in the discourse of the European Commission to its goal of increasing deportations, which in practice are frequently obstructed by the difficulty of identifying individuals as citizens of a given state. Taking the example of Senegal, I consider the pilot projects currently aimed at creating a nationwide, interoperable civil registration system in parallel to legal developments in German law over the past few years to enact increasing pressures towards identity clarification. By tracing the development of civil status documentation projects in Senegal from the colonial era through the present and evaluating discourse surrounding the pilot projects in Senegal, I situate the role of civil registration systems in Africa within the context of the German deportation regime.

**Panel #2.  Mediatizing claim making, publics, and citizenship. On ambivalent technologies for migrants on the move**

Silvan Pollozek (European University Viadrina), Maria Ullrich (University of Bonn), Olga Usachova (University of Padua)

*Contact:* olga.usachova@phd.unipd.it

Work at the intersection of citizenship studies, science and technology studies, and migration studies has shown how the (lack of) everyday access to and use of technologies shape the conditions for migrants on the move to make claims. Claims-making thereby refers to acts of demanding rights by and on behalf of migrants and points to contestations, negotiations, and struggles around (material) citizenship and (political) subjectivity (Isin 2019, Nyers 2015). Research has stressed the ambivalences of technologies for migrants, which may establish and support claims but also expose migrants to suspicion and mistrust (Ponzanesi & Leurs 2022). For instance, smartphones may collect and show evidence in the interests of migrants, but they may also be used for exposure in identification arrangements by state authorities (Gillespie, Osseiran & Cheesman 2018). Or social media platforms may render migrants' claims (in)visible in the digital sphere (Georgiou 2019) while at the same time being accessed for monitoring and surveillance by state and other actors (Latonero & Kift, 2018).

With this panel, we want to explore further the ambivalences of technologies in regard to migrants' claims-making. It asks how technologies support and restrict practices of claim making as acts of citizenship, or how they enable and constrain publics, in which migrants' concerns come to matter. We invite submissions from social movement studies, critical migration studies, science and technology studies, citizenship studies, or other disciplines that address the following topics (among others):

- conceptualising the relations between technologies, publics, and (acts of) citizenship,
- the socio-material and socio-technical shaping of publics and the (in)visibility of migrants' claims through media platforms,
- smartphones as ambivalent devices for migrants on the move,
- reappropriations of security technologies by enacting 'counter-technologies' and 'counter knowledge' for 'counter claims-making' (e.g. GPS data and monitoring tools),
- technologies of identification and the socio-technical (de)legitimization of migrants' claims
- the role of technology in advocacy work, or in artistic and creative protest interventions to stimulate critical publics,
- mediatized political subjectivities in the context of acts of citizenship and migration.

## References

Georgiou M. (2019) City of Refuge or Digital Order? Refugee Recognition and the Digital Governmentality of Migration in the City, Television & New Media, 20:6, 600-616, DOI: 10.1177/1527476419857683.

Gillespie M., Osseiran S. and Cheesman M. (2018) Syrian Refugees and the Digital Passage to Europe: Smartphone Infrastructures and Affordances. Social Media + Society 4:1: 205630511876444. DOI: 10.1177/2056305118764440.

Isin, E. F. (2019) "Doing Rights with Things: The Art of Becoming Citizens." In Performing Citizenship. Performance Philosophy, edited by P. Hildebrandt, K. Evert, S. Peters, M. Schaub, K. Wildner, and G. Ziemer, 45–56. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Latonero, M., & Kift, P. (2018). On Digital Passages and Borders: Refugees and the New Infrastructure for Movement and Control. Social Media + Society, 4:1. DOI: 10.1177/2056305118764432

Nyers, P. (2015). "Migrant Citizenships and Autonomous Mobilities." 1 (1): 23–39. doi:10.18357/mmd11201513521.

Ponzanesi S. and Leurs K. (2022) Digital Migration Practices and the Everyday. Communication, Culture and Critique 15:2, 103–121. DOI: 10.1093/ccc/tcac016.

**Automating asylum: reconstructing the Athene pilot program**

*Koen Leurs, Kinan Alajak, Rianne Dekker (Utrecht University)*

In the Netherlands, at the very start of their asylum procedure, an estimated 90% of applicants are asked to hand over their smart phones and other data carriers to the AVIM (Dutch border police). As part of the so-called 'Quick Scan' procedure, AVIM subsequently makes forensic copies of these data carriers, and checks these datasets manually in search for means to establish and verify identity claims, but also to detect potential indications of human smuggling and terrorism. In the last 6 months we have started reconstructing the Athene pilot project, which was an experiment initiated by AVIM. The Athene pilot sought to automate the digital screening of the forensic copies of the data carriers on the basis of a self-learning algorithm. The project was fed indicators by various stakeholders, and apparently operated in practice by producing over-night in-depth screening results. Upon public scrutiny in 2021, the pilot was terminated, for being in reach with GDPR regulations. During the workshop we would like to discuss our work in trying to make this security system public, combining freedom-of-information (FOI) requests alongside expert interviews with multiple stakeholders including border police, migration officials, lawyers, NGO's as well as interviews with people who have filed for asylum. In this presentation we reflect on the intricacies of researching black-boxed government AI and algorithms through the eyes of relevant stakeholders; present emerging findings of the technical, bureaucratic and everyday practice dimensions of the digitized asylum procedure; and discuss knowledge transfer beyond academia.

