Ilya Novikov

THE VISA CURTAIN: THE PROBLEM
OF THE VISA REGIME BETWEEN
THE EU AND RUSSIA

University of Tampere

International School of Social Sciences

Department of Political Science and International Relations

NOVIKOV, ILYA: The Visa Curtain - The Problem Of The Visa Regime Between The EU And Russia

Master's Thesis, 70 pages, 6 appendices

International Politics

May 2009

The topic of the thesis is the issue of visa regime between the EU and Russia and its influence on relations between the partners. The visa regime prevents the smooth development of relations between the EU and Russia and its existence seems abnormal in the conditions of the proclaimed Strategic Partnership between the partners.

The author of the thesis argues that the visa regime between the EU and Russia is a consequence of securitization of certain threats on the territory of Russia by the EU media. The media are creating a fruitful background for securitization of Russian crime, poor public health situation, human trafficking problems and threat of terrorism, thereby justifying the use of extraordinary measures against these threats. The media discourse then turns into an official discourse where the problematic issues on the territory of Russia are finally securitized and named as threats. In consequence, visa regime with Russia seems to be a natural protective tool from the existential threats from its territory.

This process shows that the EU is viewing Russia as a threat, using the old model of attitude towards Russia – as a dangerous neighbour. Certainly such practices contradict with the declarations of Strategic Partnership.

The author suggests that for true Strategic Partnership the EU needs to change the model through which it perceives of Russia. Russia should not be seen as a threat, but as an equal partner.

The methodology of the research is based on the analysis of European media discourse, where the roots of fear of Russian threats (the roots of securitization) can be traced. The methodology is the Theory of speech acts and Rhetoric Analysis.

Contents

1. Introduction

In this thesis I will study the relations between Russia and the EU, and namely the issue of visa-free travel between the European Union and Russia.

The relations between the EU and Russia are of great importance for both sides, as these relations can influence the destiny of the whole European continent. The relations in subject can provide mutual benefits for partners in different spheres of cooperation. The relations between the EU and Russia are developing in accordance with the broad concept of "Strategic Partnership" and are regulated by a number of treaties which set the objectives of relations and describe ways of cooperation in spheres of mutual interest. At the moment Strategic Partnership is being implemented on the basis of a concept of four Common Spaces: Common Economic Space; Common Space of Freedom, Security and Justice; Common Space of External Security and Common Space of Research and Education Including Cultural Aspects.

One of the proclaimed goals of the Common space of Freedom, Security and Justice is building of Europe without the dividing lines, entailing the visa-free travel agreement: "Enhanced cooperation in the field of Justice and Home affairs including on border management and migration issues, will serve the objective of building a new Europe without dividing lines, thus facilitating travel between all Europeans[1]".

Of great importance is the question of visa facilitation and abolishment as it will make the relations between the EU and Russia more intensive and will considerably contribute to the development of relations between partners.

Still, despite the mottoes of "Strategic Partnership", the parties cannot find a way to implement a visa-free travel regime between the EU and Russia. The main question for the thesis is "*Why cannot the sides come to an agreement on visa-free travel*?"

In my research I will follow the logic of Iver B. Neuman's book[2] and try to find out whether Europe (despite the concept of Strategic partnership) continues to use the logic of the Other in relations with Russia - a model which helps Europe to strengthen its own identity through

---

[1] *Road Map For The Common Space Of Freedom, Security And Justice.* P. 21. [WWW document]
[2] Neumann, Iver B. (1999).

making Other of Russia. I will demonstrate that visa regime is used as a tool in the process of "othering" of Russia, and despite the concept of Strategic Partnership, Europe is putting obstacles on Russia's way to the integration into Europe.

1.1. Background to the research problem

Throughout its history Russia has been comparing itself with Europe. Russia has been formulating its values on the basis of Europe's example, Europe's pattern of development. Europe was a role model with which Russia used to compare its identity, economy, culture and political system. Historically, there are more European than Asian features in Russia, both in culture and economy. It is possible to say that the dialogue between Russia and Europe has been developing for a number of centuries.

The contemporary political dialogue between the EU and Russia has been developing since 1994. The first stage was the signing of the "EU-Russia Partnership and Cooperation Agreement" in 1994. It was presented as the keystone of a new strategic approach of the European Union towards Russia. This treaty included measures that could approach Russia to European economic, legislative and trade standards.

The next stage was EU's "Common Strategy towards Russia"[1]. It was presented as complementary to the "Partnership and Cooperation Treaty"[2], but not replacing the latter. In a few months after the adoption of EU's Common Strategy towards Russia, Russia adopted its own medium-term strategy towards the European Union. In this document the wording of the Common Strategy of the EU was generally accepted, but Russia added an emphasis that it presents itself as an equal partner, who claims to be taken seriously as the primary trade partner of the EU and as the biggest, most influential and leading member of the Commonwealth of Independent States.

The crucial point in the EU-Russia relations was the 12th EU-Russia Summit, where a new pattern of cooperation was worked out. During the St. Petersburg Summit in May 2003, a decision was taken to implement the concept of *"Four common spaces"*[3]. This decision shows the will of the parties to begin a positively new stage in relations that provides for the higher level of integration.

---

[1] EU's Common Strategy towards Russia [WWW document]
[2] Partnership and Cooperation Treaty [WWW document]
[3] Joint statement regarding "Four common spaces". [WWW document]

The development of a common space of freedom, security and justice includes measures to enhance the movement of people between the EU and Russia and vice versa. It is remarkable that the sides also agreed at the Summit to examine conditions for visa-free travel as a long-term perspective.

A visa-free arrangement is a long-term project. At the moment the EU and Russia agree that the focus in current discussions on visa issues should be on making better use of existing visa measures more flexible, on a reciprocal basis, in order to make it easier to obtain a visa and, thus, to travel between the EU and Russia and vice versa. This approach was confirmed at the EU-Russia Summit on the 6-th of November in Rome, which agreed that priority should be given to look at the "existing flexibilities within the EU Schengen system, in order to facilitate travel in the short term and on a reciprocal basis"[1] and that expert level discussions on this should be held.

