

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

Chapter Eleven:

**“We Want to Hear from You”:**

## **Reporting as Bordering in the Political Space of Europe**

Dace Dzenovska

### **Reporting, securitized freedom, and Europeanization**

In 2013, I learned that the United Kingdom’s (UK) Border Agency—now split into UK Visas and Immigration and Immigration Enforcement—publishes news feeds, which include regular reports on successful raids on restaurants or workplaces, namely raids, which result in arrests of workers or persons deemed illegal. What struck me as I was reviewing these news feeds was that all of them included a remark that the UK Border Agency was either acting on intelligence or information received from the public. Upon further investigation, I found a 2011 report by John Vine, the UK Independent Chief Inspector of Borders and Immigration, which stated that the UK Border Agency receives intelligence from “members of the public, frontline staff and community organizations” and that “over 100,000 allegations are received per year from members of the public” by “letter, email or telephone” about “individuals living in their community” (Vine 2010: 3). In turn, the reporting facility on the UK Home Office’s website addressed the public as follows: “If you suspect that someone is working illegally, has no right to be in the UK or is involved in smuggling, we want to hear from you.” This appeal to members of the public to report—or denounce—appeared to be part of a broader campaign to involve ordinary people in border practices and other forms of policing. For example, the Intelligence

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

Management System, previously known as the Allegations Management System, of what at the time was the UK Border Agency was launched after Prime Minister David Cameron called upon “‘everyone in the country’ to help ‘reclaim our borders’ by reporting on suspected illegal immigrants” (BBC 2011). Almost in the same breath as he called for “everyone in the country” to report on “suspected illegal immigrants”, David Cameron also called upon the British people to help fight “benefit scroungers”, following which the newspaper *Sun* invited its readership to report on those who were endangering the well being of ordinary British people by abusing the British welfare system (Talsania 2012, Aitchison 2010). This suggested that reporting was not limited to governance of migration, but was rather an increasingly prevalent instrument of governance in the United Kingdom and, as I argue in this chapter, within (neo)liberal regimes of governance more broadly.

In Western political imaginary, reporting—as both informing and denunciation—tends to be associated with the political repertoire of totalitarian states—the historical other of Western liberal democracies embodied by Eastern European and Soviet socialist states for much of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Boyer & Yurchak 2010).<sup>1</sup> Yet, liberal democratic states, such as the United Kingdom, also rely on reporting in governance and encourage it as an expression of civic duty. This is done in multiple ways, ranging from general calls to the public to report suspicious activity, to establishment of hotlines for violations of law or suspicious activity, to requiring that concrete social and professional groups report on their family members, peers, or clients. For example, in the UK, Muslim women are invited to report on family members at risk of joining radical political or military formations (Saul 2014), teachers and medical staff are required to

---

<sup>1</sup> Sheila Fitzpatrick and Robert Gellately (1996) distinguish informing as a sustained relationship of reporting with the state from denunciations as spontaneous acts of reporting.

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

report on citizens and migrants alike for suspected child neglect (Goebbels et al. 2008), and landlords are required to check their potential tenants' "right to rent".<sup>2</sup>

How to make sense of this proliferation of calls and requirements to report in a Western liberal democracy? Is it similar to or different from other historical instances of reporting, most notably those of the 20<sup>th</sup> century authoritarian regimes? I suggest that the liberal democratic practices of reporting are both: more similar to the authoritarian ones than it may seem, but also crucially different. First, the increasingly common presence of reporting and calls for reporting in Western liberal democracies, such as the United Kingdom, suggest that the crass distinction between totalitarian and democratic societies and regimes of governance common to Western political imaginary is a "state effect", that is, it is a distinction that has emerged as a result of statecraft (Mitchell 1999). It is as much a tool of self-definition for Western liberal democracies as it is a material reality. Moreover, when considering reporting from a historical perspective, it becomes apparent that reporting to authorities is neither new, nor an exclusive feature of totalitarian states. Historians have traced the role of denunciations—that is, "spontaneous communications from individual citizens to the state (or to another authority such as church) containing accusations of wrongdoing by other citizens or officials and implicitly or explicitly calling for punishment" (Fitzpatrick & Gellately 1996: 747)—in community governance in imperial Russia (Burds 1996), in revolutionary France (Lucas 1996), in late 19<sup>th</sup> century Roman Catholic Church (Lease 1996), in Nazi and socialist Germany (Gellately 1996, Connolly 1996), and, of course, in the Soviet Union (Fitzpatrick 2005, 1996, Kozlov 1996, Fitzpatrick & Gellately 1996).

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/right-to-rent-landlords-code-of-practice>

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

In most historical instances of reporting, there is an assumed external authority—a dictator, revolutionary vanguard, or God—that compels subjects to report. Projects of total social transformation (e.g. nationalist, socialist, or republican revolutions and their subsequent institutionalization), or times of social and moral upheaval (Burds 1996), are particularly conducive to the emergence of a “denunciatory atmosphere” (Gellately 1996: 967). In all instances, people are both forced to report and report voluntarily, either because they subscribe to the governing ideology or because they use the system to personal ends (Gellately 1996). There is always an element of freedom in practices of reporting, yet regimes that rely on reporting as a crucial instrument of governance are generally thought of as invasive and repressive (Gellately 1996).