**Inscribing border control into smartphones: the legitimatory language and infrastructure of dataveillance in Austrian, German and Swiss refugee governance**

*Ivan Josipovic (University of Vienna)*

Asylum seekers without passports or other identification papers have recently become subject to new screening procedures in EU member states that include the extraction and evaluation of data found on their personal devices, most notably smartphones. This paper addresses the discursive struggle in which national governments engage when trying to place emerging digital practices among their target groups under sovereign control. It assumes that under liberal democratic rule, the moral and legal power of borders has to be (re-)asserted against concerns over privacy, discrimination, data handling or efficacy for example. Based on a historical discourse analysis, it shows the strategic argumentation patterns of policy-makers in Austria, Germany and Switzerland during the formulation of policies for smartphone searches in the asylum procedure as well as the infrastructures put into place during the implementation, so as to legitimize this new form of social sorting. The findings are discussed in the light of preliminary insights into administrative practices surrounding smartphone-based claim-making in the Austria asylum procedure prior to the new formalization of smartphone searches. Building on a content analysis of 40 decision protocols of the Austrian Federal Administrative Court, I will illustrate how smartphones had already been informally established as strategic means for claims-making by both asylum seekers and immigration authorities. In this vein, my research will address both the political rationales and legitimation strategies underpinning policies for smartphone data extraction and the possible implications of this formalization of dataveillance in asylum governance.

**Border Forensics: Documentation of Border Violence along the Balkan Route**

*Michelle Pfeifer (Technical University Dresden)*

Media technology like the smartphone function to mediate contestations and struggles over the freedom of movement, citizenship, policing, and belonging. In this paper, I will consider the ambivalence of smartphones for people on the move. As is well documented, phones are a central infrastructure that affords mobility, orientation, and connection to people on the move (Gillespie et al. 2016, Kaufman 2018, Risam 2018, Hegde 2019) while they also become state tools of surveillance and data extraction. I analyze the simultaneous valorization of phone data for border and asylum granting authorities and the destruction and confiscation of phones by border police during illegal pushbacks along the Balkan route. To examine this ambivalence, I turn to activist documentation of border violence along the Balkan route to show how smartphones and their destruction becomes part of an evidentiary and forensic regime that is mobilized to make claims against state violence (Weizman 2017, M'charek 2018). These practices show that metaphors that frame border technologies as smart, less invasive, or even more humane such as the valorization of smartphone data are entangled with an intensification of border violence. Documenting border violence specifically works to counter the metaphors of smart borders that frame "smart" border policing as less invasive and more humane by showing how data extraction and border violence are entangled.

**Making Pushbacks Public: Secrecy, Material Witnesses and Devices of Dis/appearance.**

*Georgios Glouftsios (University of Trento)*

In early 2021, the European Parliament established the Frontex Scrutiny Working Group (FSWG) to monitor all aspects of the functioning of the European Border and Coast Guard Agency (Frontex). During the first four months of its activities, the FSWG organised a series of public hearings and carried out a "fact-finding" investigation to gather information and evidence about pushbacks of would-be refugees at the Aegean Sea. By unpacking some of the controversies that emerged during the hearings and investigation of the FSWG, I explore how secrecy was practised and strategically employed to obscure the responsibility of Frontex for the reported pushbacks, and how it was contested through the production and presentation of related evidence. In doing so, I contribute to scholarly works at the intersection of critical security studies and secrecy research that examine secrecy not as something hidden, pre-given and fixed but as being reiteratively performed in practice. Research on secrecy's performativity has attended predominantly to conventional domains of security, like counterterrorism, surveillance and military affairs broadly conceived. My goal is to make some of the ideas and arguments developed in this literature speak to research on borders and migration. I also contribute to the literature that examines the complex interplay between secrecy and transparency by unearthing the surprising, and rather banal, ways through which reporting mechanisms and surveillance infrastructures implemented to make Frontex operations more transparent engendered, paradoxically, secrecy.

**Unsettling Material Publics of Biometric Databases in Migration Control: and if Things Would Matter?**

*Nina Amelung (Universidade de Lisboa)*

Those affected by measures of border control and related technologies and infrastructures are often turned into non-publics and invisible collectives (Broeders and Dijstelbloem 2015). Thus, the exposure to related forms of state violence, migrants' struggles and strategies of dissent are mostly overlooked (Glouftsios and Casaglia 2022), also due to the choice of analytical lenses and ways of (not) paying

attention. I critically discuss selected tools of the analytical repertoire of STS for studying contestations, how they instruct us to pay attention to particular forms of issue-articulations and not to others; thus how they are suitable to study material publics of data practices of border control. I revisit influential STS accounts to understand how and what issues turn into matters of concern (Latour 2004, 2005), how and what publics emerge (Chilvers and Kearnes 2015), assemble and consolidate around issues as material issue-publics (Marres 2005; Marres and Lezaun 2011). While the issue-oriented understanding of political contestation provides relevant insights, it also may leave analytical gaps to grasp contestation beyond institutionalized channels of political articulation, de jure citizenship and nation state bound understandings of political subjects and publics. Taking the case of the Eurodac database and its foreseeable integration into the interoperability project as a starting point I explore the limited agency of material publics inscribed in the very design of the database system, but also the limits of understanding the composition and articulation of material publics through certain conceptual lenses. I trace the issues and concerns articulated in institutionalized and visibly accessible public arenas, and juxtapose them with contesting issue articulations beyond tamed and institutionally channeled arenas. I conclude with two proposals to unsettle our understandings of material publics in order to pay attention differently, and to include political articulations that unsettle data practices of border control.