First informal discussions on visa facilitation were held in Brussels on the 13-th of October 2003. At the Rome Summit, leaders agreed to pursue this dialogue. It is understood that any visa facilitation eventually agreed upon will be implemented on a strictly reciprocal basis. From the perspective of the EU it is very important, in order to advance the visa facilitation discussions, to conclude as soon as possible a readmission agreement, which would allow for the speedy return of illegal migrants, on a reciprocal basis, who can be proven to have travelled from either Russia to an EU Member State or vice versa. Such an agreement would represent an important element of cooperation between the EU and Russia in the area of illegal migration and trafficking in human beings[2].

Meeting in Sochi on May 25, 2006, Russia and the EU reached two agreements, one on visa facilitation[3], and the other on readmissions[4]. The Visa Facilitation agreement makes it easier for some categories of people who need to travel frequently to obtain single and multiple entry short term visas. These categories include businessmen, journalists, people taking part in sporting or cultural events, or officials participating in government activities (11 categories overall). Diplomatic passport holders are not required to have visas when entering, leaving and transiting through the territories of the Member States or the Russian Federation. All people applying for a

---

[1] *Results of the EU-Russia Summit in Rome* [WWW document]
[2] In accordance with "*Visa regime*". See: [WWW document] <http://www.delrus.cec.eu.int/ru/cis_4.htm> Date of access: 14.03.2006.
[3] *Visa facilitation agreement between the EU and Russia*. [WWW document]
[4] *Readmission agreement between the EU and Russia.* [WWW document]

visa will benefit from the new visa fee: 35 euro both for visas for visitors to Russia and for visitors to EU Member States.

No doubt, that such agreement can be viewed as a solid step towards the visa-free travel agreement, but the number of people matching the categories mentioned above cannot be compared with the number of people who still have to go through all procedures required for granting access to the EU.

But experts believe that "A closer look at the visa facilitation agreement reveals that it is a weak response to the real needs of ordinary people wanting to cross the border"[1]. The requirement to possess a personal invitation from a Russian citizen or a citizen of the EU remains and ordinary tourists will not benefit. It is also true that foreigners in Russia are obliged to get registered within three days from arrival. These conditions can be viewed as major obstacles to people-to-people contacts.

At the same time visa requirements at the embassies and consulates of certain countries - members of the EU - are strengthened. For instance, to get a German visa, one has to submit a new extended list of documents. The list of Russian nationals who have to go through a personal interview to get a visa is extended as well. This means that when applying for a German visa, one has to attend the German embassy or Consulate at least twice, which adds a lot of inconveniences to people coming from cities with no German diplomatic missions. Moreover, the period of consideration of one's application at the embassy is doubled, which means that one has to wait longer for a visa or apply for a visa in advance, which is not so convenient as well. The press-secretary of Russian Union of Travel Industry, Irina Turina, states that now "the flow of tourists from Russia to Germany can decrease by 30%"[2]. Another example of problems, connected with visas for Russian nationals refers to French Consulate. In 2006 there have been three cases (in April, August and December) when French Consulate refused to receive visa applications form Russian nationals explaining it with the overflow of tourists coming from this country. The Russian Union of Travel Industry even turned to The Ministry of Foreign affairs to take part in the solution of the problems. "We are deeply concerned with the situation in subject and hold consultations with the French side to find the solution to this problem".[3]

---

[1] Lax (2007).
[2] Turina (2007).
[3] *Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia Declaration* (2007), [WWW document]

At the moment the situation is such that the overwhelming majority of the citizens of Russia are required to have visas when they enter the territory of the EU. The countries of the EU belong to the so called "Schengen area", area comprised of countries that signed the *Schengen Agreement*[1] of 1985.

The Schengen Agreement of 1985 is an agreement between European states which provides for common immigration policies and a border system. Twenty-six European Union countries (with the exception of the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom), but including non-EU members Iceland, Norway, and Switzerland – have signed the agreement and 26 have implemented it so far. Border posts and checks have been removed between Schengen countries and a common 'Schengen visa' allows access to the area.

Initially (in 1985) the Schengen Area included 5 countries: Belgium, France, West Germany, Luxembourg and the Netherlands. The dates of accession of the other member (stages of the Schengen zone enlargement) are listed below:

- November 27, 1990 - Italy
- June 25, 1992 - Portugal, Spain
- November 6, 1992 - Greece
- April 28, 1995 - Austria
- December 19, 1996 - Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden
- May 1, 2004 - Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia (not yet implemented)
- October 16, 2004 - Switzerland (ratified by referendum on June 5, 2005)

The Schengen Agreement removed border checks between participating countries. The Schengen Agreement also means that participating countries will co-ordinate their external controls. This is necessary since a person acceptable to one country but not to another can still enter both, if one admits him or her. The Schengen Agreement also includes consent to share information about people, via the Schengen Information System. This means that a potentially undesirable person cannot 'disappear' simply by moving from one participant country to another as each country will know the same about the person's background.

---

[1] *Schengen Acquis, The*. [WWW document]

All Schengen Agreement signatories except Norway, Iceland and Switzerland are European Union members. Two EU members (the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland) have opted not to sign the Schengen Agreement. The main reason the non-EU states of Iceland and Norway joined was to preserve the open borders agreement between the Nordic countries that has been in effect since 1952[1].

The Treaty of Amsterdam[2] incorporated the achievements brought about by the Schengen agreement into the European Union framework, which made the Schengen Agreement an integral part of the EU. One of the major changes was that the Council of the European Union replaced the Executive Committee which had been before in accordance with the Schengen agreement. At present, countries-applicants to the European Union must meet the Schengen Agreement requirements of their external border policies in order to be accepted into the EU. The existing signatories of the Schengen Agreement who are not EU members in fact have less opportunity influence the evolution of the Agreement as a result of the Treaty of Amsterdam. It happens so that their options are reduced to agreeing with whatever is presented before them or withdrawing from the agreement.