As I show in this chapter, reporting in liberal regimes of governance shares some of these features, especially with regard to how regular people take up the call to report and thus contribute to the formation of a “denunciatory atmosphere”. At the same time, liberal regimes of governance have their distinctive features. Liberal regimes of governance are not based on revolutionary visions of total social transformation and are not usually thought of as repressive and invasive, at least not when juxtaposed to totalitarian regimes. Their defining ideology is that of personal and political freedom, democracy, and human rights. Projects of governance—micro- and macro alike—are articulated as contributions to furthering freedom. It is thus the imaginary of freedom and its valuation as a morally and politically superior end of governance that distinguishes reporting in liberal regimes of governance from other historical instances of reporting. This is why, from a liberal perspective, citizen involvement in governance through denunciation in fascist or socialist regimes is thought of as morally wrong, whereas citizen

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

involvement in governance through reporting in liberal regimes is thought of as a manifestation of "good citizenship".

There is, however, an added dimension to contemporary liberal regimes of governance, and that is security. In contemporary liberal regimes of governance, reporting takes place not only in conditions of freedom, but also in the context of the emergence of security and surveillance as defining elements of governance (Maguire et al. 2014, Ball et al. 2012, Goldstein 2010, De Genova 2013, 2011). Freedom is thus securitized, but not abandoned altogether, while security has become a widely accepted public good.<sup>3</sup> It could thus be argued that contemporary liberal regimes of governance can be thought of as regimes of *securitized freedom*. Within such regimes, surveillance, bordering, and policing are not the sole responsibility of specialized institutions, but of society at large. Ordinary people are called upon to share the responsibility for public security by reporting on suspicious strangers, as well as on misbehaving family members,

---

<sup>3</sup> Some scholars link this "security turn" to a post-9/11 world (e.g. Schwell 2014). Others point to a more gradual consolidation of racial neoliberal regimes in Euro-American political spaces that criminalize the poor, migrants and otherwise marginalized subjects, thus dismantling the difference between internal and external threats (Wacquant 2009, Fassin 2013, Walters 2010, Goldberg 2009, Bigo 2013). Others yet argue that neoliberalism is retreating and giving way "to a darker vision of society harnessed to the valorization of policing as the primary mechanism of governance" (Hyatt in Riles 2013: 560). Importantly, in contemporary security regimes, the threat does not only lie outside the polity, but also within it in the form of a variety of racialized denizens. Contemporary security regimes blur the distinction between migrants and "failed citizens" (Anderson 2012, 2013)—for example, ex-prisoners and welfare dependents—and juxtapose both to the figure of the "good citizen".

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

neighbors, or tenants. However, security as a public good is not only about reporting on specific actions or behavior. Contemporary regimes of securitized freedom also seek to normalize reporting as an integral part of civic life and public culture. Public space is saturated with messages—for example, posters on the walls of London Tube stations—that do not invite reporting on particular acts, but rather work to create a general public atmosphere of vigilance by suggesting that people should trust their senses and report if they see anything suspicious. Reporting and other practices of citizen involvement in surveillance, bordering and policing, such as vigilantism and activism (Doty 2001, Shapira 2013) illustrate particularly clearly that the distinction between the state and society is, as Timothy Mitchell (1999) has suggested, a “state effect”.

In this chapter, I argue for the need to analyze practices of reporting in order to understand the subjects and socialities that contemporary regimes of securitized freedom assume, deploy, and produce, and thus for understanding the polities and politics that they make possible. In order to make some steps towards such analysis, I analyze reporting in the context of European practices of bordering and nation-building. My reflections are based on fieldwork with the Latvian State Border Guard (e.g. Dzenovska 2014), as well as encounters with other state institutions in Latvia as my primary fieldwork site, such as the Latvian State Language Centre. I also draw on what I have been able to gather on the role of reporting in bordering in the UK, which at this point mainly consists of reading policy reports, media articles, and scrutinizing stray reports that have been submitted to the University of Oxford’s Migration Observatory by people who evidently thought that the role of the Migration Observatory is to police rather than research migration.

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

Admittedly, empirical material on reporting in contemporary liberal democracies is scarce. Historical analyses of reporting benefit from the availability of archives, which contain letters of denunciation and files of informers or their targets. I have not had access to equivalent data on contemporary scenes of reporting. However, my aim here is to argue for the importance of paying attention to reporting as an increasingly salient element of public culture and as an instrument of governance. I am interested in asking what analysis of reporting can tell us about how power works in liberal democracies in the current historical moment. How is reporting accommodated in conceptions of good European or national citizenship? What kind of subjects are assumed and produced in the process? How do concrete practices of reporting, as well as establishment of a "denunciatory atmosphere", constitute particular public socialities and therefore also political futures?

In this chapter, I use a historical-analytical lens—that of socialism—to bring into focus the specificities of reporting as an instrument of governance in Europe after socialism. For example, I ask how is it that the informing machinery that socialist states deployed is thought of as a feature of totalitarianism, whereas the Intelligence Management System crafted by the UK Home Office is an acceptable, even commendable, technology of government? How is it that the former socialist informers are thought of as victims, collaborators or cowards, whereas "members of the public" in liberal democratic contexts who report on "individuals living in their community" as virtuous citizens?