**Unruly subjects: Everyday arts of resistance in the Aegean archipelago**

*Luděk Stavinoha (University of East Anglia)*

How do refugees assert their capacity for political speech within and beyond the confines of the camp? How are the possibilities of performing acts of resistance within these spaces of detention circumscribed by regimes of control and violent abandonment? Situated in relation to existing research that interrogates the multiple technologies of power deployed inside refugee camps, this paper shifts the analytical focus towards everyday political agency: moments when refugees refuse to perform the role of the passive humanitarian subject, giving rise, instead, to the figure of the 'unruly subject'. It aims is to shed light on the digital and non-digital 'arts of resistance' (Scott, 1990) – everyday acts of subversion, sabotage, and insubordination – through which individuals contest the logic and the language of their confinement and segregation. The paper pieces together the inevitably fragmentary accounts of political agency – from digitally-mediated protests, riots, hunger strikes to less visible forms of infrapolitics that take place in and around EU 'hotspots' in Greece, based on conversations with more than one hundred refugees, volunteers, and activists during fieldwork conducted on the islands of Chios, Samos, Lesbos, and Kos between 2016-2022. Framed through the lens of Behrouz Boochani's work on the Kyriarchal System of immigration detention, the paper centres the language through which individuals narrate their lived experience of violence and resistance within these spaces to reflect critically on the ambivalent uses of digital technologies in everyday acts of citizenship.

Francisco Pereira Coutinho (NOVA School of Law) and Emellin de Oliveira (NOVA School of Law)

*Contact*: emellin.oliveira@novalaw.unl.pt

Since the formation of States, with the elements recognised by classical literature and the Treaty of Montevideo of 1933, the security of the territory has been recognised as one of the main responsibilities of the State. As a consequence, the control of the passage of non-nationals across borders has become one of the major concerns of governments, and one of the unavoidable political phenomena in migration studies.

If, initially, the monopoly of authority to restrict international movements was held by the States through the passport (Torpey, 2000); currently, technological advances have allowed different forms of border control, which have become more dynamic, extending beyond their territorial framework.

In the case of the European Union, the creation of a space without internal border control is intrinsically linked to the development of databases (Brouwer, 2008), moving border control from a physical to a digital environment. And new surveillance technologies and the digitalisation of information have had a direct impact on border and migration policies (Broeders & Dijstelbloem, 2016), which has culminated in the proliferation of databases, able to process different personal data collected from various categories of foreigners (Vavoula, 2019).

In this sense, the present panel aims to take stock of discussions on the role of Law in the use of technology and information systems by states for border and migration control purposes and to identify the most pressing current challenges. Proposals from all disciplines that relate to the trinomial "Law, Technology and Border Control", with special attention to the protection of personal data of third-country nationals, are welcome. After the workshop selected contributions may be invited to submit to a special issue initiative within the Observatory of Personal Data Protection Yearbook.

**Post-imperial influence and the right to privacy: The IOM's Migration Information and Data Analysis System (MIDAS) in Nigeria**

*Samuel Singler (University of Oxford)*

This paper examines the International Organization for Migration's (IOM) new Migration Information and Data Analysis System (MIDAS) in Nigeria. The analysis is based on elite interviews and primary observational fieldwork in Abuja, Nigeria. In recent years, the IOM has assisted Nigerian Federal authorities with drafting new data privacy legislation to allow the Nigerian Immigration Service to process Advance Passenger Information (API) and Passenger Name Record (PNR) data at the border. These types of data create new challenges relating to data privacy, given the crime control and counter-terrorist logics underpinning their collection. This paper asks whether the development of data protection safeguards with reference to universal human rights provides an effective remedy to risks relating to migrants' right to privacy. More specifically, I focus on two related but distinct problems. The first is a tension in the IOM's rationale of respecting Southern states' sovereignty on one hand, while on the other hand compelling these states to adopt Northern-produced "universal" norms relating to human rights. The second problem is that while the IOM promotes new data privacy safeguards, these legislative frameworks are being used to expand a system that merges border control and criminal justice practices in an unprecedented fashion, and therefore creates new data protection risks. Ultimately, this paper interrogates how the development a legal right to privacy at the border relates to broader postcolonial hierarchies and the increasing expansion of 'crimmigration control' practices on a global level.

**Addressing algorithmic errors in data-driven border control procedures**

*Mirko Forti (Tuscia University)*

Technologies can make mistakes, and Artificial Intelligence (AI) algorithms are no exceptions in this sense. Algorithmic tools ascribe specific meaning to given data on the basis of elaborated information about other subjects. AI software assesses individuals accordingly to the similarity in their related data and uses such group information to produce outcomes about an applicant. AI algorithms working routine may consider people belonging to minorities as anomalies because their data do not fit within statistical categories. The European Union (EU) is increasingly relying on AI tools to perform border control procedures and manage incoming migration flows. The deployment of AI tools at the borders finds its basis in techno-solutionism assumptions, according to which technology devices could produce more reliable outcomes than those delivered by human decision-making processes. This contribution asks if AI failures in migration management activities could be tolerable. Accepting a specific margin of error could have legal and policy implications that this paper would like to address. The first section of this study investigates how AI algorithms deployed for border control purposes could make mistakes, thus considering design errors, matching mistakes and embedded biases. The second part analyses how algorithmic failures in controlling frontiers could infringe on human rights and what are the available legal remedies in such cases. The last section formulates a few concluding remarks, considering algorithmic errors and their legal and policy relevance in the EU data-driven approach to border control procedures.

**Migrant Protection Protocols in the U.S.-Mexican Borderlands: The (non) digital bordering technologies of a policy**

*Sara Bellezza (Freie Universität Berlin)*

Increasing high-tech militarization and surveillance at international borders support arrests and "apprehensions" of cross-border movement, seeking to control mobility through biometric identification and data sharing. While the digitalization of asylum processing becomes ever more depersonalized, i. e. during digital interview procedures and immigration court hearings via screen, some bordering technologies remain the same: Notices To Appear (NTAs) are handed out in paper form to protection seeking persons at the US-Mexican border. With the so-called Migrant Protection Protocols (MPP), protection seeking persons are forced to stay in Mexico when applying for asylum in the U.S. Holding only the "Notice to Appear" in hands, changing immigration court dates for asylum hearings are not communicated to persons enrolled in MPP, but updated on the Website of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS). A failure to appear in person, meanwhile, has severe consequences: a removal order in absence is issued by the court. With MPP, bordering technologies move beyond the UŚs national territory and hinder the access to the right to asylum in the U.S. Attending to the practices of different actors present at the U.S.-Mexican borderlands, ranging from state representatives to NGO workers and legal practitioners, as well as people on the move, this contribution will ask which role digital technologies and paper documents play in negotiating the access to asylum hearings at the U.S. Mexican border.

