

Social work with borders: bordering technologies and human rights

Farmer, Natalia

Published in:

The Routledge Handbook of International Critical Social Work: New Perspectives and Agendas

Publication date:

2022

Document Version

Author accepted manuscript

[Link to publication in ResearchOnline](#)

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Farmer, N 2022, Social work with borders: bordering technologies and human rights. in SA Webb (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of International Critical Social Work: New Perspectives and Agendas*. Routledge International Handbooks, Routledge , Oxon.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please view our takedown policy at <https://edshare.gcu.ac.uk/id/eprint/5179> for details of how to contact us.

Social work with borders: Safeguarding data and the challenges of technological bordering practices in relation to human rights

Natalia Farmer

Introduction

In 2014, the BBC current affairs programme, *Panorama* revealed that systematic cheating had occurred at some colleges in the UK where overseas students were required to take the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) as part of their visa requirements. Following this, the UK Government, in their quest to create a ‘hostile environment’ for those they deemed to be living in the UK ‘illegally’, focused upon the issue of student visa fraud and asked the US-based company, Educational Testing Services (ETS) to further analyse completed tests.

However, due to an inaccurate algorithm within the voice recognition technology used to identify fraud in the verbal sections of the tests, as many as 34,000 international students were falsely accused of cheating, with 7000 of them wrongfully deported by the Home Office (Baynes, 2019). Such injustices may not be as exceptional as they seem in terms of technological software increasingly making decisions or predicting human behaviour. For example, recent research from the US has highlighted the widespread use of “racially biased” predictive policing algorithms used within law enforcement (Richardson, Schultz, & Crawford, 2019), alongside data analytics that profile and punish the poor under the guise of a more efficient and humane welfare state (Eubanks, 2018).

Considering these insights, this chapter aims to examine contemporary borders and border-making processes within the context of technological developments in global migration management. By drawing from the concept of “bordering” (Van Houtum & Van Naerssen, 2002), this chapter will focus upon the relationship between border technologies, human rights and social work. The significance of new technologies and their impact on migration is highlighted in the European Union (EU) funded project ‘iBorderCtrl’, which has encountered legal scrutiny over its proposed use of various technologies designed to enhance border security. Specifically, critics have raised concerns about the variety of technological border agents such as “AI facial recognition systems” (Begault, 2019) and “video lie detectors” (Breyer, 2021) that lack transparency and risk violating human rights. Consequently, this chapter will investigate the rise of border technologies in relation to migration management and utilise insights from Science and Technology Studies (STS) to explore the human and non-human interactions that manifest within global bordering regimes. A central concern involves exploring the impact that border technologies have upon the human rights of people on the move, alongside the implications for social work. In providing a contemporary example of border technology within statutory social work in the UK, it is hoped that pertinent questions will be raised that will enable us to consider how technologies are shaping practice, often in detrimental ways that create spaces complicit with unjust bordering regimes.

The ‘black-boxing’ of bordering technologies

Within the field of critical border studies, there are many debates surrounding various conceptual approaches when attempting to understand the complexity of bordering regimes. Central to such discussions typically identify Michel Foucault's concept of "biopolitics" as integral in comprehending governmentality post 9/11 through the proliferation of securitised border control techniques and the rise of the biometric border industry (Muller, 2010). Complementing this Foucauldian lens, the work of Giorgio Agamben (1998; 2005) is also utilised to build upon a biopolitical analysis of sovereignty to argue that certain forms of life are reduced to what he argues as "bare life", which is subject to a "state of exception" (Vaughan-Williams, 2015). In other words, biometric border technologies such as body scanners or facial recognition devices create new norms upon so-called "risky bodies" (Muller, 2010, p.11) who are routinely rendered as suspicious, or as Agamben argues, legitimately subject to exceptional spaces that aim to suspend rights through the wider securitisation agenda.