By using former socialist contexts as a lens through which to reflect on reporting in liberal regimes of governance I do not mean to suggest that they are the same. I do mean to suggest, however, that historical and anthropological analyses of socialism and postsocialist transformations are helpful for thinking about the specificities of contemporary modes of power

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

(e.g. Boyer and Yurchak 2010). Moreover, analysis of the bordering practices of the Latvian State Border Guard as it was undergoing integration into European structures and a more general Europeanization of its practices and attitudes provides a link between the socialist past and the European present. Thus, while reporting is a feature shared by liberal democratic regimes of governance beyond Europe, this chapter draws on material that shows how reporting emerges as an important instrument of governance in the process of postsocialist transformations and European integration. Latvian border guards are learning both—to erect and guard borders in conditions in freedom and to become European. This means embracing values of freedom, democracy, and human rights, while also recognizing Europeanness as a racialized civilizational space. As part of this project of Europeanization, reporting in European regimes of securitized freedom is linked with racialized imaginaries and practices of Europeanness.

### **Becoming European or reporting in conditions of freedom**

The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 set into motion a myriad of practices of re-bordering, which, in the context of Eastern Europe, were also practices of Europeanization. Former internal boundaries between Soviet republics became external borders between new nation-states and for some, such as Latvia, they became borders between the European Union and Russia. The interests of the renewed Latvian state converged with those of the European Union, as both aimed to strengthen the Eastern border in order to regulate the movement of variously defined foreigners. In fact, Latvia's ability to guard the new external border of the European Union was a crucial marker of its Europeanness (see also Follis 2011 for a similar discussion on Poland). However, the initial period of transformations was somewhat chaotic, as border control procedures and technologies were not yet standardized. The Latvian border guards



*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

did what they thought appropriate in order to meet the goal of strengthening the border. A high-ranking official of the Latvian Border Guard told me that, despite the chaos, "immigration control was successfully devised in the beginning," as measured by the minimal presence of migrants and asylum seekers in Latvia. Border Guard officers explained to me that one of the techniques used to reach this goal was to approach people on the street if they looked as though they did not belong. Indeed, an acquaintance of mine, whose husband is African American, often had to go and pick him up from various police stations where he had been detained on suspicion that he might be illegal. Immigration police simply detained him on the street until his persona and legal status could be clarified. In the early post-Soviet days, Latvian immigration authorities relied on a common sense understanding of who did and who did not belong. In the process, the proper European subject emerged as white. The subject racialized as non-white was the target rather than the beneficiary of the European practices of bordering and surveillance (Maguire 2012).

Subsequently, in the process of EU integration and border standardization, the Latvian Border Guard was tasked not only with strengthening the external EU border, but also with becoming civilized, that is, with protecting borders while observing the basic human rights of border crossers. Approaching people on the street on the basis of their looks could be deemed discriminatory, though, as one officer put it, "we could still do it if we wanted to, but our attitudes have changed". Europeanization as civilization, then, meant keeping a variety of mutually reinforcing policing techniques at one's disposal, while having the "good sense" of using those appropriate for a properly European border force. This process of Europeanization also entailed institutionalization of alternative policing strategies: for example, as part of the new bordering strategy, border guards received intelligence from individuals who reported their

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

paperless partners in bouts of anger. The Latvian Border Guard also re-oriented its activities towards sustained collaboration with the police, employment agencies, and hotels, which included asking the staff of these institutions to report on suspicious persons or activities. Not being able to racially profile people on the street, the Border Guard delegated this task to the public where racialized imaginaries of belonging were common. For the Border Guard, reporting turned out to be a crucial strategy for controlling the territory in conditions of freedom and within a European political and institutional framework. Europeanization of border practices, thus, entailed institutional commitment to an inclusive vision of society and human rights, as well as informal practices of racialized categorization.

Reporting was also used by other institutions of governance—for example, by the Latvian State Language Centre, an institution charged with the task of policing language use in the public arena. The role of the Centre is to implement the Latvian Language Law, which stipulates that individuals occupying jobs in which they might come into contact with the public must demonstrate a certain level of Latvian language skills. In order to enforce this, the Centre conducts inspections, most of which are initiated by *sūdzības* (complaints) from members of the public. The activities of the Centre are mostly geared towards countering the Russification efforts of the Soviet state as a result of which Russian became the public *lingua franca* during the Soviet period. In independent Latvia, Latvian is the state language and all individuals occupying public positions, whether in public or private sectors, are required to be able to communicate with the public in Latvian. Thus *sūdzības* in this context are usually assumed to play out tensions between Latvian and Russian-speakers. However, as observed by language inspectors, scenes of reporting suggest a more complex theatre of tensions than the public and political conflict between Latvians and Russian-speakers.

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

Moreover, despite ideological commitment to the task of the State Language Centre and reliance on reporting in carrying out this work, staff members of the Latvian State Language Centre do not necessarily idealize those who submit complaints as virtuous or good citizens. For example, one inspector of the Latvian State Language Centre acknowledged the value of reporting in the Centre's work, but noted that members of the public mostly report in anger or, in some cases, as part of an act of revenge towards their former employer: "I mean, she worked there for all those years and did not have a problem with the language used at work and then reported on them as soon as she was fired". Other examples mentioned by the language inspector included members of an apartment cooperative reporting on other members for not speaking Latvian in their meetings. This was a private setting where individuals did not seem to be able to resolve communication with each other and turned to the state as a repressive arbitrator. As the language inspector noted, they could have each spoken their own language as long as the other party understood it, but there were other underlying conflicts—for example, debt—that prevented members of the cooperative from resolving the matter themselves. Rather than finding some more neutral means of mediation, they chose the State Language Centre as a punitive state agency to intervene in the conflict. The language inspector concluded that language problems were often entangled with conflicts of material nature and that most people reported when their material interests were at stake.