**Revolution in Military Affairs, NATO and the surveillance of the EU's maritime borders in the Mediterranean: Digital technology at the centre of "war" against hybrid threats and NATO's transformational capacity to respond to contemporary security and strategic needs**

*Frendehl Sipaco Warner (University of Canterbury, New Zealand)*

Digital technology has facilitated the transformation of the role of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) in Europe from being exclusively military to one that has civilian elements in the irregular migration space in the Mediterranean, particularly in relation to border control and search and rescue at sea. The concept of the Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA), which posits that future "wars" would only be won by governments who best manage information flows through the incorporation of information technology in their military processes, offers a comprehensive understanding of the reappraisal of NATO's role and widening remit in the region as a reflection of the organisation's transformation capacity to adapt to modern security and strategic needs, which include concerns of a humanitarian nature and fears of "hybrid threats", and which rely on digital technology for information-gathering, surveillance or reconnaissance. The implementation of an information technology- focused joint EU-NATO maritime security policy by NATO is better understood through the RMA, which accounts for the evolution of the concept of "war" being relocated from the battlefield to the migration space, and where digital information is at the centre of efforts by a transnational military organisation's tactical response to ensure a balance between threats mitigation and recognition of protection rights, filling a gap in the literature that until recently has been heavily biased towards either the securitisation or militarisation of responses to irregular migration and asylum.

**EU digital border control and fundamental rights of third country nationals**

*Priscila Azevedo (NOVA School of Law)*

The development of an extremely interconnected economy between countries has caused the traditional concept of borders to change its perspective. It is well known that globalization has made it a great challenge to control the flow of people on the move, and the use of technology has changed the location of border controls, which in some cases are performed even before entering the physical border. Analyzing the European Union scenario, it can be said that its external borders are no longer just the geographical borders we know. They have become digital borders (or it would be more accurate to say fortresses) and are constantly being improved to control the migratory flow so that unwanted people do not reach or stay in the physical territory of the Schengen Area. The growing digitalization of migration control and the interoperability of information systems bring greater efficiency to the management of the Union's external borders, but also imply many questions about the respect for the fundamental rights of third-country nationals, who are already in a vulnerable position. This article seeks to analyze the role of technology in the European Union's migration policy, the main existing information systems and the possible impact on the fundamental rights of third-country nationals, such as the right to data protection and personal privacy.

**Panel #4. Situating long-term implications of registering and identifying practices**

Chiara Loschi, Annalisa Pelizza, Paul Trauttmansdorff

(Department of Philosophy and Communication, University of Bologna)

*Contact:* chiara.loschi@unibo.it, paul.trauttmansdorff@unibo.it

This panel invites to reflect on the long-term perspectives and implications of identifying and registering mobile populations. A multidisciplinary literature in STS, security studies, and critical border and migration studies has extensively studied and criticised IT systems, data infrastructures, and new biometric technologies, which track, identify, register, and digitise people on the move. Practices of identification and registration are thus fundamental in shaping the patterns and trajectories of human mobility, the logics of policing and surveillance, or detainment and deportation infrastructures. Scholars have examined how these practices are performative in producing new forms of (non)knowledge and legible identities, enabling new subjectivities and relationships (Andersson 2016), and enacting migration as a governable entity, sorting it into racialized/gendered classifications (Kloppenburg and van der Ploeg 2020). STS has been particularly vocal in emphasising agency, contingency, and dynamic processes. However, by embracing a perspective on the micro-dynamics, scholars tend to understate the longer-term consequences, the obduracy, and the relative stability of registration and identification systems and their infrastructures (Pelizza 2020). This is surprising since long-durée approaches have demonstrated how identification and registration can be traced back to the sixteenth century (Groebner 2007), but also underpin colonial and imperial ambitions with long-lasting and devastating effects for human beings (Mitchell 2002).

Our panel invites conceptual and empirical contributions that help shedding light onto long-term perspectives and implications of registering and identifying people on the move – through the build-up of large-scale databases, monitoring systems, knowledge infrastructures, taxonomies, population registers, or other sociotechnical infrastructures. We seek to engage with genealogies, epistemologies, and power relations, as well as conflicts and struggles around the attempts to create and stabilise systems of identification and registration. Topics can revolve around the following (or similar) themes, such as

- Genealogies of data systems and/or population registers
- The legacies of coloniality in identification and registration systems
- Long-term consequences for power relations, forms of citizenship, and geographies of responsibility
- Registering and identifying in war and humanitarian contexts
- Practices of registration and identification during the pandemic and their effects
- Emerging regimes of knowledge and evidence in the governance of mobilities
- Statistics and the production and circulation of numbers
- The role of laboratories, scientific practices, and R&D agendas for identification and registration practices

This panel warmly encourages participation with the aim to build long-term collaboration, including further participation at conferences to be held at the University of Bologna in June 2023 and joint publication efforts.

References

Andersson, Ruben. 2016. "Hardwiring the Frontier? The Politics of Security Technology in Europe's 'Fight against Illegal Migration.'" Security Dialogue 47 (1): 22–39. doi:10.1177/0967010615606044.

Groebner, Valentin. 2007. Who Are You? Identification, Deception and Surveillance in Early Modern Europe. New York: Zone Books.

Kloppenburg, Sanneke, and Irma van der Ploeg. 2020. "Securing Identities: Biometric Technologies and the Enactment of Human Bodily Differences." Science as Culture 29 (1): 57–76. doi:10.1080/09505431.2018.1519534.

