
Editorial

Ambra Formenti

CRIA-NOVA FCSH,
Edifício ID, FCSH-Nova, Av. Berna, 26,
Sala 3.09, 1069-061 Lisboa, Portugal
Email: ambra.formenti@gmail.com

Ines Hasselberg*

CRIA,
Edifício ID, FCSH-Nova, Av. Berna, 26,
Sala 3.09, 1069-061 Lisboa, Portugal
Email: ines.a.hasselberg@gmail.com
*Corresponding author

José Mapril

Department of Anthropology,
New University of Lisbon, Portugal
and
CRIA-NOVA FCSH,
Av. Berna, 26, Sala 3.09, 1069-061 Lisboa, Portugal
Email: jmapril@fcs.unl.pt

Francesco Vacchiano

Institute of Social Sciences,
University of Lisbon,
Av. Prof. Aníbal Bettencourt 9, 1600-189, Lisboa, Portugal
Email: francesco.vacchiano@ics.ulisboa.pt

Biographical notes: Ambra Formenti is a Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the Centre for Research in Anthropology (CRIA-NOVA FCSH). She completed her PhD in Anthropology at the ICS, University of Lisbon, with a thesis on the role of religion in the process of identity construction among Guinean Evangelical Christians in Lisbon. Her current research project explores the recent changes in migration patterns from Portugal to the UK, by comparing the re-migration of Guinean citizens and the new paths Portuguese emigration. Her research interests include mobility, labour and religion in Africa and in the African diaspora. Her work is published in international peer-reviewed journals such as *African Diaspora*, *Pentecostudies*, *Journal of Religion in Africa* and *Etnográfica*.

Ines Hasselberg is an associated researcher at the Centre for Research in Anthropology (CRIA). After completing her PhD in Anthropology at the University of Sussex, in 2013, she held a postdoctoral position at Centre for

Criminology at University of Oxford from 2013–2017. She has conducted extensive research on punishment, border control and family life. Her work is published in international peer-reviewed journals such as *Punishment and Society*, *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, *JEMS* and *Anthropology Today*. She is the author of award-winning *Enduring Uncertainty. Deportation, Punishment and Everyday Life* (Berghahn, 2016) and co-editor of *Deportation, Anxiety, Justice: New Ethnographic Perspectives* (Routledge, 2016).

José Mapril is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Anthropology-Universidade Nova de Lisboa and a senior researcher at CRIA-NOVA FCSH. Since the end of 2018, he is the coordinator of the executive committee of CRIA. His main research interests are transnationalism, migrations, subjectivities, cultural citizenship, Islam, Islamophobia and secularism, through multi-sited ethnographies in Portugal, Bangladesh and the UK. Currently, he develops a project on onward migration, life course and future among Bangladeshis in Europe and is also part of the HERA project 'HERILIGION', developing a research on heritage making and the place of Islam in Portugal.

Francesco Vacchiano is a Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of Social Sciences, University of Lisbon. He is an Anthropologist and Clinical Psychologist with interests in migration, medical and psychological anthropology, European borders and boundaries, bureaucracies and politics of citizenship, as well as societies and institutions in North Africa. He has been conducting research in Morocco, Tunisia and along the Mediterranean on contemporary human mobility and related policies and practices of inclusion/exclusion. He is a Principal Investigator of the project 'Globally sensitive: revolt, citizenship, and expectations for the future in North Africa', funded by Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (2015–2020).

1 Introduction

Despite its progressive introduction of new forms of mobility-based social classification, Portugal seldom features in border studies literature. Yet, it presents itself as an interesting case on many regards. As with other European cases, the national make-up of the migrant population in Portugal is both the result of the country's colonial and post-colonial relations and the product of its integration into the EU common space. Yet, its rhetoric, priorities and policies on migration set Portugal apart from its European counterparts.

This special issue brings together a collection of articles on diverse aspects of border-making in Portugal. The articles are the result of an international workshop that took place in Lisbon in 2017, and seek to frame the Portuguese case against the broader backdrop of European and North American border regimes (for a definition, see Berg and Ehin, 2006; Balibar, 2009; Vaughan-Williams, 2009; Tsianos and Karakayali, 2010; Vacchiano, 2013; Casas-Cortes et al., 2015; De Genova, 2016).