This is the lens through which the language inspector evaluated most other complaints he received. When prison inmates complained about nurses not speaking the Latvian language, he concluded that the nurses probably did not provide the inmates with desired drugs. He also noted that there are more and more cases where Russian-speakers report on other Russian-speakers to sort out their economic interests. Sometimes it is lawyers who report on behalf of their clients. If

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

someone registers a complaint that the Russian language is imposed in a kindergarten, then it is probably the case that a parent has been reprimanded for their child being late. "Nobody complains just like that", observed the language inspector, as he recounted another case where a teacher who was 70 years old and had worked in a school for most of her working life was reported as not speaking Latvian. "They just needed her to leave", the inspector concluded.

Not all cases, however, were materially motivated. Some people reacted to a humiliating or enraging encounter that they experienced in a taxi or in a shop. Reporting activity also intensified in moments of political tension, such as the 2013 referendum on whether to make the Russian-language the second state language in Latvia. The inspector also noted that some people are "professional reporters", that is, they monitor affairs in multiple spheres of public life and report to a variety of state institutions. Perhaps most unexpectedly, multiple inspectors noted that the frequency of reporting is significantly influenced by lunar phases—the number of reports increases substantially around full moon. Ultimately, the inspector concluded, "we protect the interests of physical persons. It is a small minority of people who report, but, by protecting them, we protect all others". Thus the inspector navigated a murky ethical terrain. On the one hand, he did not have much faith in the moral compass or civic consciousness of the individuals on whose reports his work relied. On the other hand, he reasoned that these people who strive to sort out their private feuds and interests nevertheless contribute to the public good by enabling the State Language Agency to make the public space more Latvian. Insofar as this is a publicly endorsed goal of the institution, relying on reporting was justifiable even as the availability of the mechanism of reporting brought out the worse in those who took it up. In post-Soviet Latvia, then, institutionalization of reporting in governance is not necessarily thought of as a morally dubious technique of governance even as the virtue of reporters themselves occasionally comes

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

under question. The Latvian case confirms that in situations, where the ends of governance and the regime of governance itself are thought to be good, the use of reporting tends to be justified even as the act of reporting itself is not celebrated.

In the United Kingdom, the few reports mistakenly addressed to the Oxford's Migration Observatory also suggest that complex personal relations animate scenes of reporting. Of the five denunciations I have seen, four pertained to the same two asylum seekers—an Iranian man and a woman, allegedly cousins, but, according to the reporters, posing as a couple in the United Kingdom. The reporters—possibly four different individuals, possibly one person writing from four different addresses—reported that both asylum seekers are well situated back in Iran, but are claiming asylum in the UK, because they want to get benefits. In appealing to authorities, the reporters wrote that it was not fair that these two individuals should claim asylum and the associated benefits, especially when foreign students struggle so much to survive “in that crazy land” [the UK] where “life is horrible.” The fifth report pertained to a Bangladeshi woman who was also allegedly well situated in Bangladesh—the report included considerable detail as to her family's properties—, but had lied in order to obtain asylum because “she is greedy for pound and glittering of London”. The reporters suggested that the individuals they reported on deserved to be punished because they had lied out of greed, desire for benefits and cosmopolitan existence, and were not in dire economic need at all. The reporters thought that this was especially unfair in relation to other Iranians or Bangladeshis who are struggling to survive in London. While the moralizing overtones of the reports play into prevalent stereotypes about asylum seekers as benefit seekers, it is hardly possible to know how these reports came about. It remains unclear to what extent they were animated by a genuine sense of unfairness and to what

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

extent they were animated by additional factors, such as anger arising out of personal conflict with the reported individuals, whether in the UK, Iran, or Bangladesh.

Some of the case studies described in a 2014 report of the UK Independent Chief Inspector of Borders and Immigration on the workings of the Home Office's Intelligence Management System also suggest deeply personal and socially embedded contexts of reporting. One case study described in the evaluation report pertains to an instance of reporting where the reporter informed the authorities about another person's marriage-breakdown, which effectively eliminated that person's only legal means for staying in the UK. It is not clear whether the reporter was the partner of the broken marriage or someone else, but the knowledge of marital affairs suggests a degree of intimacy that goes beyond superficial suspicion. Another case study pertained to a report that an individual had overstayed their expired UK visa for 6 years. Yet another allegation suggested that an individual had applied for a visit visa from India, but that their intention was actually to stay in the UK. The authors of the evaluation report lamented that the Home Office did not react in time, thus failing to prevent the issuance of the visa to the said individual (see also Barrett 2013).

All of these cases suggest that reporting is not only about governance, but also, if not most importantly, about intimacy and the constitution of social relations vis-à-vis reporting as an increasingly prominent tool of governance in liberal regimes of securitized freedom. It is therefore crucial to study the socialities assumed and produced by contemporary security regimes in order to understand what collective futures inhere in the present.