Mitchell, Timothy. 2002. The Rule of Experts. Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

Pelizza, Annalisa. 2020. "Processing Alterity, Enacting Europe. Migrant registration and identification as co-construction of individuals and polities." Science, Technology and Human Values 45 (2): 262–288. doi: 10.1177/0162243919827927

**Partial Recognition: Residence Permits, Municipal IDs, and Bureaucratic Inscription**

*Arantxa Ortiz (Leiden University)*

This paper examines the role of identity documents in the everyday illegalization and partial incorporation of non-citizens in the Netherlands. It interrogates how various state, suprastate, and activist actors mobilize infrastructures like identity documents to make competing claims about spatial, social, and racial belonging. First, the paper traces the processes through which particular ways of looking, evaluating, and disciplining have become standardized in the racialization and illegalization of individuals and groups in the Netherlands. Second, it examines illegalized activists' calls for alternative identity documents through which they could gain partial rights and greater access to the public sphere (De Graauw 2014; Hegarty 2022; Gordillo 2006; Lewkowicz 2021; Sriraman 2018). Since 2018, Amsterdam-based activists have advocated for municipal IDs for all residents in hopes of providing an identification card for illegalized residents. This could facilitate their access to basic services and offer them partial protection when interacting with state and law enforcement actors. The paper interrogates how the Amsterdam municipal ID proposal may allow illegalized residents to resignify identity documents. Lastly, the paper engages both the dilemmas—such as partial registration in state systems—and potential benefits—such as partial protection from law enforcement—that accompany the introduction and negotiation for alternative and/or locally-issued identity documents.

**Registration as a battlefield: a genealogy of the Italian population registers**

*Enrico Gargiulo (University of Bologna)*

Population registers play a major role in Italy: introduced between 1862 and 1864, immediately after the unification of the country in 1861, they are meant to be a device comparable to a "daily and perpetual census", through which to obtain an accurate "picture" of the population located in every municipality of the Italian state. Despite the intentions of the state institutions, however, the path toward this purpose has not been easy. Regulations were not strictly and uniformly followed by municipalities, while state institutions soon renounced keeping track of the mobile part of the population. Moreover, at the beginning of the twentieth century, population registers gained an even more important role. "Populousness" – namely, the numerousness of those who are recognised as formal residents – became decisive for establishing the size category of a municipality, and hence the remuneration of its civil servants as well as its prestige and territorial pre-eminence. At the same time, registration became the bureaucratic entry door to welfare services as healthcare, housing, etc. As a consequence, municipalities started showing some common tendencies in their ways of managing population registers: if on the one hand they turned a blind eye toward the obligation to expunge the names of citizens that had emigrated abroad, on the other hand they systematically avoided registering individuals of the lower classes, living on the margin of society, recently immigrated, or simply more likely to require social protection. Currently, registration is still a contested device: around

its meanings, its purposes, and the ways it has to be employed a conflict arises, which opposes those authorities that want to monitor and those that desire to establish administrative borders by selecting the "deserving" part of the population. By resorting to a long-durée approach and several methodological strategies – the analysis of political discourses and legal norms; in-depth interviews; information and accounts collected by participating in legal and political actions; and the collection of data from municipalities – this paper aims to stress the actors and the stakes of the conflict over registration. From this analysis, the different dimensions– epistemological, legal, political – of registration as a "battlefield" as well as the implications of the different interpretations of population registers becomes clearer.

## Making the Italians through screen-level bureacracy? Re-shaping European citizenry through the digitalized implementation of a national citizenship law

*Daniela Trucco (University of Côte d'Azur)*

Italy is currently the main entrance-door to European citizenship, recording the highest number of citizenship acquisitions among EU-countries (132,000 in 2020). Half of them are highly-discretionary grants (naturalization) which complex assessment process, led by the Ministry-of-Interior's Central-Direction-for-Citizenship, has been deeply dematerialized. The process, enhanced by Covid-19 pandemics restrictions, have drastically reduced interactions between bureaucrats and applicants. This transformation challenges the way in which discretion intervene in citizenship policies implementation (Hajjat 2012, Sredanovic 2022), as well as the possibility for research to disclose it. While scholarship has started to question e-government technologies and IC-infrastructures' impact on border control policies (Borrows and Hitchcock 2017, Ponzanesi and Leurs 2022), their consequences on citizenship policies are still overlooked. Crossing three main frameworks – implementation studies, critical citizenship and 'nation' studies, and e-government studies – the paper aims at enlighten dematerialization's effects on the socio- legal making of the 'national' and European citizenry. It is grounded on a hybrid fieldwork conducted from September 2021. I mix in-person and online interviews with applicants and non- state actors supporting them in the procedure (N=30) ; a netnography of online forums, Facebook groups, and websites specialized in citizenship policies implementation; a two-months (March-April 2022) ethnographic fieldwork at the Italian Ministry-of-Interior's Central-Division-for-Citizenship in Rome, including non-participating observation and in-depth interviews with civil servants (N=10). I argue that dematerialization sharpens socio-economical barriers to citizenship, while paradoxically comforting institutional rhetoric over citizens' activation and migrants' civic integration. Bureaucrats' discretion's shrinkage, the increasing role of non-State actors, and the introduction of a written 'integration form' are the main arguments conforting this thesis.