Conversely, some have highlighted the conceptual limitations within these approaches, such as the failure to comprehend how racialised bodies experience legal structures (Weheliye, 2014) or the insufficient approach towards addressing the intersections of sexism, racism, and colonialism that are inherently woven into the fabric of bordering regimes (Whitley, 2017). Others have demonstrated that contemporary biopolitical control encompasses more than fixed border spaces located at various state checkpoints such as airports or seaports. For instance, the intensification of securitising borders in relation to people on the move has been referred to as a "migration infrastructure" (Xiang & Lindquist, 2014), comprised of an entanglement of technology, institutions, and actors. Alternatively, Shachar's (2020) "shifting border" disrupts theorising the border as a static line, in physical terms such as walls, or fences. Instead, a new paradigm is

proposed that consists of borders characterised by biometric techniques that include digital surveillance tools equipped with the capacity to monitor people and their movements in novel ways. Similarly, Haggerty and Ericson's (2000) notion of the "surveillant assemblage" is often utilised to further understand the relationship between surveillance, security and bordering processes. By drawing from the philosophical works of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, Haggerty and Ericson theorise surveillance not as structured hierarchies, but as "flows" and "connections" of "other phenomena such as people, signs, chemicals, knowledge and institutions" (p. 608). Thus, providing a useful framework to analyse how shifting border regimes are developing to deploy a range of surveillance techniques and actors that increasingly rely upon new technologies.

These approaches are useful in highlighting the general unease of human migration and help to unpack contemporary biometric borders as diffusing securitised locations rather than fixed spaces. With this in mind, the specific aim in this chapter will draw from insights within STS that caution we have neglected the importance of non-human entities. While technologies such as information management systems are not necessarily new, they are what Haraway and Wolfe (2016) describe as "companion species" that have agency, and consequently we need to explore our interactions and alliances with them. Subsequently, this chapter will take up such concerns to analyse the complexity of contemporary non-human border regimes, "whether they be algorithms, security devices, or walls that prevent people from crossing borders" (Milivojevic, 2021, p. 10). To address this, the central analytical framework applied in this chapter draws from Actor-Network Theory (ANT), an approach created by Bruno Latour, Michael Callon and John Law. ANT has been widely utilised in many interdisciplinary fields, and the central premise

stresses the importance of an object-orientated perspective that shows the relational aspects between humans and non-humans within the social context. Latour (2005, p.72) highlights, objects are things that “might authorize, allow, afford, encourage, permit, suggest, influence, block, render possible, forbid, and so on.” This approach is useful when examining bordering regimes because it helps to further investigate and understand the impact of biometric technologies as powerful actors that are inseparable from our existence.

One specific concept from ANT will be utilised and involves Latour’s (2000) metaphor of the “black box”, or ‘black-boxing’ as a process that urges us to focus upon more than simply the input and output of technology. Latour cautions that as technology becomes ever more successful, the less we question the internal complexity and inner mechanisms which then become taken-for-granted practices. For Latour, his interest remains in the invisible:

“In STS, we study things that are entirely secret. I mean, not *explicitly* made secret, but just denied. Things that interest nobody and so no one pays any attention to them. I am more interested in that. People and fields which are *made* secret are, in a way, easier to reveal, because there is an operation of hiding! I am more interested in the fields which no one mentions – like technical projects – which are not especially ‘secret’, but are just hidden from view.” (Latour, 2016, p. 545)

In this sentiment, the principal objective of this chapter is expressed. That is, the interest being in the use of technological projects whose processes are concealed, ambiguous and opaque. As

Milivojevic (2021, p. 55) cautions in relation to digital technologies, the need to avoid “black-boxing” is crucial to “ensure that technology is not used as an excuse for human rights violations or further marginalisation of vulnerable populations.” Given that our contemporary era is increasingly characterised by the mining of data often used to increase the surveillance and monitoring of marginalised communities (Eubanks, 2018), the concept of “black-boxing” becomes an important tool when unpacking safeguards related to data privacy and security.

International biometric ‘bordering technologies’

The emergence of border security as a means of controlling people on the move has dominated the Global North’s migration context since as early as the 1990s, and as previously mentioned, since 9/11, the focus on security has resulted in a “global billion-dollar industry” (Olwig, Grünenberg, Møhl, & Simonsen, 2020). Given the political prioritisation of migration management, often framed through an ‘illegalised’ lens, biometric technology is now extensively deployed as a key intervention to regulate mobility and segregate the “legalised” from the “illegalised” (Milivojevic, 2021). International examples of such technologies are not hard to identify as countries seem to have “an almost obsessive preoccupation with where you are going and who you are” (Muller, 2010, p. 8). For example, EURODAC is an EU asylum database established in 2003 and operates as a tool to store biometric data such as fingerprints and facial images from those arriving in passport control (European Commission, 2021). Designed to identify “legitimate” travellers from “illegitimate” migrants (Olwig et al., 2020), EURODAC works in conjunction with Frontex, also known as the European Border and Coast Guard Agency who monitor border control at Europe’s external borders. Similarly, the US-Mexico border has

been subject to “border militarization” for several decades, resulting in the use of military-style equipment to support border enforcement and undermine the human rights of migrants attempting to cross borders (Dunn, 2021).