The papers reflect on border regimes not as apparatuses of migrants' exclusion, but as complex mechanisms of 'differential inclusion' according to hierarchical principles and social stratification (Mezzadra, 2006; Mezzadra and Neilson, 2013), enforced and contested by multiple actors who operate from a variety of social positions and locations in converging as well as diverging directions. Through this multi-layered and variegated

assemblage of procedures, well captured by the Foucaultian notion of *dispositif*, operations like categorising, sorting, measuring, diagnosing, detaining, deporting – or conversely, deciding to postpone or wholly eschew such actions – become licit, accepted and naturalised. This has been increasingly visible also in Portugal.

Being a country of emigration during most of the 20th century, in the 1980s Portugal underwent a remarkable ‘turnaround’ to immigration (King et al., 2000) – initially composed of workers hailing from the former Portuguese empire – fuelled by the economic growth that followed the entry of the country into the EU in 1986. Thenceforth, the gradual but relentless alignment of national immigration policies with the EU standards contributed to increase the impact of governmental action over people’s mobility and the proliferation of new categories of conditional citizenship moulded upon differential rights to stay and to move; what has been described in the literature as *denizenhsip* (Hammar, 1990).

Portugal, as other European countries, is currently witnessing a multiplication of borders, unassembled and recomposed throughout a variety of sites and locations, such as streets, neighbourhoods, the labour market, health services, prisons and detention centres, and the many state offices in which membership and nationality are certified and reasserted. In these locations, a combination of technological, legal, conceptual and administrative devices constitutes a complex system of social classification and control, which involves multiple actors and is ultimately aimed at determining the status of people within the postcolonial and neoliberal geography of citizenship. Such devices continuously produce moral and socio-legal dichotomies such as autochthone and foreigner, good and bad, legal and illegal, deserving and undeserving, useful and redundant, which often mirror and recreate the forms of racial and class segmentation established within the colonial situation (Mezzadra, 2006; Hage, 2016; Kalir, 2019).

As it has been largely acknowledged, these processes have intentional consequences with regards to the political economy and the place that certain segments of the population occupy in the labour market (De Genova, 2002; Mezzadra and Neilson, 2013). At the same time, they have a strong impact on the lives of migrants, generating specific experiences of marginality and exclusion on the one hand and, and forms of negotiation and resistance on the other.

Yet, unlike other EU countries, especially after the recent upsurge of neo-nationalism in Europe, Portugal constitutes a relevant case for comparison also for its markedly different way of presenting immigration, discussing its stakes and showcasing the national posture towards it. Portuguese institutions reiterate a narrative that presents the country as a welcoming place for immigrants owing to the overall good disposition of its society toward diversity, pluralism and tolerance. This narrative is reflected in the current political rhetoric of welcoming refugees, in contrast to most other European countries, despite – or on account of – more ambivalent views of the media and public opinion on the one hand, and the striking scarceness of resources made available for reception and social integration on the other (see Vacchiano and Challinor in this issue).

Portugal has also made rather limited use of detention and deportation as tools of border management, despite the large numbers of irregularised migrants in the country and a set of legal provisions that allow for their removal (see Matos and Esposito, this issue). Compared with other European countries, Portuguese immigration policy has been relatively tolerant towards irregular migration. In fact, despite new restrictive immigration laws that followed the ratification of the Schengen Agreement (1992),

migrants have continued to enter the country with temporary visas, overstaying with an irregular status and working in the informal economy (Peixoto et al., 2009). Some of them benefited from a series of regularisation programs, which were launched to face labour shortages in specific sectors (Carvalho, 2018). In Portugal, however, deportation can be a legal sanction inflicted as an accessory sentence to foreign-nationals convicted of criminal offences. That deportation is legally a form of punishment (as opposed to an administrative practice, as in most other jurisdictions) brings to the fore questions that intersect migration concerns with matters of punishment and deservedness to membership (Hasselberg, 2016; see also Gomes, this issue).

Notwithstanding its peripheral position in the European ‘southern borders’, Portugal has recently assumed a relevant role in the European system of border surveillance and regulation. The Portuguese state and the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA), located in Lisbon, emerged as new key actors in EU border control on 25 September 2018, when the first joint drone surveillance operation of Frontex, EMSA and Portuguese authorities was launched (Nowak, 2019). The operation, which tested the functionality of special drones equipped with technologies that can distinguish so-called ‘migrant vessels’ from other ships and boats, was a crucial step for the setup of the joint European information system for border surveillance (EUROSUR), a mechanism of information exchange among EU member states (on EU programs of border surveillance and data sharing, see Amelung and Machado in this issue). Moreover, with the involvement of Portuguese private companies in the production of these pilotless aircrafts, Portugal fully enters the ‘booming business of borders’ [Petitjean, (2019), p.117] that is profiting from the technological upgrading of European external borders (Lemberg-Pedersen, 2013; Csernaton, 2016; Hayes and Vermeulen, 2012).