## "Do not give street-level officers the possibility to make mistakes": Data infrastructures for migration management as revealing epistemological tensions

*Chiara Loschi & Annalisa Pelizza (University of Bologna)*

The paper will discuss how data infrastructures can reveal tensions between technological and law epistemologies in migration management. The analysis focuses on the data practices using databases run by national and European agencies involved in migration management. We suggest that increasing development of data infrastructure to register, store and share third-country nationals' data (both personal and related to movements) has reshaped national authorities' practices. However, not much is known yet about how this reshaping takes place, and the tensions involved. EU policy about migrant data refers to agencies broadly defined by the functions they perform (e.g. 'law enforcement authorities' etc.), leaving to national governments the freedom to designate the specific bodies that are mandated to perform these functions. However, policy implementation does not come without

resistance and adaptions. Data practices across offices and organisations, while often depicted as seamless from the outside, are not smooth at all (Glouftsios &amp; Leese 2023). Slippages between standards and practices include «frictions between different configurations of elements that struggle to replace each other» (Pelizza 2016), which represent a useful lens to understand diverse epistemologies at work. Our analysis of data practices conducted at Greek and Italian law enforcement authorities and hotspots reveals epistemological tensions between technological and law rationalities that are not easily reducible to mundane dynamics, but speak for radically diverse genealogies.

### Forensic Identification as Governance of Migratory Movement: Reifying the Gaze of the State in the Forensic Laboratory

*Anna Finiguerra (Queen Mary University of London)*

Although death in the Mediterranean is a common occurrence, only in rare cases have authorities carried out formal procedures of recovery and identification of missing migrant bodies. Forensic identification, across different political contexts, is considered necessary only where a crime has been committed, and border deaths seem to consistently fall outside the criminal scope. This paper will analyse how the tool of forensics, which historically has been used to highlight state violence and crime, has been consistently depoliticised in the case of migratory journeys. This is mainly due to two reasons: a consistent understanding of border deaths as accidental or the criminal responsibility of smugglers rather than violent bordering practices on the part of states and a reliance on state knowledge and infrastructures when carrying out technical identification procedures. To make this argument, this paper analyses the case of the shipwreck of August 18th 2015 in the Mediterranean to highlight how forensic investigation contributes to the governance of migration. Contrary to the expectations of practitioners themselves, forensics fails to give migrants dignity in death and instead condemns most of them to oblivion. The state-centric practice of forensic identification will then be compared to activist practices of forensic investigation to show how the social and political situatedness of these practices of knowledge production inform their political outcomes.

### Visa Applicants as Performers of Border Surveillance

*Mert Cangönül (Koç University)*

Etymologically referring to 'having been seen', visa regimes enable states to 'see' profiles of foreigners through consulates and embassies located far away from actual territories. In today's highly 'selective' mobility atmosphere, visas play very important role for states' border surveillance. Yet, seeing foreigners is possible not simply through state institutions. Rather, visa applicants are also practitioners of this surveillance mechanism since they are obliged to do a lot of paperwork during visa applications. By submitting documents about their past (e.g. previous financial records), present (e.g. employee status), future (e.g. binding job contracts) and biometric data (e.g. fingerprints), visa applicants also perform surveillance on behalf of states. These (self-)documentation practices indicate diffusion of policing from conventional state bodies like intelligence officers, police or consulates to the visa applicants who shoulder practical, economic and moral burdens of data collection work. I argue that study on the nexus between visa applicants and surveillance may offer us a more dynamic analysis of power relations in international mobility settings. To discuss this, I will scrutinize Schengen visa regime by asking: a) What are the major trends in Schengen visa policies for Third Country Nationals since 2010s and how COVID-19 border regulations affect these trends? b) What kind of surveillance forms exist during the Schengen visa application processes? c) Considering today's highly demanding paperwork duties for visa applicants, what do documentation practices tell us about current and emerging power diagrams (e.g. sovereignty, disciplinary power and governmentality)?

**Face the Nation**

*Nina Dewi Toft Djanegara (Stanford University)*

In this paper, I trace the long durée of facial recognition and its use for border enforcement in the United States. I argue that this history begins with the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, a law which severely restricted immigration from China to the United States. To enforce the new exclusion laws, the U.S. government issued identity certificates to regulate which Chinese people were allowed to enter the country. More than 40 years before photographs were included in passports for U.S. citizens, the Chinese registration certificates were the first form of photo ID ever issued by the U.S. government (Pegler-Gordon 2009, Robertson 2010). This research draws from original case files stored in the archives of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), historical newspapers, and contemporary ethnographic observations among facial recognition developers and border protection officials. In particular, I analyze transcripts from immigration hearings during the early 20th century and focus on moments when immigration officials compared the face of the border-crosser with the photograph attached to the identity certificate. Perceived differences in facial features became grounds for deportation. For example, one inspector recommended that a man be returned to China because "after a careful examination of both photographs through a magnifying glass" he noted "distinct differences in the formation and location of eyebrows, shape of nose, shape of ears and the way they are set on the head." I suggest that these deliberations should be understood as an early form of facial recognition. Finally, by juxtaposing the narratives that were used by immigration officials to justify the introduction of photo ID in the late 19th century and facial recognition in the early 21st century, I will demonstrate that the same racialized logic underlies both technologies: fear over suspicious bodies and the unknowable Other.

**The biography of an identification software system**

*Wouter Van Rossem (University of Twente/ University of Bologna)*

Systems and infrastructures for identifying and registering mobile populations have many facets and long development histories, and the researchers' partial perspectives will shape their understanding of the technologies and practices involved. To study phenomena with so many moving parts, researchers often conduct their studies at multiple sites or include human and non-human actors that shape identification encounters. This paper proposes multi-temporal sampling as a method for understanding the long-term development of identification systems and infrastructures. Two heuristics are proposed for selecting such moments in the lifecycle of identification technologies. The first heuristic employs SCOT's concept of "interpretative flexibility" of artefacts to identify significant moments when the meanings of identification practices and technologies are challenged, changed, or closed down. The second heuristic employs the concept of "gateways" from infrastructure studies to highlight moments when software systems and infrastructures intersect. This article makes two contributions to the research agenda of long-term perspectives on identification based on data gathered through fieldwork at an IT vendor of a software for matching people's identity data. First, by tracing the interpretive flexibility of the software, it is possible to see how this private company became enrolled in security logics. Second, gateway moments make it possible to see the "infrastructural compromises" (Dijstelbloem, 2021) necessary when adapting globally honed technologies to new settings. When the software was integrated with an EU system, infrastructural compromises were made to allow backwards compatibility with MS systems. Together, these findings shed light on the activities of under-the-radar actors, such as software vendors, whose distribution and reuse of software packages have long-term implications on identification practices and infrastructures in a variety of contexts.