The EU's "Council Regulation (EC) No 574/1999 of 12 March 1999 determining the third countries whose nationals must be in possession of visas when crossing the external borders of the Member States"[3], sets out a list of 101 countries whose nationals must be in possession of a visa when crossing the external borders of the Member States. Russia is on the list.

Also there is a list of countries whose nationals may be exempted from the visa requirement when crossing the external borders of the Member States. The list of countries includes 43 countries[4] among which are some European (San Marino, Andorra, Holy See), North American (United States of America, Canada, Mexico), South American (Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay etc.) and Asian countries (Australia, Malaysia, South Korea, Singapore etc.).

For the purposes of the EU's Regulation "visa" means an authorisation given or a decision taken by a Member State which is required for entry into its territory with a view to:
- an intended stay in that Member State or in several Member States of no more than three months in all;

---

[1] See [WWW document] <http://www.eurovisa.info/ and http://www.mediavisa.net/> Date of access: 14.03.2006.
[2] *Treaty of Amsterdam* [WWW document]
[3] EU's *Council Regulation (EC) No 574/1999 of 12 March 1999* [WWW document]
[4] *List of countries whose nationals may be exempted from the visa requirement* [WWW document]

- transit through the territory of that Member State or several Member States except for transit through the international zones of airports and transfers between airports in a Member State (airport transit).

A Member State may exempt from visa requirements:

- civilian air and sea crew;
- flight crew and attendants on emergency or rescue flights and other helpers in the event of disaster or accident;
- holders of diplomatic passports, official duty passports and other official passports[1].

1.2. Heuristic Points of Departure

Although, the parties admit that the free visa travel regime will give a positive impetus to relations and agreed:

> *- in the short-term, to conclude parallel negotiations on an agreement on visa facilitation and an agreement on readmission*
> *- to continue and intensify the visa dialogue at expert and political level to examine the conditions for a mutual visa-free travel regime as a long-term perspective2,*

Russia remains excluded from the European Free Travel Area by the Schengen Agreement and, definitely, that does not contribute to the intensive development of relations between the European Union and Russia.

The question that this works seeks to address is why is there such contradiction between the level of political practices and political declarations? Are we seeing a new curtain that separates Russia from Europe? The aim of the work is to suggest an explanation for the reasons of the EU's visa regime towards Russia, as the declared policy of "Strategic Partnership" contradicts with the visa policy of the EU.

One of the questions that are being discussed at the moment both by policy-makers and by scholars of International Relations is about the limits of EU-Russia integration: Can the concept of Four Common Spaces be implemented at present moment or the relations have not yet

---

[1] Visa requirements for nationals of third countries [WWW document]
[2] Road Map For The Common Space Of Freedom, Security And Justice. P. 21. [WWW document]

achieved such point? Obviously, the question of visa regime is crucial in building the common space of freedom, security and justice.

The background problems can be formulated as the following questions: How does the EU see Russia's place in Europe? Is the source of misunderstandings between the EU and Russia in practical reasons or it is deeper in the identity of the parties? What is the theoretical model of relations that the EU is using in relations towards Russia?

1.3. Key concepts

The research design of the thesis is based on three key concepts and conceptualizations which are the IBO triad, the idea of Russia as the "Other" and securitization.

As the visa-facilitation issue is closely connected with border relations on the whole, it will be necessary to study the existing theoretical approaches in Border Studies which is a part of an interdisciplinary field of research between political geography and political science, including the theory of international relations.

In the first chapter I refer to the Triad of "Identities, Borders and Orders" (IBO Triad) which serves as a starting point to the research of border regime and its connection with orders of the bordering territories and their identities. The analysis of the three parts of the triad and their intersections helps to understand the notions in subject better, as Identities, Borders and Orders are interdependent and should be analyzed along with each other. In other words the results of the analysis of one component of the triad will be complementary to the results of the analysis of the other two. In the first chapter of the thesis each nexus of the triad (I-B, B-O, I-O) is described. Thus the work is structured through the usage of the concept of the IBO Triad.

The next theoretical concept I touch upon in the first chapter is "boundary". I employ the view that boundaries are constructed through narratives. "Ontological' narratives – stories that actors use to make sense of their lives as members of social collectives and to define who 'we' are. "[1]

It is also important to state that borders can be treated as "hard" and "soft" facts. The former means that borders can be seen as something official and physical – like the national border. The latter means that border can be something theoretical – existing in people's minds and narratives.

---

[1] Paasi (2006).

The part of the thesis concerning theoretical approaches to borders is largely based on works by Anssi Paasi[1], Klaus Eder[2], David Jacobson[3], Yosef Lapid, Daniel Deudney and John Ikenberry[4]. The next part of the theoretical chapter touches upon the issue of the "Other" and its usage in the Theory of International Relations. I follow the logic of Iver Neumann[5], who writes that ideas about Self/Other have been developing in four different ways: ethnographic path, psychological path, the Continental philosophical path, and the "Eastern exclusion".

The use of the Other is an old logic which has been used in many purposes: creation of social groups and social boundaries on the basis of certain differences, distinguishing ethnicity on the basis of this approach, psychological view on the self in the context of comparison with the others, distinguishing differences between an enemy and the stranger etc. In the framework of this work it is more interesting how the logic of the Other is used to create identity of a certain country or community of people.

In "Uses of the Other"[6], Iver B. Neumann uses a several studies of European identity formations on the all-European, regional, and national levels. The theme that draws these studies together is how "the East" is used as a sign of otherness at all three levels. Whereas previous studies framed this process as part of colonial and postcolonial developments, this book suggests that "Easternness" is also present as a marker in contemporary discourses about Russia.

Neumann writes that after the WWII the Soviet Union played the role of the constitutive other in the European discourse. This fact is important for the research as it analyzes the image of Russia in Europe.

Neumann starts with the XVI-XVII centuries with Muscovy and continues to trace the representation of Russia in Europe till the post-Cold war period. 5 periods are picked out for analysis:

1) XVI-XVII centuries – Muscovy

2) XVIII century – Tsar Europe in the north

3) XIX century – Tsar Europe in the East

4) Interwar period – the Soviet Russia

---

[1] Paasi ibid.
[2] Eder (2006).
[3] Mathias, Jacobson, Lapid (2001).
[4] Deudney, Ikenberry (1999).
[5] Neumann (1999), p.3.
[6] Neumann, Ibid.