One of the most dominant examples of technological border security that has attracted attention is the use of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs), also commonly referred to as drones. Enforcing immobility through drones has been described as “surveillance from the sky” (Milivojevic, 2021) under the guise of crime prevention or, framed as humanitarian endeavours. However, this form of “dronisation of borders” (Csernaton, 2018) has faced criticism that suggests drone technology has not contributed towards rescue activities but is instead utilised to collect data about irregular migrants on the move (Marin, 2016). Burt and Frew (2020) offer an in-depth analysis demonstrating the extent of drone usage in relation to border control in many countries. They map out the use of military-style drones used to patrol national borders, highlighting how they are driven by a security paradigm that perceives people on the move as a security threat. For instance, the US has a long history of drone usage but more recently, the Department of Homeland Security’s Bureau of Customs and Border Protection (CBP) has used these devices in a law enforcement capacity to “search for the illegal transit of goods or people across the border” (Burt & Frew, 2020, p.7). Notably, their surveillance capabilities have come under criticism for being used to observe political activities, such as the 2020 Black Lives Matter protests following the murder of George Floyd by police officers. Similarly, Burt and Frew highlight the Australian Government’s “Operation Sovereign Borders”, which implements a “zero tolerance” policy intended to “stop the maritime arrivals of asylum seekers” (p. 44). Again, drone technology plays

an integral role within this border protection regime, with documented plans to spend \$1.3 billion on maritime surveillance technology in the form sea drones used to patrol coastal waters.

A second area that highlights the prolific use of bordering technologies as a central part of surveillance and control within migration management is what Milivojevic (2021) refers to as “smart borders” that utilise technological artefacts to “prevent people from crossing borders” (p. 10). This involves biometric technologies such as body scanners, facial recognition devices and fingerprint screening systems that require human interaction in order to implement security and mobility-regulating processes. Importantly, Milivojevic argues, any “thing-human alliance” (p. 10), has the capacity to alter agency within decision-making processes and increasingly draws humans into assistant border guards in a variety of settings. For instance, while the biometric age assessments of unaccompanied minors seeking asylum have been a source of controversy in Europe due to the use of DNA, bone and teeth analysis (Ellingham & Adserias-Garriga, 2019), new forms of biometric technology are emerging. The below excerpt taken from interviews conducted by Madianou (2019, p. 582) with Syrian refugees demonstrates the increased entanglement between new technologies and human interactions:

“A few times a month, Bassam pushes a shopping cart through the aisles of a grocery store stocked with bags of rice, a small selection of fresh vegetables, and other staples. [...] The Tazweed Supermarket, where he’s shopping, is on the periphery of a 75,000-person refugee camp in the semi-arid Jordanian steppe, six and a half miles from the Syrian border. At the checkout counter, a cashier tallies the total, but Bassam doesn’t pay with cash or a credit card. Instead, he lifts his

head to a black box and gazes into the mirror and camera at its center. A moment later, an image of Bassam's eye flashes on the cashier's screen. Bassam collects his receipt—which reads “EyePay” and “World Food Programme Building Blocks” across the top—and walks out into the noonday chaos of the Zaatari refugee camp.” —Juskalian (2018).

In this example, iris scanning technology is combined with human interaction as part of the United Nation's World Food Programme (WFP). Not only does this technology verify a digital identity within the wider UNHCR database and function as currency for food distribution, but it also shows the wider trend towards utilising digital technologies not only within state-operated locations but also within humanitarian agencies, further increasing already entrenched power inequalities (Madianou, 2019).