With some of these themes in mind, contributions to this special issue address a variety of questions, from multiple perspectives and different disciplinary backgrounds. On the one hand, they place and contrast the Portuguese case studies within broader European and North American trends in border-making. In doing so, the authors reflect on lessons learnt and new directions in policy and practice, and on how these are perceived and experienced by different stakeholders.

On the other hand, the articles in this issue analyse different aspects of border-making in Portugal, against the backdrop of the ongoing Portuguese economic crisis and its associated austerity measures. The economic and social crisis that affected Portugal since 2010 has had important consequences for the implementation of border policies, the ways in which migrants are responding to border practices, and the reconfiguration of migration patterns. For many migrants planning to move to European countries in search of employment, Portugal is becoming a transit place, where they spend some years awaiting ‘papers’, i.e., the regularisation of their status, with which they may then continue their migration paths (Mapril, this issue). For them, Portugal becomes a ‘borderland’ (Balibar, 2009), “an extraordinary spatial-temporal zone where one waits to live” [Balibar, (2001), p.83].

2 The essays

This collection benefits from the contributions of several scholars from distinct disciplinary backgrounds including law, anthropology, criminology, psychology and sociology. The articles are empirically rich, analytically sound, and engaged with critical

studies in citizenship, belonging and border-making. They complement and speak to each other and together they work to provide a picture of border-making in Portugal. The last article, by Barak Kalir concludes this collection by bringing out, in a thought-provoking discussion, the key issues that emerged from the contributions here presented.

The articles of Francesco Vacchiano and Antónia Martin Barradas examine the asylum system in Portugal.

Francesco Vacchiano examines the asylum seekers' relocation scheme laid down in the framework of the European Agenda on Migration, which envisaged the transfer of almost 3,000 refugees from Italy and Greece to Portugal, following the so-called 'refugee crisis' of 2015. Building on long-term ethnographic research, Vacchiano analyses the implementation of the EU relocation program in Portugal and the ways in which its supposed beneficiaries responded. Engaging with the perspective of the asylum seekers and with the critical scholarship on border-making, the author concludes that a common outcome of the program has been a specific, subordinate inclusion within the Portuguese society, despite the humanitarian rhetoric with which it has been presented by Portuguese authorities. He proposes to revise the notion of 'emplacement' in order to give an account of the set of processes that, along with mobility disruption and containment, perform specific forms of life and subjectivity within the host society.

From a law and human rights standpoint, Antónia Martin Barradas analyses the revision procedure regarding the Portuguese asylum law, and which started at the end of 2013 to harmonise national law with the EU Dublin Regulation. The author argues that the revision procedure in Portugal resulted in a less favourable law for asylum seekers: it changed the legal categories to which people looking for international protection could be assigned to and the criteria allowing for the detention of immigrants were substantially enlarged.

Elizabeth Challinor draws on rich ethnographic material to discuss processes of categorisation. She shows how the imposition of 'border-generating categories' is made, negotiated and contested at the interface between refugees, asylum seekers and migrants, civil society, and state institutions and bureaucracies. Ethnographic data was collected in several sites in a northern Portuguese town, including the organisation and implementation of training activities promoted within the scope of a local integration plan, and bureaucratic encounters with state officials. Challinor illustrates how the relevance of an individual's legal status changes according to context, and how foreign-nationals respond to the attribution of shifting categories of difference.

In a similar way, José Mapril and Ambra Formenti apply the ethnographic gaze to the ways in which migrants experience the border in their everyday life. Mapril describes the perspectives and experiences of 'resident non-citizen' (Coutin, 2011) Bangladeshis, waiting for documents and regularisation in Portugal. Inspired by a phenomenological approach, the author illustrates how migrants perceive this waiting as a radical uncertainty about one's own future, especially in relation to life course projects. These perceptions can be interpreted through the concepts of 'border biographies' (Agier, 2015) and 'lives in limbo' (Mountz et al., 2002) – a recurrent trope in this special issue. Concurrently, Mapril argues that waiting is the outcome of the 'governmentalities of migrations' – including delayed and postponed decisions about visas, residence permits, etc. – through which border regimes produce certain types of subjectivities that imply experiences of waiting, suspension and liminality.