5) The Cold War – the Soviet Union.

Each period is characterized by a certain historical pattern of relations between Europe and Russia. These patterns are to be studied thoroughly for it was possible to make a conclusion regarding the present state of affairs between the parties. It is reasonable to find out whether the present relations fall under one of this patterns, or the present EU-Russian relations are of new character.

Neumann argues that it is possible to single out two main patterns of attitude towards Russia.

1. Russia as a threat.
2. Russia as a learner.

In different periods Russia has been seen in these two variants, and the choice of attitude to Russia depended from the international political situation at a given time. There have been representations of Russia as a barbarian state which has to learn a lot from a superior European neighbor. Such representations were modified into another, more aggressive variant of Russia – "barbarian at the gate" – which can be interpreted as a threat from the East. As Neumann sums it up:

> *Russia however stands out for its five hundred-year history of always just having been tamed, civil, civilized, has just begun to participate in the European politics and has just become a part of Europe. Since the Enlightment it has been seen as a pupil and a learner, whether a successful one (the dominant version of the Enlightment), a misguided one (the alternative version of the Enlightment), a laggard who should learn but refuses to do so (the dominant version of the nineteenth century), a truant (the twentieth century version), or a gifted but somewhat pigheaded one (the present version). It is therefore deeply appropriate that for the last five years the main metaphor used in European discussions of Russian politics and economics has been that of transition*"[1].

As a result, the specification of Russia as the Other is that it is always seen as the country being in some stage of transition to Europeanization. Neumann makes the conclusion that Russia's specificity as Europe's Other resides not along the spatial but along the temporal dimension, as the country that is perpetually seen as being in some stage of transition to Europeniazation. The discourse on effectiveness of Russia's integration into Europe will be reinforced by the rich baggage of the "not yets" and "justs" of half the millennium[2].

---

[1] Neumann (1999), p. 110.
[2] Ibid. p. 111.

After studying the role of border and proving that it can be an effective mechanism of creating identities and after proving that the EU is using Russia's Other as a tool of identity formation it will be necessary to join these conclusions into one. To explain the contradiction between the existing visa regime and political rhetoric of strategic partnership I will apply the concept of securitization in order to show how the Visa issue is constituted as a security threat. I hypothesise that Neumann's theory of Russia's Other can be the reason for the securitization of visa discourse.

According to the concept of securitization, the meaning of security lies in the use of its concept, in the act of securitization, whereby, "the exact definition a criteria of securitization is constituted by the intersubjective establishment of an existential threat with a saliency sufficient to have substantial political effects."[1]

On this basis, I will claim that the visa discourse contradicts with the discourse of strategic partnership, as the possibility of having the visa free regime with Russia is securitized by the EU officials and media. This is largely because of the existing model of the perception of Russia which is described in Neumann's work. The process of "othering" Russia has both the character of civilization discourse and of technical process. The technical character can be found in concrete technical governing practices. In this particular case these are practices regarding the freedom of travel between the EU and Russia. The concepts of Self and Other are becoming concrete practices in speech acts of the EU officials where the distinction between the EU and Russia are made. Despite the fact that the common rhetorical background has changed to Strategic Partnership, the overall perception of Russia in Europe is still that of a perpetual Other of Europe which is also reflected in the fact that the visa discourse is securitized.

1.4. The added value of the thesis

The relations between the EU and Russia are thoroughly studied – both in Russia and abroad from different points of view by scholars representing different disciplines (Economy, International Relations). A considerable number of publications on the topic of EU-Russia relations in general is regularly issued.

The results of this very research will demonstrate:

---

[1] Buzan, Waever et al., (1997), p.25.

- one of the fundamental reasons for the EU visa regime towards Russia
- the way the visa regime can be used as a tool to construct the identity of a region (on the example of EU-Russia border regime relations)
- the fact that the EU is using the old model of relations with Russia. Despite the official policy of strategic partnership, the EU is treating Russia as something a priori different.
- The work will also explain the EU's reasons for the visa regime with Russia.
- The work will follow the logic of Iver Neumann and will continue the studies of the uses of the Other by the EU and the phenomenon of "the East" in European Identity formation.

1.5. The Empirical Scope of the Study and the Identification of Primary Sources

The empirical scope of research includes two types of data: official documents of the EU, which represent official discourse and data from European mass media, which represent the media discourse of the EU. I have chosen the documents on the basis that they touch upon the visa issue between the EU and Russia (either positively, negatively or neutrally reflecting the subject). Such approach can help:

1. to show how the issue of a visa free regime with Russia is securitized
2. to trace the reasons of securitization
3. to single out examples of securitizing practices referring to this issue – both in official documents and media.

The official documents can demonstrate the official position of the EU which is reflected in the visa policy with Russia. According to the theory of securitization, the securitizing act can only be performed by a person who has power to do that. In order to be able to talk about EU level phenomena, it is thus necessary to have official statements illustrating to make conclusions regarding the securitization of visa issues.

In order to have a broader view of the securitization of the visa issue, I will also analyse media documents. These documents will be analyzed with the help of rhetoric analysis. This analysis will help to distinguish rhetoric techniques, which create the background for political statements of securitizing sort.

The domain of analysis thus includes official documents, articles from newspapers, magazines of International relations and books on the subject published since 2002. As it was in 2002 when the visa abolition question was first sounded in the official discourse between the EU and Russia.

2. Theoretical Points of Departure: IBO Triad, Othering and Securitization

2.1. The Identities – Borders – Orders triad

I would like to start this chapter with the description of the triad which seems relevant for this work – the triad of identities, borders and orders (or the IBO triad). My work is largely about this triad and the way its three parts relate to each other through a particular mechanism of a visa regime.

The IBO triad has been widely studied in the Theory of International Relations and a number of scholars[1] give a list of reasons why it is important to study this triad carefully.