Databases are another key feature within border control technologies that operate as essential actors because, as Olwig et al. (2020) argues, “without good databases, there is no material from which to develop technologies” (p.41). As previously mentioned, EURODAC operates in the EU as a database to store the biometric data of asylum seekers. However, recent developments have included the integration of six existing EU databases into one central information system in order to “prevent and combat illegal immigration” (Blasi Casagran, 2021, p. 433). After exploring the impact of this amalgamation, Blasi Casagran argues that the exchange and use of information within the database raises crucial questions concerning privacy and data protection, alongside “blurring the boundaries between immigration and criminal law” (p. 456). Describing the EU as

a “Security Union”, it is suggested that the interoperability between the databases do nothing other than prioritise security over human rights, which has a disproportionate impact upon migrants and asylum seekers. Similarly, in the US, Customs and Border Protection (CBP) have invested significant amounts of money into their border control and the use of databases is a significant feature. According to Coulthart and Riccucci (2021) the US Government has extensively utilised big data for its risk assessment and migration strategy by operating computer algorithms to inspect and determine the risk of travellers. Once information is extracted, data is then operationalised as a framework that enables border agents to “determine the level of sanctions to apply to illegal border crossers” (p. 2) when implementing enforcement actions. We will return to the implications of databases shortly, in a social work capacity, but for now, what we see here are examples that demonstrate how data and algorithms are being used in ways that raise concerns about how information is being gathered and exchanged and for what purposes.

Safeguarding human rights

Within the context of migration control, the violation of human rights globally in relation to refugees, asylums seekers, migrants are an extensively researched area (Digidiki & Bhabha, 2020; Nethery & Holman, 2016). While an overview of the historical origins of human rights is beyond this chapter’s scope, it is worth noting that human rights discourse continues to be the subject of philosophical debate. In this section of the chapter, in keeping with Latour’s interest in processes “hidden from view”, the focus is less upon well-documented human rights abuses such as indefinite detention or family separations, but instead, more emphasis is placed upon the mundane details of border technology violations that are perhaps overlooked. In terms of legal

frameworks, the International Bill of Human Rights provides the foundation and includes the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) statement that “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights” (United National Assembly, 1948, p. 131). When considering the implications of border technologies, principles and values such as the right to privacy and freedom from discrimination are areas of concern that legal scholars have raised (Molnar, 2020), which warrants further scrutiny.

Firstly, the right to privacy is articulated within Article 12 of the UDHR, and as highlighted by Blasi Casagran (2021), the merging of six European security and border management databases into one central system poses specific privacy and data protection concerns. This relates to safeguards outlined under General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) that specify principles of fairness and transparency. In particular, Blasi Casagran questions the impartiality of the one system and cautions that it may result in the “unfair processing of data” (p. 444) due to an increase in the number of unidentified users such as those working within visa, customs, police, and judicial authorities who were previously not authorised. Moreover, in ethnographic research that documents the experiences of asylum seekers navigating biometric borders in Europe, Olwig et al. (2020) provide a stark account of the reality of privacy violations. In a case study that explores the impact of the EURODAC database, the privacy fears of a young Somali man at Italian border control is documented and in order to avoid his fingerprints being taken and stored into the database, which could potentially affect his asylum claim elsewhere, he burns his fingertips in desperation. Thus, speaking to Haggerty and Ericson’s (2000) previously mentioned “surveillant assemblage”, whereby we see the trade-off of one’s social rights, or in this case,

(physical body parts), in an impossible effort to escape the gaze and monitoring of border technologies that invade privacy and anonymity.

Secondly, freedom from discrimination is a fundamental aspect of the UDHR, set out within the principles of rights and freedoms in Article 2. However, in sharp contrast to this, in terms of the relationship between technology and poverty in the US, Eubanks (2018) argues that technological advances such as databases and algorithms, alongside the use of risk models within welfare settings have deepened inequality. In what she has termed the “digital poorhouse”, discrimination is endemic and she highlights that:

“People of colour, migrants, unpopular religious groups, sexual minorities, the poor, the other oppressed and exploited populations bear a much higher burden of monitoring and tracking than advantaged groups” (p. 6).