**Temporalities of resistance: a time-based perspective on data infrastructures for migration management and reaction to them**

*Lorenzo Olivieri (University of Bologna)*

Scholarship about time and migration has widely discussed both the temporalities of migration management and the temporalities of the migration journey. On the one hand, acceleration and pre-emptive governance emerged as the main temporal goals and temporal strategies through which regulating - and hampering - migrants' mobility. On the other hand, migrants' temporal experiences have been analyzed in terms of waiting, acceleration and deceleration, cyclicity and repetition. Less attention has been paid to enquire the mutual, constitutive interrelationships and frictions between these two sets of temporalities: how do border-crossers accept or resist the temporalities of migration management? To answer this question, I single out the moments in which the temporalities of migration management and border-crossers' temporalities overlap and collide with each other and how border-crossers' agency is affected, hindered and limited accordingly. To discuss such moments of temporal collision, I analyze the scripts and temporalities shaping the asylum process and the Registration and Identification procedures carried out at the Hotspots and I compare them with border-crossers' descriptions of their encounters with migration officers and migration infrastructures. I thus develop the notion of hijacked knowledge to describe how migrants' possibilities of action are negatively affected by moments of temporal collisions which tend to exploit border-crossers' vulnerabilities and to foster their compliance. With the concept of reactive calibration, on the other hand, I wish to suggest that once migrants become aware of the temporalities of control, they try to appropriate them by aligning their bodies, narrations and identities to those temporalities.

**The unspectacular border? Intra-Schengen border controls and mobility inequality in the Danish-German borderlands**

*Mirjam Wajsberg (Radboud University of Nijmegen)*

In January 2016, the Danish government reinstated border controls at the Danish-German. Then-prime minister Lars Lokke Rasmussen described these controls as follows: "We are introducing a temporary border control, but in a balanced way, where the police will control buses and trains, but still leave room for ordinary people to cross the borders." (Statsministeriet 2016) Although the measures were supposed to be temporary, six years on the border controls still exist. As Rasmussen implied, a distinction is made between "ordinary" people, and those considered 'non-ordinary', thus raising questions of who is considered to belong into the former category and who is excluded from it? I show that mobility stratification ensuing from this distinction is built, in part, on racialized and gendered assumptions belonging in/to the border region. Investigating the 'intra- Schengen border aims to shed light on how b/ordering violence presentsin subtler, yet persistent ways away from the spectacle of Europe's violent external borders. Drawing on ethnographic material collected in the Danish-German borderlands and on the train between Germany and Denmark from 2017 to 2022, I address the impact of different 'crisis' moments, such as the Covid-19 pandemic and the displacement of people from Ukraine in 2022, on the border infrastructure and its effect on people's mobility. Theoretically, the paper is informed by the concepts of borders as infrastructure (Dijstelbloem 2021) and viapolitics (Walters et al. 2022). Through this conceptual framework I explore how bordering practices play out in the intra-Schengen area and how the train as a vehicle and relational space acts as a specific conduit of the border.

**Rethinking Biometric Subversion: How Migrant Bodily Reactions to Biometric Surveillances Unsettle the Resistance-compliance Paradigm**

*Romm Lewcowicz (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology (Halle)*

The paper explores the lived experience of migrant biometric surveillance in the EU through a study of bodily reactions to it. Based on a larger ethnographic research of Eurodac carried out in Turkey, Greece, and Germany, the paper explores cases that range from finger mutilation to articulating a political right to be fingerprinted. While scholarship has primarily interpreted mutilation as an act of resistance motivated by a desire for ungovernability, and a demand to be fingerprinted may seem like a will for submission or compliance, the paper shows how the resistance/compliance paradigm obscures more than reveals. Rather than debating whether one ought to be governable or ungovernable to biometric surveillance, migrants develop imperfect techniques to be able to flexibly shift between legibility and illegibility. The paper articulates a new conceptual framework to address contemporary modes of surveillance that sit at the intersection of inclusion and exclusion, asylum and deportation, surveillance and care.

**Borders, Big Data, No Data: Recent Datafication Odysseys in Migration through the Aegean**

*Vasilis Argyriou & Aristotle Tympas (National and Kapodistrian University of Athens)*

Combining a critical synthesis of contributions from Critical Border and Migration Studies, Data Studies and STS (Science and Technology Studies), and primary research on migrant boats and crypts, we argue that borders have not been only redefined by the deployment of large scale high-tech computing-telecommunications infrastructures for collection/extraction and aggregation of big data about migrants and travelers, but, also, by the pursuit of a no-data policy regarding the illegal and dramatic push-back of the low-tech migrant boats. Borders have actually been sites of secrecy and orchestrated ignorance, misrepresentations, and disinformation establishing forms of 'situational ignorance' (Pred, 2013). A no-data strategy that covers many incidents of pushbacks at the Aegean Sea, to the Turkish coasts and vice versa, is indicative of the strategically deployed institutional silences and part of the reformation of the general border assemblage. The latter includes not only the high-tech systems of Eurosur and Frontex, but, also, the actual interventions on site as pushbacks and the low-tech dinghies and crypts that are used to cross the sea and land borders. To elaborate on the shaping of borders through the simultaneous advance of big data and no-data practices, we will introduce to cases that exemplify the limited (or even no) data tactic, but also on the efforts from migrants, activists, journalists and scholars to fill the data-gap.