Firstly, the components of the triad can be characterized as ascending "*key concepts*" in current social theory and practice and in IR particularly. McLennan describes these concepts as "*ever-interesting*" and "*indispensable*"[2]. They are "*ever-interesting*" because they can change their essence and reconfigurate together with the surrounding reality, thus these "*key concepts*" can be rediscovered and attract new attention of scholars. "*Indispensable*" means strong relevance to a number of theoretical undertakings of the Theory of IR. Key concepts can be also described as "*free-floating*" as they lose their ties with some single field of study and become universal concepts analyzed by different disciplines. For example "*identity*" is no longer a privilege of psychology where this term originated, "*border*" is no longer studied by political geography alone, "*order*" doesn't refer to political disciplines only. Such developments give a way to new combinatory possibilities. Parts of different social sciences can form a new, promising model for theorizing. Cut loose from specific disciplinary fields, identities, borders and orders have been dramatically reconfigured in various cross-disciplinary discussions. They give a new ground for synthesis and fruitful intellectual blending.

---

[1] See: Albert, Jacobson, Lapid (2001).
[2] McLennan, G. (1995), X.

Secondly, the components of the IBO triad are interdependent, and for better understanding of their nature should be studied together. They are better defined and discussed in relation to each other. The process of collective identity formation involves studying of border issues. Borders constitute identities by dividing them form each other. In most cases borders are inseparable from identities they define. At the same time bordering practices have sufficient impact on the order of a certain collective identity, and in fact are acts of individuation and segregation of these orders. The process of border, identity and order construction is mutually self-constituting, so when we study one element of the triad we can benefit if we study the other two.

Thirdly, the IBO triad is interesting for analysis, as it helps to reveal the changes in territoriality, that are taking place today. Ruggie points out that "*the IBO pattern would have been impossible without the rise of the profoundly influential notion of territoriality hammered out at Westphalia in 1648"[1]*. This historically specific notion of territoriality depicts political space in terms of distinct, separated and mutually exclusive formations. But by the middle of the twentieth century, the concept of territoriality evolved into a fixed, essentially timeless geographical space where the conceptual building blocks of modern social science – state, society, economy, culture and community – are found. In modern times Westphalian territoriality plays a formative role in explaining what makes the world hang together not only in the international, but in the economic, sociological, anthropological senses. With reference to the IBO triad, IR scholars have come to treat territoriality as a fixed ahistorical parameter. However, territoriality is still a topic for various discussions. For instance, it has been recently assumed that our world is very much influenced by a number of deterritorialized forces including capital, information and people travelling across the globe. The relation between the IBO triad and this new trend in IR is of great importance when we discuss the contours of the world of today.

To understand the IBO triad better, we should analyze the intersection of its parts.

I-B nexus: The connection between the Identities and Borders is well recognized in the Theory of IR. But for a long time the I-B connection lacked theorizing as it was assumed that Identities and Borders are quasi-natural givens. Thus borders are logical correlates of identities and vice-versa[2]. Such static view was not able to discover the nature of borders or identities, and for instance to explain what comes first – identities or borders, or how identities and borders are related on the whole. But since the middle of the twentieth century there has been a rise of

---

[1] Ruggie (1998), p. 131.
[2] See: Eisenstadt (1998), p. 140.

interest towards the borders/identities nexus. Some of the key dissociations of the Theory of IR (inside/outside, domestic/foreign, self/other) are linked with the I-B nexus and cannot be studied separately from it. There has not been worked out a common view on what comes first – identities or borders. The I-B sequence was long believed to exclusively dominate this intersection. Lately, another point of view has been developed: "*Boundaries come first then entities*"[1]. Yet we cannot always reduce what is found inside boundaries to a product of boundary formation. Which dynamic comes first is ultimately an empirical question.

B-O nexus: First of all, it is important to note that borders and bordering are absolutely indispensable to any notion of linguistics or social order. "*Language, for instance, depends upon borders to construct the concepts required for cognition and communication*"[2]. In the IR theory the B-O nexus is essential to the understanding of the conception of political order (hierarchy inside and anarchy outside). Anarchy and hierarchy are not only different but exclusive modes of political ordering, thus they require a corresponding mode of territorial bordering, which gives a sharp separation of the world into "*mutually exclusive and jointly exhaustive parcels of land*"[3]. The processes of bordering and ordering happen together and the question of what comes first seems to be case-specific. Both borders and orders are socially constructed, but actors are limited in their bordering practices by a variety of practices of separability and individuation. One of such bordering practices is a passport (or even visa) regime which has become a common tool to separate one social order from another. John Ikenberry writes that "*such practices are hammered out in a contested process called constitutional politics*"[4].

I-O nexus: "*No enduring political order can exist without a substantial sense of community and shared identity*"[5]. Current studies of political order in IR refer to identity issues and vice-versa. For instance Rod Hall[6] demonstrates a strong historical relationship between collective identities and systemic ordering principles.

To sum it up the IBO triad is an interesting approach to analyze its three components in connection with each other. In this work I will employ this approach and try to analyze the bordering practice (EU-Russian visa regime) taking into consideration Identity of the two actors and their internal political Order.

---

[1] Abbott (1995), p. 859.
[2] Spener and Staudt (1998), p.7.
[3] Goodin. (1996), p. 366.
[4] Ikenberry (1997), p. 148.
[5] Deudney & Ikenberry (1999) p. 193.
[6] See: Hall (1999).

2.2. Social Construction of Boundaries

As the main focus of this research will be placed on border crossing regime, it is important to describe how borders as such are constructed and transformed. The theory of construction of borders presented below, employs the analysis of the IBO triad, because social construction of boundaries can be viewed as a part of identity and order. It is noteworthy however, that the established borders in their turn also influence the process of identity formation and development of the order inside the boundaries.

Boundaries can be presented as hard facts and as soft facts[1]. Hard facts are institutionalized boundaries i.e. marked on the map and legally fixed in certain documents. Soft facts are boundaries which exist in people's minds and can be presented as narratives about spaces and identities. Soft borders are a part of hard borders in that sense that their symbolic power helps to institutionalize hard borders.