Crucially, in terms of discrimination, Browne (2015) reminds us of the importance of historical context to fully comprehend how racism is built into contemporary surveillance and biometric technology and argues that we must locate “blackness as a key site through which surveillance is practiced, narrated, and enacted” (p. 9). By drawing upon historical racialised injustices within the US, such as the notorious human branding practices that burned identification marks into the skin during the Atlantic slave trade, Browne asserts that the surveillance of bodies along racial lines is an ongoing social and political norm. Through the concept of “racialising surveillance”, understandings of discrimination and technology are developed to provide a deeper account of the legacies that continue to render certain bodies susceptible to digital discrimination. Research

from Olwig et al. (2020) is again useful to highlight how “racialising surveillance” manifests in reality. In case studies at Copenhagen Airport, discussions centre around the use of technologies to detect ‘illegal’ migrants. During interviews, interactions with technologies were problematised, with one border guard stating that “If I wasn’t a racist before, this work is turning me into one” (p. 93) in response to the profiling of particular facial profiles or skin colours that are deemed high risk.

Finally, alongside the importance of safeguarding human rights such as the right to privacy and freedom from discrimination, an additional aspect to consider involves inherent error and bias that occurs when using technological devices to collect, store and generate information.

Milivojevic (2018) cautions that issues of “garbage in-garbage out” (p. 30) can result in the use of inaccurate data to inform decision-making processes, with potentially devastating consequences that proliferate human rights violations, with little notion of fairness or equality. Similarly, a concern Eubanks (2018) also discovered during her research exploring automated eligibility processes within the welfare system in the US:

“Complex integrated databases collect their most personal information, with few safeguards for privacy or data security, while offering almost nothing in return. Predictive models and algorithms tag them as risky investments and problematic parents.” (p. 11)

Thus, many legal and ethical questions are posed in relation to the moral implications of such technologies, especially within marginalised communities whereby providing personal and

sensitive data is a prerequisite when attempting to access support services such as social work. Ultimately, as human interaction is increasingly being removed from technological processes, “ensuring transparency of algorithms, products and systems” and “enabling oversight by stakeholders such as civil society or individuals affected by algorithm-based decisions” (Eubanks, 2018, p. 55) becomes vital for accountability purposes. Or, as Asaro (2019) emphasises, what is needed is an “ethics of care” (p. 41) that ensures transparency over algorithms and data practices in relation to digital technologies.

Social work with borders

Given the numerous concerns raised within this chapter in relation to the relationship between border technologies and human rights violations, let us now divert our gaze in the direction of social work practice. To examine this connection, this section is focused upon one specific example of border technologies within statutory social work in the UK. Utilising qualitative data from PhD ethnographic research I conducted with family’s subject to immigration control (Farmer, 2018), the implications of a national Local Authority database used for those who are within the immigration system and have no recourse to public funds (NRPF) will be prioritised. NRPF is a legal condition within Section 115 of the Immigration Act and Asylum Act 1999 and prohibits individuals and families from accessing welfare benefits, social housing and homelessness assistance. Research has highlighted the many discriminatory consequences of this policy (Farmer, 2020; Jolly, 2018), yet no attention has investigated the technological

entanglements that are deeply embedded into social work practice. With this in mind, this section aims to demonstrate how border technology is now a powerful actor within the profession.

NRPF Connect is a database used to enhance communication between Local Authorities (LA) and the Home Office (HO). According to the NRPF Network (2021), NRPF Connect is used in 69 councils as an “immigration status checking, case-prioritisation, and case management solution for councils supporting people with no recourse to public funds”. Rationalised as a cost-saving tool intended to support best practice and effective service delivery, a key aspect of the database provides an exchange of information between the LA and HO and in some instances, cases are referred to HO “enforcement teams” (NRPF Network, 2021). In an NRPF Connect Local Authority User Guide, the increased relationship between UK immigration authorities and statutory social work departments is revealed, as social workers using the database are prompted to input key immigration details into the database, such as the outcome of asylum applications. Additionally, the manifestation of HO language is evident throughout the database with “crimigration” (Bhatia, 2020) terminology often mobilised such as “over-stayer”, “deception” and “enforcement action” (St Clair Miller, 2021 p. 18). While NRPF Connect is framed as a way to enhance service provision, improve data collection and save money, we also need to be mindful of how such technology operates as a powerful actor within border surveillance and control. As Eubanks (2018, p. 9) warns us, “technologies of poverty management are not neutral” and “cheerleaders of the new data regime rarely acknowledge the impacts of digital decision-making on poor and working-class people.”