Ambra Formenti also explores the embodied dimensions of bordering processes, but by focusing on the case of Bissau-Guinean patients who arrive in Portugal under the terms of an international cooperation agreement on health. Especially, she uses the notion of ‘medical bordering’ to show how border devices are exercised on migrants’ bodies in hospitals, in order to test the truthfulness of their demands for care, and ultimately, the legitimacy of their stay in Portugal. Furthermore, the author analyses the impact of these practices on the lives of patients and their strategies to cope with them, in the light of contemporary debates on biopolitics and humanitarianism.

The articles by Silvia Gomes and by Raquel Matos and Francesca Esposito address the nexus of borders and incarceration from an intersectional perspective. Based on a qualitative study in Portuguese prisons, Gomes analyses the life trajectories of foreign male and female prisoners from PALOP (Portuguese-speaking African countries) and Eastern European countries. The author argues that the pathways to prison of foreign individuals must be connected with their objective living conditions, their identity intersections, as well as the role that the criminal justice system itself plays due to police corruption and special surveillance in certain social spaces. According to Gomes, the state creates borders of social vulnerability and reproduces social inequalities by creating different citizenship status for nationals and foreign-nationals, on the one hand, and targeting specific social groups who are perceived as social menaces, on the other. The result is the overrepresentation of foreigners and certain ethnic groups in the criminal justice system, and in particular, in prison.

Drawing on life histories of migrant women, Matos and Esposito explore how gender, migration and border control intersect in the lives of ten women interned in a Portuguese detention facility for immigrants. First, the authors show how gender plays a crucial role in women’s mobility, and how the lack of documents itself can be used as a control mechanism in intimate relationships. Second, they trace the processes through which undocumented migrant women are produced as subaltern subjectivities, who are exposed to conditions of insecurity, exploitation and violence, including on the part of the state, through detention and deportation, which reinforce gendered vulnerabilities. Yet, rather than depicting migrant women as passive victims, Matos and Esposito provide a portrait of mobile and precarious subjects (Butler, 2006), who are forced to navigate scenarios of violence, uncertainty, and instability, but who still struggle in search of a life worth living and exercise their agency accordingly.

The article of Nina Amelung and Helena Machado discusses the ambiguities of border surveillance in cross-border data exchange amongst EU member states. The authors use the concept of ‘bio-bordering’ to explore the modes of ordering biometric data applied in criminal investigation that have consequences for people of suspicion moving across nation-states’ borders. The authors focus on the Prüm system, designed for the transnational exchange of DNA data for forensic and police use, to illustrate the tensions that derive from contradictory bio-bordering dynamics: EU attempts of making borders permeable for effective and expansive data flows in the name of increased security and the control of selected people’s mobility, on the one hand; and member states efforts to enforce their territorial borders with logics that serve their citizens, on the other. Amelung and Machado take the Portuguese case as an example of how national arrangements can result in the latent re-bordering of bio-borders.

Acknowledgements

This special issue stems from a workshop we convened called *Bordering: A View from Portugal*, which took place at the Universidade Nova de Lisboa in 2017. The workshop was a joint organisation of the Center for Research in Anthropology (CRIA, NOVA University), Institute of Social Sciences from University of Lisbon, Minho University and Border Criminologies network. It was partly funded by the Portuguese Science Foundation (CRIA/ANT/04038/2013). We would like to thank all those who participated in the workshop; we have no doubt that the discussion held there have informed the revision of articles. We are grateful to the editorial staff of the *International Journal of Migration and Border Studies* for their support in bringing this collection to publication. We also want to thank all of the anonymous peer-reviewers who gave their time and expertise to comment of earlier drafts of the papers presented here; the special issue has greatly contributed from their input. We are grateful to Barak Kalir, who provided the keynote speech for the workshop and a contribution to this special issue, and has been greatly supportive of this project from the start.

Ambra Formenti's contribution to the special issue was funded by the Portuguese Science Foundation, under the strategic plan of the Centre for Research in Anthropology (CRIA) (UID/ANT/04038/2013). Ines Hasselberg's contribution was supported by the Portuguese Science Foundation (Grant SFRH/BPD/118075/2016). José Mapril's research was funded by the Portuguese Science Foundation within the strategic plan of CRIA – Centre for Research in Anthropology (UID/ANT/04038/2019). Francesco Vacchiano was supported by a position 'FCT Investigator' (2015–2020) and the exploratory project IF/01002/2014/CP1239/CT0003, both funded by the Portuguese Science Foundation.