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

### **Surveillance and social relations in the political space of Europe**

In the course of re-bordering Latvia as part of re-bordering Europe, bordering is distributed in the political space (Balibar 2002). The emergence of reporting as a mechanism for migration control is part of this re-distribution of bordering. However, reporting is not just a technology of surveillance through which the state regulates migration. It is a practice embedded in and productive of social relations, thereby complicating the juxtaposition between the state's mechanisms of surveillance and "ordinary people". For example, in his call for fostering of critical "security anthropology", Daniel Goldstein (2010) invites attention to how non-state actors understand and inhabit the security turn. Drawing on his own work in Latin America, Goldstein illustrates how people are taking up wartime security by forming vigilante groups. In a similar vein, Haniel Shapira (2013) has recently written an ethnography of Minutemen—a group of men, mostly of military background, who have become citizen vigilantes "waiting for José" on the US-Mexican border. Furthermore, in his analysis of policing methamphetamine production and use in a Virginia locality, William Garriott (2013) shows how policing is distributed within the local community. People are asked to contact police when they encounter suspicious objects or behavior. On many occasions, it turns out that socially embedded knowledge is superior for policing than intelligence produced by the state bureaucracy. On some occasions, community involvement leads to lethal violence, as was the case in a Florida neighborhood watch. In 2012, George Zimmerman—a neighborhood watch coordinator of the Retreat in Twin Lakes community in Sanford, Florida—shot Trayvon Martin—an African American teenager after an altercation between the two. Zimmerman had initially approached Trayvon Martin, for he thought that the boy looked suspicious wearing a hoody. This and similar instances of community vigilance suggest that the poor, the racially marginalized, and

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

migrants—actual or suspected—are primary targets of policing in polities where responsibility for security is distributed in the population. It is not the state as a clearly delineated entity that exercises power upon bodies. Rather, power in regimes of “securitized freedom” is exercised through socialities of surveillance where individuals and communities are engaged in watching each other for signs of threat, which more often than not take the form of racialized poverty or migration. In other words, there is a social dynamic to surveillance that is entangled with the state, but not single-handedly produced by it. The act of reporting, thus, can serve as a lens through which to examine socialities of liberal security regimes and the political openings or closures they entail.

The Latvian and UK institutions that invite reporting by members of the public, such as the Latvian State Border Guard and the UK Home Office, assume that individuals who report are socially embedded, have friends, family, partake in community life, love, hate and argue, all of which can become fruitful grounds for reporting. These social relations, however, are not of explicit concern to the institutions. In contrast, as suggested by Katherine Verdery (2014), the Romanian socialist security apparatus was very much concerned not only with the information received, but also with the social relations disrupted or cultivated through reporting. On the basis of analysis of her *Securitate* file composed during her fieldwork in Romania since the 1970s, which she retrieved from the archives of the Romanian security agency, Verdery suggests that the *Securitate* did not only aim to obtain useful information for the state, but also worked upon social relations through the mechanism of reporting. Verdery argues that, contrary to Western conceptions of liberal autonomous subjects, Romanian security apparatus worked with conceptions of socially embedded subjects. She describes the case of her friend Mariana who had been recruited by *Securitate* to inform on her. Mariana had reluctantly agreed when approached,



*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

thinking that that she would at least be able to protect Verdery by providing what she thought was irrelevant information to *Securitate* officers. However, Mariana also suffered, for she could not talk about this with anyone. Verdery writes: "Her relation with her officer introduced a deceitful relation to herself, one she has trouble acknowledging even now, telling me: I simply cannot think of myself as an informer'. In a sense, being an informer obscured her from herself." (2014: 179).

Verdery goes on to argue that the use of informers in Romania was parasitic on basic forms of social life, while pushing those forms in new directions to create socialist persons (2014: 196). The security apparatus took people's sociality to be dangerous and thus worked to disrupt it. Verdery suggests that the security apparatus intervened by changing persons through their relationships—if persons were the sum of their relationships, then changing their relationships changed them as well. For example, Verdery's file revealed that the security apparatus has tried to prevent her from seeing some people, while inserting others into her social circles. Security officers thus tried to disrupt her social relations by making her "the sum of theirs and not her relations".

Verdery's analysis illuminates an important distinction between modes of power in socialism and liberalism. Whereas the Romanian socialist regime considered that reformation of social relations was crucial for the making of proper socialist subjects, contemporary liberal regimes do not work on social relations the same way. That is, liberal regimes of securitized freedom do not aim to remake people's social networks in an invasive manner to create different future men and women, but it does not mean that they do not rely on social relations in governance. In other words, while liberal regimes of securitized freedom do not explicitly work on sociality, they do assume socially embedded persons by introducing the possibility of

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

resolving personal grievances or furthering self-interest vis-à-vis a punitive state apparatus. The UK government's Prevent Programme is a good illustration of the assumed social embeddedness of reporting individuals insofar as it invites Muslim women to report on male members of family planning to go fight with "jihadists" (Saul 2014). The state is appealing to women to prevent their family members from exposing themselves to danger by reporting to the state. The state furthers its anti-terrorism agenda, while the family prevents a possible loss of a family member. This scheme is based on the recognition that people will report for personal reasons rather than as disinterested good citizens in the name of public security. The women are assumed to be family and community members. They are asked to act as socially embedded individuals who know of the plans and intentions of their family members, but also as individuals who have a direct relationship to the state as citizens regardless of their legal citizenship status. In this case, the state-citizen relation is constituted through reporting. The subject assumed is thus socially embedded, but unable or unwilling to handle the issue at hand through social relations and networks and therefore in need of state intervention. Contemporary security regimes thus are not top-down machines of violence, but crucially depend on the subject that is socially embedded, yet able to distance from social relations and enter into a direct relationship with the state, even if for personal benefit.