Yet, survey results from Islington Council suggest that social workers are positive about using NRPF Connect for a variety of reasons. Alongside the cost-saving features of the database, users convey that they like the enhanced communication with the HO and the access to immigration history it provides. In contrast, some concerns highlighted issues of “inaccurate” and “insufficient” responses from the HO (Islington Council, 2021, p.4). However, in interviews conducted with research participants during Ph.D. research, the impact of such technology only served to undermine the trust and engagement between service users and social workers, who were seen as collaborating with the HO and complicit with immigration control (Farmer, 2018). For example, participants spoke of a Kafkaesque situation characterised by ambiguity and confusion when interacting with their social worker in relation to immigration details. In the below quote, a research participant describes his frustration about the lack of official documentation:

“They say no we didn’t say that; they never give you written anything. They are always gonna say we told our team leader. They never ever give any written anything. They will treat innocent people very badly. Because nobody knows what’s going on inside. Where is the proof?”

(Farmer, 2018, p. 159)

Insights such as this, alongside issues about the potential for inaccurate data raises crucial questions about the limitations of databases to police an already marginalised and racialised sector of society. Despite GDPR regulations, similar concerns have been raised by the public health community with the National Health Service (NHS) regarding the impact of patient data-

sharing for immigration enforcement through NHS Digital, another national data system. In qualitative interviews, Papegeorgiou, Wharton-Smith, Campos-Matos, and Ward (2020) concluded that sharing information for immigration purposes led to patient suspicion and mistrust and was considered a threat to the ethical principles of public health. With this in mind, transparency in social work practice about how service user data is being shared and for what purposes remain imperative questions to consider in relation to privacy, consent and confidentiality within the context of unjust bordering regimes.

Ultimately, the interplay between NRPF Connect and social workers further deepens what Olwig et al. (2020) refer to as “suspicious relations”, that emerge within the interactions between humans and border technologies. As survey results from Islington Council highlighted, social workers problematically viewed the database as a positive piece of technology, with little rigour scrutinising the potential consequences, as raised by the public health community within the NHS. Thus, we see social workers increasingly engage with technological infrastructures that make decisions about immigration eligibility, with less attention dedicated to tackling safeguards that ensure violations of privacy and issues of discrimination are not routine or normalised aspects of contemporary practice. Furthermore, as new technologies continue to develop that provide an “ethical distance” to “make inhuman choices” (Eubanks, 2018, p. 13), alongside ever-increasing surveillance of racialised communities, marginalised groups will continue to encounter unequal levels of digital scrutiny, surveillance and control that become ever more “difficult to challenge, redirect, or uproot” (p. 187). With this in mind, when it comes to border technologies, social work must critically examine what technological spaces are being created that risk being complicit with immigration bordering regimes.

Conclusion

Although social work has developed some specific emphasis on working with refugees, asylum seekers and migrant communities, there is little theoretical focus upon the study of borders and bordering regimes. With the exception of Guentner, Lukes, Stanton, Vollmer and Wilding (2016), who demonstrate how bordering practices are operationalised within UK welfare systems to strip migrants of social rights, there is a significant gap exploring the concept of “bordering”. Instead, we are left to draw from academic areas such as critical border studies, sociology, geography, political science, or race and ethnicity. Additionally, even more neglected are questions of border technologies and interactions between the human and non-human. As this chapter demonstrated, social work practice is entangled within immigration technology and we must question how this is shaping practice. As Eubanks (2018) cautions, “when a very efficient technology is deployed against a despised outgroup in the absence of strong human rights protections, there is enormous potential for atrocity” (p. 200). As a profession, this cannot be dismissed or ignored but addressed to ensure appropriate safeguards are implemented.