> *Boundaries are one specific form of institution. The major function of institutions is perhaps to establish stable structures for human interaction and thus to reduce uncertainty and increase ontological security, but they can vary greatly in nature[2].*

A boundary does not exist only in the border area or on the map. A boundary can be found in many institutions such as education, the media, novels, memorials, ceremonies etc. These institutions are effective expressions of narratives connected with boundaries and border conflicts and serve as references to the Other. As Paasi puts it:

> *These mediums are the essence of the institutionalization of the border symbolism and perform the key functions of symbolism, that is social control and communication. As far as nationalism is concerned, particularly challenging objects of research are the practices and discourses that territorialize memory and transform it as part of the civil religion"[3].*

The interpretations attached to boundaries change constantly together with the developments in cross-border socio-political relations. The challenge is to study the changing interpretations given to boundaries and how they influence inter-state relations within the international geopolitical landscape. Orders, boundaries and identities should not be understood as something primordial but rather something situational and contextual.

---

[1] See: Eder (2006).
[2] Paasi op cit.
[3] Ibid.

Boundaries are both symbols and institutions that simultaneously produce distinctions between social groups and are produced by them. Nevertheless, they not only separate groups and social communities from each other but also connect them. Borders provide normative patterns that regulate and direct interactions between members of social groups, rules on how to cross boundaries and rules governing the exchange of people, goods and symbolic messages.

As symbols, boundaries are mediums and instruments of social control and communication. As institutions, they link the past, present and future together, i.e. they construct a continuity for social interaction. This makes the links between boundaries, orders and identity particularly strong. Since identity is achieved through the inscription of boundaries, the question of order inside is essential.

The meanings of boundaries are emphasized by the fact that identities are produced through boundaries. Identities are often represented in terms of a difference between Us and the Other, rather than being something essentialist and typical to a certain group of people. While identity is based on differentiation, this should not inevitably take the form of opposition, of drawing a hard boundary between 'us' and 'them'. The production of boundaries is linked effectively with the social and spatial division of labour, the control of resourses and social differentiation

It is of great interest to examine how state boundaries become a part of the everyday life and the identity narratives existing in a state. This also makes it possible to understand why various generations living on the same territory may have quite different identities – they simply have different spatialized memories.

Boundaries are expressions of power relations. As institutions, they embody certain political order. They are hence constitutive of social action and may be both obstacles and sources of motivation. The Finnish-Russian border serves as a good example of this duality:

> *During the Soviet period the border areas of both the Finnish and Soviet side became typical examples of alienated borderlands, peripheral areas where all links were directed towards their own national centres. The border is the same today and border patrolling practices are still very strict, but since the collapse of the Soviet Union the border has no longer been a serious obstacle to cooperation, which now takes place across it in forms varying from environmental to cultural and from economic to regional planning projects.*[1]

The major challenge for boundary studies is to analyze how orders and identities are produced and reproduced, and how the exclusions and inclusions between 'We' and 'Them' that it implies

---

[1] Ibid.

are historically constructed and shaped. Claiming an identity is a mode of defining identity between "Us" and "Them".

Since boundaries are an expression of the power structures that exist between societies, a major challenge for boundary research is to deconstruct such power relations in the form of boundary narratives. Boundaries may therefore be comprehended as flows of power in which memories are transformed into things of the present and future. It is important to analyze how certain rituals and symbols, discourses and practices of power have emerged, taken their current shape, gained in importance, and affected political decisions.

The production of images of borders has strong impact on border discourses which in their turn can play a causal role in the making of institutional borders. Imaginary borders can be presented as an archive of collective memories of people that have been accumulated for a certain period of time, and such memories produce what we call identities. Eder argues that "identities are structured time sequence when identity construction results from former effects of producing identity difference"[1]. In other words, narratives play a crucial role in identity construction, thus in border construction, as identity was defined as a mode of defining boundary between us and them. Symbolic borders (narratives) and structural patterns (such as the north-south, east-west, Europe-Asia) shape the present-day discourses on the borders of a certain region.

Eder[2] distinguishes three cognitive modes of constructing transnational boundaries:
1. "Through legal definitions of membership" – e.g. citizenship which provides rights individuals and legally binds people to certain territories.
2. "Through providing protection of space of well-being against others" – binding people by a system of social relations.
3. "Through reviving cultural roots which bind people by the common past" – e.g. cultural heritage of a certain identity.

The less shared narratives there are, the less chances have identities and borders to be constructed. Thus the main problem of creation of common spaces and identities is the absence of powerful narratives that can tie people together and support in the long run the commonality of their own.

---

[1] Eder op. cit., p.256.
[2] Ibid.

2.3. Border regime: Passport and visa as instruments of social control

Travellers nowadays need passports or other documents, which only nation-states have the right to issue in order to enter foreign territories together with a valid visa depending on which passport they hold and where they want to travel to. Eric Neumayer[1] argues that the modern system of passports and visa restrictions has developed gradually over time. While passports and visas in one form or another have existed since medieval times, the comprehensive system as we know it is linked with the evolution of the nation-state. Since the Westphalian peace the nation-states have successfully managed to monopolize the authority to determine who may enter their external borders, which came with the establishment of the principle of national sovereignty. Some may argue that sovereignty of the state has recently weakened, but still it is an inalienable right of the states to control and restrict entry into their territory. Collinson[2] argues that "such controls and restrictions have historically been viewed as inherent in the very nature of sovereignity". In order to guarantee security and order a state has to control those who enter its territory and state must be free in its decision whether to allow newcomers in or not.

Thanks to a number of certain tools which allow to filter transborder flows of people the state can make a distinction between desirable and undesirable travelers. Passport is one of such tools.

The passport is part of a complex of policies that help to define the national population and help to protect and control borders. Passport serves as the primary tool of national identification. The core purpose of the passport is to request a sovereign to aid and protect nationally identified passport bearer. Initially the passport was designed to signify the sovereign's dominance over the space and population, but eventually the passport has become a vital instrument of international mobility[3].