There is too little data on the social relations assumed and constituted by contemporary practices of reporting, thus it is premature to authoritatively discuss the effects of socialities of surveillance on individuals and collectivities. However, as I reflect on modes of power at play in contemporary scenes of reporting in the concluding part of this chapter, I do suggest some avenues for thinking about what such effects may be.

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

### **Power, sociality, and political futures**

Katherine Verdery places the mode of power at work in socialist security regimes in a line of historical sequence that “runs from the very visible public executions witnessed by large crowds with which Foucault opened *Discipline and Punish*, on to the panopticon popularized by Bentham – where vision is concentrated in a single invisible observer at the center, with the observed citizen arrayed visibly around him – and hence to the socialist power, which places the observed citizen at the center, with multiple kinds of vigilant observers arrayed invisibly around him” (2014: 209). The question that I have tried to open in this chapter is what mode of power and associated socialities are conjured up by practices of co-surveillance and reporting in contemporary liberal democracies. How do such practices illuminate the current historical moment? What kind of power is at work when individuals are called upon not only to be responsible neoliberal subjects, but also to be responsible subjects of surveillance?

The aim of this chapter has been to suggest that it is worth paying attention to scenes of reporting to push further thinking about contemporary modes of power in Europe and in (neo)liberal regimes of governance more broadly. I have provisionally marked this mode of power as “securitized freedom”. I have tacked back and forth between historical analysis of former socialist regimes and reflections on scenes of reporting in the political space of Europe to cast light on some of the ways in which reporting matters today. There are, of course, important differences between the informing apparatus of socialist and liberal states. In addition to the assumption that liberal states govern in the name of freedom, whereas socialist states govern in the name of total (and violent) social transformation of society, there are also differences between the assumed subjects and objects of reporting. For example, whereas in the Soviet Union *everyone* could be considered under suspicion as a potential enemy of the state, in

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

contemporary Latvia and Britain it is mostly those who are perceived to be *foreigners or failed citizens* that are targeted by informing practices. Thus, even as everyone is supposed to watch everyone else or the public space in general for the sake of common good, contemporary regimes of securitized freedom mobilize a distinction between beneficiaries and objects of surveillance, which maps onto familiar and racialized distinctions between Europeans and their others. Moreover, Europeanness is not mapped solely onto foreigners, but also on citizens who can gain or lose "goodness" or Europeanness depending on their conduct in particular circumstances.

Importantly, the subject of reporting, that is, the person who reports, is not necessarily the beneficiary of regimes of securitized freedom. Despite the implicit appeal to "good citizens" in the state agencies' invitation to report, the reporters are not seen as "good citizens" in the actual scenes of reporting. In fact, as the cases reviewed suggest, it may not even be formal citizens who report on non-citizens. It could very well be migrants reporting on other migrants, because they find their situation unfair in comparison to the life of the people they are reporting. On the basis of insights from preliminary conversations with the authorities in Latvia, and from a review of the few reports received by the Migration Observatory, it seems that the reporter emerges as a marginal subject, seen by the authorities as possibly a poor, not very well educated person and someone easily swayed by emotion or lunar phases. It might be the case, then, that the state does not actually intend for the "good citizens" to report on non-citizens, but rather for the "failed citizens" or non-citizens to report on others like them (Anderson 2013). The effect is that denunciations are state-based tools through which the marginalized help to police themselves for the sake of security of the normative (neo)liberal subject—the beneficiary par excellence of securitized freedom. The normative (neo)liberal subject may or may not report, but this subject is most often complicit with regimes of securitized freedom by simply going on with life and by

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

taking surveillance to be a "fundamental social institution" that exists for his or her benefit (Graber 2014: 76).

Reporting is about modes of power and regimes of governance. Its distinctive feature as a tool of governance is that it simultaneously constitutes and undermines categorical distinctions. On the one hand, reporting draws often-racialized lines between citizens and foreigners, good citizens and failed citizens, and Europeans and non-Europeans. On the other hand, reporting undermines these categories insofar as those who report and those who are reported on cannot be easily categorized. While the calls for citizens to report and thus to protect borders or benefits resound as aimed at "good citizens", in reality it is "good citizens" reporting on other "good citizens", asylum seekers reporting on asylum seekers, migrants on migrants, and "failed citizens" on "failed citizens", as well as any combination thereof. It thus suggests that bordering and policing is done by everyone, while the beneficiaries of regimes of securitized freedom are few.