In the initial sections of this chapter, the concept of Latour’s (2000) “black-boxing” was introduced to encourage us to focus upon the taken-for-granted aspects of technological processes. Returning to this notion, what is evident within technological tools such as NRPF Connect is that in the absence of regulatory frameworks, they are developed and deployed in “black-boxes”, with little transparency or accountability that recognises their impact upon an

already marginalised and racialised community. Molnar (2020) stresses, often such technological experiments “do not consider the profound human rights ramifications and real impact on human lives” (p. 1). Consequently, it remains vital to recognise the deeply unequal power relations at the centre of border technologies. There must be a commitment within social work to address the inherent racism and discrimination embedded within migration management. Moreover, Molnar emphasises:

“Rather than developing more technology ‘for’ or ‘about’ communities on the move and collecting vast amounts of data to be fed into opaque processes, people who have themselves experienced displacement and movement should be steering discussions on when and how emerging technologies should be integrated into refugee camps, border security, or refugee hearings – if at all.” (p. 6)

This concluding statement is perhaps most pertinent to social work, with its value and ethical base rooted in ideals of service user voice and control. Uncomfortable conversations around the impact and accountability of border technologies upon practice must be had. This must include a focus upon our own complicity within the use of migration management technologies that serve to further deepen inequality and reproduce social injustices. We require a critical eye upon the impact of contemporary border technologies that can affect lives and violate human rights.

References

- Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Agamben, G. (2005). *State of Exception*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Asaro, P. M. (2019). AI ethics in predictive policing: From models of threat to an ethics of care. *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine*, 38(2), 40-53.
- Baynes, C. (2019). Government 'deported 7,000 foreign students after falsely accusing them of cheating in English language tests'. *The Independent*. Retrieved from <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/home-office-mistakenly-deported-thousands-foreign-students-cheating-language-tests-theresa-may-windrush-a8331906.html> [Accessed 23 Aug. 2021]
- Begault, L. (2019). Automated technologies at EU borders and the future of Fortress Europe. *Euronews*. Retrieved from https://www.euronews.com/2019/03/27/automated-technologies-at-eu-borders-and-the-future-of-fortress-europe-view?utm_medium=Social&utm_source=Facebook#Echobox=1553694747 [Accessed 23 Aug. 2021]
- Bhatia, M. (2020). Crimmigration, imprisonment and racist violence: Narratives of people seeking asylum in Great Britain. *Journal of Sociology*, 56(1), 36-52.
- Blasi Casagran, C. (2021). Fundamental Rights Implications of Interconnecting Migration and Policing Databases in the EU. *Human Rights Law Review*, 21(2), 433-457.
- Breyer, P. (2021). EU-funded technology violates fundamental rights. *about:intel, European Voices on Surveillance*. Retrieved from <https://aboutintel.eu/transparency-lawsuit-iborderctrl/> [Accessed 23 Aug. 2021]
- Browne, S. (2015). *Dark matters*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Burt, P., & Frew, J. (2020) *Crossing a Line: The Use of Drones to Control Borders*. Oxford: Drone Wars UK.
- Coulthart, S., & Riccucci, R. (2021). Improving Big Data Integration and Building a Data Culture for US Border Security. *Homeland Security Policy Paper*, 1-12. Harvard Kennedy School, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs.
- Csernaton, R. (2018). Constructing the EU's high-tech borders: FRONTEX and dual-use drones for border management. *European Security*, 27(2), 175-200.
- Digidiki, V., & Bhabha, J. (2020). EU migration pact fails to address human rights concerns in Lesbos, Greece. *Health and Human Rights*, 22(2), 291.
- Dunn, T. J. (2021). The militarization of the US-Mexico border in the twenty-first century and implications for human rights. In *Handbook on Human Security, Borders and Migration*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Ellingham, S., & Adserias-Garriga, J. (2019). Complexities and considerations of human age estimation. *Age Estimation*, 1-15.
- Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- European Commission (2021). Migration and Home Affairs. Identification of applicants (Eurodac). Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/asylum/identification-of-applicants_en [Accessed 24 Aug. 2021]
- Farmer, N. (2018). No controversy, no issue: The unfolding of 'no recourse to public funds' (NRPF) and insecure immigration status in social work. Glasgow Caledonian University, Glasgow, Scotland. Retrieved from <https://ethos.bl.uk/OrderDetails.do?uin=uk.bl.ethos.794884> [Accessed 23 Aug. 2021]