**Identifying the Human: Representations of migrants in international migration data projects**

*Margarita Boenig-Liptsin (ETH Zürich)*

In 1948, three years after its founding, the United Nations adopted the UN Declaration of Human Rights. The cornerstone principle of the Declaration was "human dignity," which can be generally defined as the recognition of the inherent worth of every person. In the wake of World War II, dignity was intended to protect people at the level beyond the nation from the violence that could be inflicted by the nation-state on its own citizens. Refugees, displaced peoples and people who had been deprived of citizenship during the war were seen as some of the primary beneficiaries of the newly institutionalized concept of dignity. Yet, they were also some of the most outspoken critics of the concept's utility in securing the needed protections on the basis of only, as Hannah Arendt expressed in 1949, one's "abstract nudity of being human." Fast forward some 70 years and today data are presented as an essential tool in the pursuit of human rights. In 2020, the United Nations approved a "Data Strategy" that seeks to use techniques of data collection and analytics in order "to better deliver on [the UN's] mandates for people and planet." In the area of migration, the OECD, International Organization for Migration (IMO), and the UN came together to enact the Data Strategy through the creation of the International Forum for Migration Statistics. This paper focuses on representations of migrants and migration in international migration data projects, such as the projects included in the International Forum for Migration Statistics. My aim is to understand how the concept of human dignity is put into practice in these projects, which require increasingly more extensive data collection and surveillance of migrants by and with the help of the nation-state while aiming to provide people with ways of living in the interstices of nations.

**Becoming Citizens in a Global Pandemic: Implementation Constraints and Innovative Measures**

*Zeynep Mentesoglu Tardivo (Luiss University)*

This article focuses on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on naturalisation procedures in six Western countries. In the middle of a global pandemic, citizenship appointments are affected by the restrictions, all in-person citizenship tests, interviews and citizenship ceremonies are cancelled, leading to a naturalisation backlog for implementation agencies and a sense of disappointment for the applicants. While the constraints COVID-19 put on public authorities are felt unequivocally, the measures countries adopted to proceed with citizenship acquisitions are not studied. A key question is how COVID-19 has further hurdled the naturalisation procedures and which innovative measures are adopted, or not adopted, to overcome its unforeseen circumstances. This article argues that the acquisition procedures are negatively impacted by the COVID-19 circumstances, yet the measures adopted in response differ greatly. The comparative analysis shows that Canada, Australia and the UK adopted innovative technologies, digitalised citizenship tests and offered virtual naturalisation ceremonies. The decision whether to employ digital tools to assist with naturalisation process varied in the United States, France and Denmark. The US did not modernise the naturalisation procedures as a virtual mode would be legally impermissible. France selectively fast-tracked the citizenship applications of frontline migrant workers. In the Danish context, the (in)famous exchange of hands requirement in citizenship ceremonies was suspended by the adoption of a legal act after a long debate. The innovative measures and first-time practices give implementation agencies reason to employ electronic tools and virtual platforms to overcome the implementation constraints during the pandemic crisis and maintain some practices in the post-pandemic era.

**Frontex in Wonderland: Banal Securitization and Normalization in the Field of EUropean External(ized) Border Management**

*Eline Wærp (Malmö University)*

The dissertation delimits the 'field of EUropean external(ized) border management', which it takes as its unit of analysis. Asking how this field is enacted and through what logics, it provides a genealogy of the field from the creation of the European Border and Coast Guard agency (Frontex) in the early 2000s until today, including the discourses and practices comprising it and the actors promulgating them. The analysis demonstrates the coalescing of the seemingly conflicting discourses and practices of security, crisis and humanitarianism over time, and how Frontex draws on them in producing an ostensibly apolitical and technocratic 'border knowledge' which obscures alternative, de-securitized perspectives. The theoretical framework, comprised of the Copenhagen and Paris school of security studies, allows for an exploration of how the process of securitization unfolds through discourses and practices in both spectacular and mundane ways. Critical discourse analysis of Frontex's annual risk analysis reports from 2010-2021 has been conducted, as well as interviews with Frontex and DG Home officials, border guards, and civil society representatives. The dissertation draws attention to the banal securitization and the normalization of securitization that has taken place in this field over the last two decades, along with how practitioners in this field negotiate their role in the (re)production of this securitized episteme.

**The new crimmigration continuum: ATDs and the algorithmic governance of immigrants.**

*Marianna Poyares (New School for Social Research)*

In the past two years the "Alternatives to Detention" program managed by ICE has, despite the lack of public scrutiny, tripled in size. Following a campaign promise, President Biden promoted a shift in strategy in immigration enforcement by significantly reducing that part of the budget apportioned to custody and detention centers, while concurrently raising the amount budgeted for ATDs, marketed as a humane, human-rights-compliant alternative to the mass incarceration of migrants. However, ATDs consist of a powerful system of interconnected technologies and bio-indexed forms of surveillance and mobility control over criminalized migrants. Through a mixed-methods analysis that includes data and policy analysis, and participatory observation within communities of asylum-seekers in the United States, I argue that ATDs, though differing from detention, should be understood not as a true alternative, but as a form of pervasive algorithmic governance. First, I provide a critical analysis of the multi-layered institutional and legal infrastructure that supports ATDs. Then, I move toward a critique of the algorithmic rationale ATDs engender, following what Claudia Aradau has called "algorithmic reason." I focus on the production of risk-indexes that inform the ATD surveillance regime, considering issues of algorithmic racism, patterns of normality and anomalies, and the deplorable effects of ATDs in immigrants' communities as a whole. Finally, I identify how the bio-indexed algorithmic governance imposed by ATDs operates on two levels: that of the individual, but also at the level of the entire immigrant community with which the individual under ATD interacts.