References

- Agier, M. (2015) *Migrações, Descentramento e Cosmopolitismo: Uma Antropologia das Fronteiras*, Unesp, São Paulo.
- Balibar, É. (2001) *Nous citoyens d'Europe? Les frontières, l'État, le peuple*, La Découverte, Paris.
- Balibar, E. (2009) 'Europe as borderland', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp.190–215.
- Berg, E. and Ehin, P. (2006) 'What kind of border regime is in the making? Towards a differentiated and uneven border strategy', *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 41, No. 1, pp.53–71.
- Butler, J. (2006) *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*, Verso, London; New York.
- Carvalho, J. (2018) '“Bringing the state back in”: a political economy analysis of Portuguese immigration policy', *Mediterranean Politics*, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp.501–521.
- Casas-Cortés, M., Cobarrubias, S., De Genova, N., Garelli, G., Grappi, G., Heller, C., Hess, S., Kasperek, B., Mezzadra, S., Neilson, B., Peano, I., Pezzani, L., Pickles, J., Rahola, F., Riedner, L., Scheel, S. and Tazzioli, M. (2015) 'New keywords: migration and borders', *Cultural Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp.55–87.
- Coutin, S. (2011) 'The rights of non-citizens in the United States', *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp.2289–2308.
- Csernatonì, R. (2016) *High-tech Fortress Europe: Frontex and the Dronization of Border Management* [online] <https://www.europeanpublicaffairs.eu/high-tech-fortress-europe-frontex-and-the-dronization-of-border-management/> (accessed 12 September 2019).

- De Genova, N.P. (2002) 'Migrant 'illegality' and deportability in everyday life', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 31, No. 1, pp.419–447.
- De Genova, N.P. (2016) 'The 'crisis' of the European border regime: towards a Marxist theory of borders', *International Socialism*, Vol. 150, pp.31–54.
- Hage, G. (2016) 'État de siège: a dying domesticating colonialism?', *American Ethnologist*, Vol. 43, pp.38–49 [online] <https://doi.org/10.1111/amet.12261>.
- Hammar, T. (1990) *Democracy and the Nation State: Aliens, Denizens, and Citizens in a World of International Migration*, Avebury, Aldershot.
- Hasselberg, I. (2016) *Enduring Uncertainty: Deportation, Punishment and Everyday Life*, Berghahn, Oxford.
- Hayes, B. and Vermeulen, M. (2012) *The EU's New Border Surveillance Initiatives*, Heinrich Böll Foundation, Berlin.
- Kalir, B. (2019) 'Departheid: the Draconian governance of illegalized migrants in western states', *Conflict and Society*, Vol. 5, pp.1–22 [online] <https://doi.org/10.3167/arcs.2019.050102>.
- King, R., Lazaridis, G. and Tsardanidis, C. (Eds.) (2000) *Eldorado or Fortress? Migration in Southern Europe*, Macmillan Press, London.
- Lemberg-Pedersen, M. (2013) 'Private security companies and the European borderscapes', in Gammeltoft-Hansen, T. and Sorensen, N.N. (Eds.): *The Migration Industry and the Commercialization of International Migration*, pp.170–190, Routledge, London.
- Mezzadra, S. (2006) 'Citizen and subject: a postcolonial constitution for the European Union?', *Situations: Project of the Radical Imagination*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp.31–42.
- Mezzadra, S. and Neilson, B. (2013) *Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor*, Duke University Press, Durham.
- Mountz, A. et al. (2002) 'Lives in limbo: temporary protected status and immigrant identities', *Global Networks*, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp.335–356.
- Nowak, J. (2019) *Drone Surveillance Operations in the Mediterranean: The Central Role of the Portuguese Economy and State in EU Border Control* [online] <https://www.law.ox.ac.uk/research-subject-groups/centre-criminology/centreborder-criminologies/blog/2019/02/drone> (accessed 12 September 2019).
- Peixoto, J., Sabino, C. and Abreu, A. (2009) 'Immigration policies in Portugal: limits and compromise in the quest for regulation', *European Journal of Migration and Law*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp.179–197.
- Petitjean, O. (2019) 'The booming business of borders', in *Beyond Borders, The Passerelle Collection*, Vol. 19, No. 3, pp.117–121.
- Tsianos, V. and Karakayali, S. (2010) 'Transnational migration and the emergence of the European border regime: an ethnographic analysis', *European Journal of Social Theory*, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp.373–387.
- Vacchiano, F. (2013) 'Fencing in the south: the Gibraltar area as a paradigm of the new border regime in the Mediterranean', *Journal of Mediterranean Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp.337–364.
- Vaughan-Williams, N. (2009) 'The generalised bio-political border? Re-conceptualising the limits of sovereign power', *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 4, pp.729–749.