- Farmer, N. (2020). 'I Never Felt like an Illegal Immigrant Until Social Work Turned up at the Hospital': No Recourse to Public Funds as Necropolitical Exception. *The British Journal of Social Work*.
- Jolly, A. (2018). No recourse to social work? Statutory neglect, social exclusion and undocumented migrant families in the UK. *Social Inclusion*, 6(3), 190-200.
- Islington Council (2021). NRPF Connect. NRPF Connect Survey Results. Retrieved from <https://www.nrpfnetwork.org.uk/-/media/microsites/nrpf/documents/nrpf-connect/survey-results.pdf?la=en&hash=61692392A39B7A86E6782F69A5C3DFDA6B3F0335> [Accessed 23 Aug. 2021]
- Guentner, S., Lukes, S., Stanton, R., Vollmer, B. A., & Wilding, J. (2016). Bordering practices in the UK welfare system. *Critical Social Policy*, 36(3), 391-411.
- Haggerty, K. D., & Ericson, R. V. (2000). The surveillant assemblage. *The British journal of sociology*, 51(4), 605-622.
- Haraway, D. J., & Wolfe, C. (2016). » Companions in Conversation «. *Manifestly Haraway*, 201-296.
- Latour, B. (2000). Opening Pandora's Black Box. In I. McLoughlin, D. Preece & P. Dawson (Eds.), *Technology, organizations and innovation: Theories, concepts and paradigms* (pp. 679-697). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Latour, B. (2016). Bruno Latour encounters international relations: An Interview. Interview by M. B. Salter & W. Walters. In *Millennium Journal of International Studies*, 44(3), 524-546.

- Madianou, M. (2019). The biometric assemblage: Surveillance, experimentation, profit, and the measuring of refugee bodies. *Television & New Media*, 20(6), 581-599.
- Marin, L. (2016). The Humanitarian Drone and the Borders: Unveiling the Rationales Underlying the Deployment of Drones in Border Surveillance. In *The Future of Drone Use* (pp. 115-132). TMC Asser Press, The Hague.
- Milivojevic, S. (2021). *Crime and Punishment in the Future Internet: Digital Frontier Technologies and Criminology in the Twenty-first Century*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Molnar, P. (2020). *Technological Testing Grounds. Migration Management Experiments and Reflections from the Ground Up*. European Digital Rights and The Refugee Law Laboratory. Retrieved from <https://edri.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Technological-Testing-Grounds.pdf> [Accessed 24 Aug. 2021]
- Muller, B. (2010). *Security, Risk and the Biometric state: Governing Borders and Bodies*. London: Routledge.
- Nethery, A., & Holman, R. (2016). Secrecy and human rights abuse in Australia's offshore immigration detention centres. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 20(7), 1018-1038.
- St Clair Miller, H. (2021). NRPF Connect. No Recourse to Public Funds. Local Authority User Guide. Retrieved from <https://www.nrpfnetwork.org.uk/-/media/microsites/nrpf/documents/nrpf-connect/nrpf-connect-user-guide.pdf?la=en&hash=3E0476E742E07C2E266C9C38391D3D6CE3A883BF> [Accessed 23 Aug. 2021]
- Olwig, K. F., Grünenberg, K., Møhl, P., & Simonsen, A. (2020). *The Biometric Border World: Technologies, Bodies and Identities on the Move*. Abingdon: Routledge.

- Papageorgiou, V., Wharton-Smith, A., Campos-Matos, I., & Ward, H. (2020). Patient data-sharing for immigration enforcement: a qualitative study of healthcare providers in England. *BMJ open*, *10*(2), e033202.
- Richardson, R., Schultz, J. M., & Crawford, K. (2019). Dirty data, bad predictions: How civil rights violations impact police data, predictive policing systems, and justice. *New York University Law Review Online*, *94*, 15.
- Shachar, A. (2020). *The shifting border: Legal cartographies of migration and mobility*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- United Nations General Assembly (1948) Universal Declaration of Human Rights Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights> [Accessed 10 August. 2021]
- Van Houtum, H., & Van Naerssen, T. (2002). Bordering, ordering and othering. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*, *93*(2), 125-136.
- Weheliye, A. G. (2014). *Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Whitley, L. (2017) 'The disappearance of race: A critique of the use of Agamben in border and migration scholarship'. *Borderlands E-Journal*, *16* (1), 1–23.
- Xiang, B., & Lindquist, J. (2014). Migration infrastructure. *International migration review*, *48* (s1), 122-148.