At present passport is a document of identification certifying the identity of the bearer with regard to other official documents and certifying the international legal status of the bearer. The passport provides the admitting country with the information who the bearer is and where the bearer can be expelled. The standards for the passport were initially defined by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and still remain governed by this organization.

---

[1] Neumayer (2005).
[2] Collinson (1996), p. 77.
[3] Salter (2004), p.72.

The primary function of the passport is to "denote a person's identity and citizenship and provide an assurance for the State of transit or destination that the bearer can return to the state which issued the passport[1]". Passport generally describes the citizenship of a person. Torpey[2] points out that that the imposition of citizenship and a unique identity is a vital aspect of the modern state. Passports are part of national governments technology за codification and surveillance. Passports are on the frontline of defining and defending national citizenship and privilege national belonging as desirable[3].

But not passport as such, as Salter[4] suggests, but the visa restrictions imposed on passport holders from certain countries are one of the most important mechanisms with which nation states exert their prerogative to control entry into their territory. Visas allow a sovereign to exercise control over entrants to a country before they arrive at the border.

Visa (short for the Latin carta visa, lit. "the document having been seen") can be defined a document issued by a country giving an individual permission to formally request entrance to the country during a given period of time and for certain purposes and most always stamped or glued inside of a passport.

Every state faces a dilemma whether to facilitate the cross-border flow of people for its economic and political benefit, or whether to limit this flow in order to maintain security purposes. In order to understand the international system of visa regimes, one should analyze why some countries want to encourage the inflow of people from certain countries, but want to deter the inflow of people from other countries.

Firstly it is possible to start with the motivations for keeping people out. One of the main dangers for the state is that visitors might turn into immigrants and stay illegally in the country instead of returning back home. Immigrants are seen as challenges to the domestic economy, territoriality and national identity[5], thus they are regarded as a threat to social and ethno-cultural stability. The world of today is has big potential for the increase of immigration. Improved communication links (transport and media), pictures of prosperity of the countries of the West broadcast into poor countries, mass tourism, affordable telephone calls and cheaper flights create a climate

---

[1] ICAO (2004).
[2] See: Torpey (2000).
[3] Soguk (1999).
[4] See: Salter (2003).
[5] Koslowski (2000).

where migration is developing rapidly. The targets of illegal migration are as a rule countries of the OECD as they seem more attractive to migrants from the point economic and political stability. Neumayer also points out that "poverty, political repressions, human rights abuse, war and civil conflicts have not eased off[1]" – in other words these factors are pushing people away from their home countries in search of better life.

Visa restrictions in this case are seen as an important tool to deter would-be immigrants. Firstly, visa costs money – which can be a certain barrier to the poorest levels of the population. Then there is a hassle of applying for visa via mail or in person, which implies a trip to the embassy or the consulate of a country and waiting there in the queue possibly for hours. Secondly, there is a possibility that the embassy or the consulate will deny the application without explanation. As Torpey argues:

> *"At a time when substantial but unknown numbers of people become immigrants simply by overstaying the legally prescribed duration of their stay, limiting ingress is the best way for states to avoid entering into a series of potentially costly obligations for nonnationals. Passport and visa controls are crucial mechanisms for this purpose, the 'first line of defense' against the entry of undesirables"2.*

In response to the rising flow of the asylum applications and illegal migrants in the 1990s the Western European countries worked out a common policy of visa restrictions. Council regulation 2317, adopted in 1995, provided the first common list of countries residents of which are required to have visas to enter the EU. This regulation has become a part of the Schengen acquis, which became part of the EU treaty system with the Amsterdam Treaty. This regulation played a crucial role in lowering the internal border controls within the Schengen area. Today all countries of the EU, with the exception of Ireland and the United Kingdom, plus Iceland and Norway have an identical list of countries whose residents must be in possession of a valid visa when crossing the external borders of the Member States. The number of countries in this list has increased since 73 in 1995 to 132 in the 2001. Enhanced freedom of movement inside the EU was achieved at the expense of the decreased mobility for those residents of the countries from the list. Such situation gave birth to criticism towards attempts of the EU to build 'fortress Europe' and 'Wall around the West'[3]. For instance, former Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma warned that the Schengen visa rules would 'replace the iron curtain with a different, more humane but no less dangerous Paper Curtain'[4].

---

[1] Neumayer (2006).
[2] Torpey (1998), p.252.
[3] Andreas and Snyder (2000).
[4] Op.cit. in Lavenex and Ucarer (2004), p.433.

In case of the EU there can be traced the following tendency – which Heather Grabbe[1] calls "The Schengen Bargain" – soft internal borders cause hard external borders. Such tendency helps to create the effective zone of free movement inside the EU, but sharpens its edges which become harder to penetrate from the outside. Inside the EU area people can move without frontier checks, but entry to this area is strictly controlled. EU-imposed border policies have major security implications for Eastern Europe. For Ukraine, Russia and other countries on the periphery of the EU zone, Schengen becomes a foreign policy of the EU. Even if the EU sees it as a matter of internal affairs, visas and border policies have a direct impact on perceptions of European enlargement policies and circles of inclusion and exclusion. Grabbe argues that "EU-driven border-tightening and visa regimes inhibit the ability of local and regional actors to cooperate on a range of sensitive issues, including minority relations, migration, local economic infrastructure and institution-building"[2]. It is true that erection of Schengen borders with such neighbours as Russia (Kaliningrad region) had negative impact on delicately balanced relations and cross-border economic integration.

Piret Ehin and Eiki Berg[3] argue that EU border regime is a product of 'composite policy'. They borrow a notion of composite policy from Sedelmeier[4] who defines 'composite policy' as "a broad policy framework, which draws its substance from distinctive policy decisions" across a range of policy areas. EU's border strategy is composed of three distinct policy paradigms:

1) Regional policy – emphasis on cross-border cooperation (the main trend is cohesion)
2) Schengen and Justice and Home Affairs policy – emphasis on strict control of borders (the main trend is security)
3) Enlargement and ENP – emphasis on conditional openness/integration (the main trend is expansion)

Ehin and Berg believe that the development of the external borders of the EU is a case-specific process. The external border remains "an extremely diverse and fragmented conceptual category. EU's old a new neighbours differ greatly in terms of their domestic structures, as well as foreign policy orientations and the intensity if ties with the EU"[5]. It means that in each specific case of border there can prevail any of three border policy paradigms.