Reporting is also about sociality and political futures. If the social fabric cultivated in regimes of securitized freedom is one of co-surveillance and reporting, what kind of social and political formations is this producing? Where does one locate one's political interventions in conditions when policing is distributed within the population? For example, the raids undertaken by the UK Home Office, which brought my attention to practices of reporting in the first place, are often targeted by anti-raid activism. In a blog report on anger over raids in Brixton, Tim Dickens quotes a woman saying that "the Border Agency needs to know that if they are going to be conducting these kind of arrests in the community then the community will be watching." However, it seems important to recognize that the community had already been watching. Given that the Home Office cannot conduct speculative immigration checks and must have a reason to

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

act, they must have received or produced "intelligence." This raises the question of how one might conceive of a politics that takes into account the pervasive presence of the reporting subject who makes that phone call or writes that email to inform on "individuals living in their community?" The question is consequential indeed: what would it take to rework social relations in a way that would not propel people to sort out their personal or collective grievances by turning acquaintances, neighbors, strangers, and family members over to the punitive agencies of the state? Most importantly, how to connect scholarly and political interventions that examine or target regimes of governance increasingly based on reporting with interventions that examine and work upon the sociality produced by the emergence of a "denunciatory atmosphere"?

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

## References

Aitchison, Guy. 2010. "Help us stop 1,000 billion benefit scroungers." OpenDemocracy.com  
Available: <https://www.opendemocracy.net/ourkingdom/guy-aitchison/help-us-stop-£1000-billion-benefit-scroungers>

Anderson, Bridget. 2013. *Us and Them: The Dangerous Politics of Immigration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anderson, Bridget. 2012. "What does the 'Migrant' tell us about the (Good) Citizen?" Centre on Migration, Policy and Society Working Paper No. 94. Available:  
[https://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/fileadmin/files/Publications/working\\_papers/WP\\_2012/WP1294\\_Anderson.pdf](https://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/fileadmin/files/Publications/working_papers/WP_2012/WP1294_Anderson.pdf)

Balibar, Étienne. 2002. "What is a Border" and "The Borders of Europe." In *Politics and the Other Scene*. New York: Verso. Pp. 75-103.

Ball, Kirstie, Kevin Haggerty & David Lyon (eds). 2012. *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies*. London & New York: Routledge.

Barrett, David. 2013. "Home Office fails to investigate vast majority of tip-offs about illegal immigrants." *The Telegraph*, November 8.

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

Available: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/immigration/10434062/Home-Office-fails-to-investigate-vast-majority-of-tip-offs-about-illegal-immigrants.html>

BBC. 2011. David Cameron urges people to report illegal immigrants. October 10. Available: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-15235649>

Bigo, Didier. 2001. 'Migration and Security'. In *Controlling a New Migration World*, edited by Virginie Guiraudon & Christian Joppke, London: Routledge.

Boyer, Dominic & Alexei Yurchak. 2010. "American Stib: Or, What Late-Socialist Aesthetics of Parody Reveal about Contemporary Political Culture in the West." *Cultural Anthropology* 25(2): 179-222.

Burds, Jeffrey. 1996. "A Culture of Denunciation: Pesant Labor Migration and Religious Anathemization in Rural Russia, 1860-1905." *The Journal of Modern History* 68(4): 786-818.

Connolly, John. 1996. "The Uses of Volksgeimenschaft: Letters to the NSDAP Kreisleitung Eisanach, 1939-1940." *The Journal of Modern History* 68(4): 899-930.

De Genova, Nicholas (n.d.) "*The 'European' Question: Migration, Race and Postcoloniality in Europe*". Unpublished manuscript.



*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

De Genova, Nicholas. 2013. "Spectacles of Migrant 'Illegality': the scene of exclusion, the obscene of inclusion," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36(7): 1180-1198.

De Genova, Nicholas. 2011. "Spectacle of Security, Spectacle of Terror," in Feldman, Shelly, Charles Geisler & Gayatri A. Menon (eds). *Accumulating Insecurity: Violence and Dispossession in the Making of Everyday Life*. Athena: University of Georgia Press. Pp. 141-165.

Dickens, Tim. 2012. Anger Over Bordery Agency Raids in Brixton. BrixtonBlog:  
<http://www.brixtonblog.com/concerns-raised-over-brixton-border-agency-raids/6574>

Doty, Roxanne Lynn. 2001. "Desert Tracts: Statecraft in Remote Places." *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 26(4): 523-543.

Dzenovska, Dace. 2014. "Bordering Encounters Bordering Encounters, Sociality, and Distribution of the Ability to Live a Normal Life." *Social Anthropology* 22(3): 271-287.

Dzenovska, Dace. 2014 "Notes on power in scenes of denunciation." COMPAS blog, available:  
<http://compasoxfordblog.co.uk/2014/03/notes-on-power-in-scenes-of-denunciation/>

Dzenovska, Dace. 2013 "'We want to hear from you' (or how informing works in a liberal democracy)." COMPAS blog, available: <http://compasoxfordblog.co.uk/2013/04/we-want-to-hear-from-you-or-how-informing-works-in-a-liberal-democracy/>

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

Fassin, Didier. 2011. Enforcing Order: An Ethnography of Urban Policing. Polity.

Fitzpatrick, Sheila. 2005. *A Little Swine*. In London Review of Books 27(21): 3-6.

Fitzpatrick, Sheila. 1996. "Letters from Below: Soviet Letters of Denunciation of the 1930s." The Journal of Modern History 68(4): 831-866.

Fitzpatrick, Sheila & Robert Gellately. 1996. "Introduction to Practices of Denunciation in Modern European History." The Journal of Modern History 68(4): 747-767.

Follis, Karolina S. 2011. *Building Fortress Europe: The Polish-Ukrainian Frontier*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Garriott, William. 2013. "Policing Methamphetamine: Police Power and the War on Drugs in a Rural US Community." In Garriot, William (ed). Policing and Contemporary Governance: The Anthropology of Police in Practice. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. Pp. 53-78.

