



|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Title                  | EU国境地域における<境域>のポリティクス：欧州移民規制レジームの構築とチュニジア人難民                                    |
| Author(s)              | 南波, 慧   |
| Citation               | 境界研究, 7, 45-70  |
| Issue Date             | 2017-03-31  |
| DOI                    | 10.14943/jbr.7.45   |
| Doc URL                | <a href="http://hdl.handle.net/2115/65060">http://hdl.handle.net/2115/65060</a> |
| Type                   | bulletin (article)  |
| Additional Information | There are other files related to this item in HUSCAP. Check the above URL.      |
| File Information       | 07Summary_03Namba.pdf (英文要旨)  |



[Instructions for use](#)

generic group of people.

At the end of the seventeenth century, however, a notion was introduced to divide “the Portuguese” into two different groups: one considered to be more “European” and another less. In addition, a new name, the “White Town,” started to be applied to the walled quarter in the early eighteenth century, instead of “the Christian Town,” which had been used previously. This implies that the concept of the quarter was changing. Around this time, intensifying hostility with the French East India Company promulgated a perception in the English Company that associated “the Portuguese” with the Catholic French. Such changing conceptualizations of “the Portuguese” and of the walled quarter in Madras were significant factors behind the resolution to expel Catholic inhabitants from the White Town in 1749. This case demonstrates that the conceptualization of boundaries around a group of people could be dynamic in fluctuating social contexts.

## **Politics of « *Borderlands* » in the European Union: Construction of a European Immigration Control Regime and Tunisian Refugees after the Arab Spring**

NAMBA Satoru

The power of the nation-state is said to be in retreat in the face of globalization in the contemporary world, particularly associated with the remarkable role played by transnational economic actors within a global market economy. However, this “retreat of the state” has not been observed in all of the state’s functions. In particular, the nation-state continues to maintain exclusive control over areas relating to immigration policy. In controlling borders and the movement of people, each state draws on a complex border control regime based on interstate agreements for the purposes of controlling the movement of people across borders.

The first half of this paper will examine the specific functions of the European border regime that was put into place, in cooperation with various authoritarian North African states, before the events of the “Arab Spring.” This border regime had two aspects: the power to “let die” and deportation through readmission agreements.

In spite of the increasing ambiguity of borders between states, the nation-state continues to maintain a monopoly over the process for determining legitimate means of movement. Almost

---

all states within “EUrope”, have abolished passport controls based on the Schengen agreement. However, this has not meant the abolishment of all border controls. The European Union and member states have constructed control systems against immigration flows with strict control over “illegal” immigration across the EU’s external borders. As a result, irregular migrants, including refugees, have resorted to increasingly risky routes of passage. In the EUropean borderlands, over 2000 people lost their lives trying to enter the EU’s territory in 2011. Along with stricter immigration control policies, border guard agencies have increased the risks for citizens involved in rescuing migrants. Border related deaths are thus not a “natural” consequence of risky forms of migration, but are the result of the state’s power to “let die.”

Despite the risks involved, many refugees and irregular immigrants arrive in EUrope by crossing the Mediterranean. Although claiming to provide protection for refugees, EUrope was deporting those deemed to be “illegal immigrants” based on readmission agreements between EUrope and North African countries with authoritarian governments. This meant that those who may have qualified as refugees were deported to countries where they may suffer persecution. In exchange for co-operation in dealing with “illegal” immigration, EUrope tacitly supported human rights abuses carried out by these regimes.

The second half of this paper will cover EUrope’s response to Tunisian refugees. After the “Arab Spring,” many Tunisians fled the country due to political unrest and EUrope was their main destination. However, leaders in EUrope viewed this mass flow of migrants as “economic” immigrants and moved to securitize this flow of refugees. Italy was a major destination for Tunisians, and the Italian government lacked the capacity to deal with them appropriately. Although Italy called for cooperation between EU member states in dealing with the influx of migrants, the EU authorities failed to show leadership in handling the situation. In the absence of a EUropean response, the Berlusconi government issued temporary residence permits to the migrants, granting the refugees visa-free travel to many EUropean countries. In a major incident, refugees with permission to travel headed to France and were blocked from entering the country. The French government stopped a train carrying refugees from crossing the Franco-Italian border, in violation of the Schengen agreement. The Berlusconi government was outraged by these actions taken by the Sarkozy government because it was interpreted as a denial of Italian sovereignty. The European Commission failed to provide a solution to this conflict between France and Italy, and the deal these countries reached set a precedent for the suspension of the Schengen in similar cases.

Finally, this paper will show how EUrope is strengthening systems for managing and controlling immigration in its borderlands.