Gellately, Robert. 1996. "Denunciations in Twentieth-Century Germany: Aspects of Self-Policing in the Third Reich and the German Democratic Republic." The Journal of Modern History 68(4): 931-967.

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

Glaeser, Andreas. 2009. *Political epistemics: The secret police, the opposition, and the end of East German socialism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Goebbels, A.F.G., Nicholson, J.M., Walsh, K. & H. De Vries. 2008. "Teachers reporting on suspected child abuse and neglect: behavior and determinants." *Health Education Research* 23(6): 941-951.

Goldberg, David. 2009. *The Threat of Race: Reflections on Racial Neoliberalism*. Wiley Blackwell.

Goldstein, Daniel. 2010. "Towards a Critical Anthropology of Security." *Current Anthropology* 51(4): 487-517.

Graeber, David. 2014. "Anthropology and the rise of the professional-managerial class." *HAU: the Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 4(3): 73-88.

Haggerty, Kevin D. 2012. "Surveillance, crime and the police." In Ball, Kirstie, Kevin Haggerty & David Lyon (eds). *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies*. London & New York: Routledge. Pp. 235-243.

Hayes, Ben. 2012. "The surveillance-industrial complex." In Ball, Kirstie, Kevin Haggerty & David Lyon (eds). *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies*. London & New York: Routledge. Pp. 167-175.

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

Kozlov, Vladimir K. 1996. "Denunciation and Its Functions in Soviet Governance: A Study of Denunciations and Their Bureaucratic Handling from Soviet Police Archives, 1944-1953." *The Journal of Modern History* 68(4): 867-898.

Lease, Gary. 1996. "Denunciation as a Tool of Ecclesiastical Control: The Case of Roman Catholic Modernism." *Journal of Modern History* 68(4): 819-830.

Lucas, Colin. 1996. "The Theory and Practice in Denunciation in Revolutionary France." *Journal of Modern History* 68(4): 768-785.

Maguire, Mark. 2009. "The Birth of Biometric Security." *Anthropology Today* 25(2): 9-14.

Maguire, Mark. 2012. "Biopower, racialization and new security technology." *Social Identities* 18(5): 593-607.

Maguire, Mark, Catarina Frois & Nils Zurawski (eds). 2014. *The Anthropology of Security: Perspectives from the Frontline of Policing, Counter-Terrorism and Border Control*. Pluto Press.

Mitchell, Timothy. 1999. "Society, Economy, and the State Effect." In George Steinmetz ed. *State/Culture: State-Formation after the Cultural Turn*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 76-97.

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

Riles, Annelise. 2013. "Market Collaboration: Finance, Culture and Ethnography after Neoliberalism." Cornell Law Faculty Publications. Paper 665. Available: [http://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/facpub/665/?utm\\_source=scholarship.law.cornell.edu%2Ffacpub%2F665&utm\\_medium=PDF&utm\\_campaign=PDFCoverPages](http://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/facpub/665/?utm_source=scholarship.law.cornell.edu%2Ffacpub%2F665&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

Saul, Heather. 2014. "Syria crisis: UK police urge Muslim women to report relatives planning to join war." In The Independent, December 30, 2014. Available: <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/middle-east/syria-crisis-uk-police-urge-muslim-women-to-report-relatives-planning-to-join-war-9281100.html>

Schwell, Alexandra. 2014. "Compensating (In)security: Anthropological Perspectives on Internal Security." In Maguire, Mark, Catarina Frois & Nils Zurawski (eds). *The Anthropology of Security: Perspectives from the Frontline of Policing, Counter-Terrorism and Border Control*. Pluto Press. Pp. 83-103.

Shapira, Hariel. 2013. *Waiting for José: The Minutemen's Pursuit of America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Talsania, Krishna. 2012. "Are Sun readers ready to 'Beat the Cheat' armed with the facts?" In The Guardian. March 7. Available: <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2012/mar/07/sun-beat-the-cheat-benefits>

*Forthcoming in De Genova, Nicholas (ed). 2017. The Borders of "Europe": Autonomy of Migration, Tactics of Bordering. Durham: Duke University Press.*

Verdery, Katherine. 2014. *Secrets and Truths: Ethnography in the Archive of Romania's Secret Police*. Budapest: Central European University Press.

Vine, John. 2014. *An Inspection of the Intelligence Management System*. London: Independent Chief Inspector of Borders and Immigration. Available online:

<http://icinspector.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/An-inspection-of-the-Intelligence-Management-System-FINAL-WEB.pdf>

Vine, John. 2010. *Preventing and Detecting Immigration and Customs Offenses: A Thematic Inspection of How the UK Border Agency receives and uses intelligence*. Available online:

<http://icinspector.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/Preventing-and-detecting-immigration-and-customs-offences.pdf>

Wacquant, Loïc. 2010. "Crafting the Neoliberal State: Workfare, Prisonfare and Social Insecurity." *Sociological Forum* 25(2): 197-220.

Wacquant, Loïs. 2009. *Punishing the Poor: the Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity*. Durham: Duke.

Walters, William. 2010. "Migration and Security." In Burgess, Peter (ed). *The Handbook of New Security Studies*. London: Routledge. Pp. 217-228.