---

[1] Grabbe (2000), p.527.
[2] Ibid. p.528.
[3] Berg, Ehin (2005).
[4] Sedelmeier (2002).
[5] Berg, Ehin (2005), p.66.

Neumayer argues that "countries impose visa restrictions on passport holders from nations from which they fear large-scale illegal immigration"[1]. Obviously there can be another reason for visa restrictions – potential terrorists and criminals (e.g. drug traffickers). It is reasonable to suppose that passport holders from countries whose nationals have perpetrated acts of terrorism are likely not to get visas when going abroad as well.

On the other hand the states can have considerable advantages if they do not impose visa restrictions and simplify border-crossing procedures. The absence of restrictions is not just motivated by the absence of concerns about the threats coming from the territory of the bordering state, but also by positive influence of the simplified border crossing procedures. Firstly, there can be economic reasons for the absence of visa restrictions. International trade, foreign investments, tourism, scientific and business contacts are developing faster if there are no obstacles such as visas and closed borders. Thus countries which have intensive trade intercourse are likely to provide easy access to each other's markets. Poorer countries are encouraged to provide easy access to their territories for foreigners from rich countries in the hope of encouraging foreign investment and so called knowledge spill-overs into the country. In the sphere of mass tourism, it is more profitable for major tourist destination countries not to impose restrictions on citizens of major sending countries in order to be competitive on the market. O'Byrne argues for instance that for some countries "freedom of travel is the freedom to trade"[2], which explains relaxation of visa requirements in states where tourism is one of the main sources of national income. As Neumayer sums it up "Major tourist detinations are less likely to impose visa restrictions and major tourist sending nations are less likely to face visa restrictions traveling abroad"[3].

But economic reasons are just a part of the countries' motivation to refrain from imposing visa restrictions. There can be political reasons. Visa restrictions can be viewed as unfriendly act or a sign of distrust towards the citizens of the country in question. Wang[4] argues that both - such restrictions are reasoned by relations between the two countries, and the restrictions themselves affect these relations. Neumayer[5] continues that "countries are not likely to impose visa restrictions on other countries with which they share the same geographical region or civilization". If we apply this hypothesis to EU-Russian relations then it's possible to say that the

---

[1] Neumayer (2005), p. 76.
[2] O'Byrne (2001).
[3] Neumayer (2005), p.77.
[4] Wang (2004).
[5] Neumayer (2005), p.77.

European Union and Russia belong to different civilizations, or at least this civilizational link is not that strong to abolish the existent visa regime. Granting of a visa-free access to someone's territorial space is a friendly gesture, which shows that the countries have mutual understanding, respect and will to develop their relations on a new level of cooperation.

To sum it up, the state (or a group of states) has pros and cons when deciding to introduce a visa regime towards a certain country. The criteria for such act are described in the EU's Council Regulation No. 539/2001, which proposes a list of third countries whose nationals must be in possession of visas when crossing the external borders of the EU:

> *The determination of those third countries whose nationals are subject to visa requirement, and those exempt from it, is governed by a considered, case-by-case assessment of a variety of criteria relating inter alia to illegal migration, public policy and security, and to the European Union's external relations with third countries, consideration also being given to the implications of regional coherence and reciprocity.*

So the problem of borders can be described as a result of two contradictory governmental practices: providing security and providing mobility. The benefits of mobility are trade, tourism, culture and diversity and information intercourse. But mobility can also pose the following threats – security and crime, political and cultural difference, health and disease spread. The state has to decide which of the practices prevails and then implement the visa regime towards a certain country or not.

2.4. Uses of the "Other" in identity formation

Securitized borders serve as lines of dissociation between the Self and the Other. The IBO triad is well presented in this case. Identities are constructed with the help of the Self/Other dissociation which is emphasized shown by the explicit Border. In its turn the Border is made explicit by the use of specific securitizing techniques which are nothing but the manifestation of the Order. In this part of the chapter I will describe how the term the "Other" is used in identity formation purposes.

Studying of the Other is closely connected with the studying of the Self. The history of the Western self stretches back to the Roman idea that a persona could have general rights and duties. Martin Hollis identifies two orientations about the self – Humean and Hobbesian:

> *Hobbes and Hume differ over the concept of a person. Hume can find nothing but a bundle of perceptions from which to compose the self. Social theorists descended from him treat an agent as a set of ordered preferences, which action*

aims to satisfy. Those of Hobbesian persuasion add a presocial atom, whose preferences they are. [1]

The first theorist who pays considerable attention to the question of identity formation and connects it with the self/other dissociation pair is Hegel. His idea is that by knowing the other, the self has the power to define itself:

> *Each is for the other the middle term through which each mediates itself; and each is for himself, and for the other, an immediate being on its own accord, which at the same time is such only through this mediation. They recognize themselves as mutually recognizing one another*[2].

Neumann[3] suggests that theorizing about Self/Other has taken four different paths: ethnographic path, psychological path, the Continental philosophical path, and the "Eastern exclusion". Three first are institutionalized, while theorists of the fourth path were excluded from the center academic disciplines and were referred to as marginal.

The *ethnographic path* has been developed by those scholars who have done work on nationalism. The roots of this path go back to Emile Durkheim's theory of social division of labour. When distinguishing an "in-group" one must necessarily entail its demarcation from a number of "out-groups", and such demarcation is an active and ongoing part of identity formation. "The creation of social boundaries is not a consequence of integration rather it is one of its necessary a priori ingredients"[4]. Frederick Barth[5] argues that ethnicity should be fruitfully studied by paying most of attention to the boundaries of ethnic groups, and pay less attention to traits that seem to be endogenous. In other words ethnic groups are reproduced by borders that separate one group from other groups, which were seen to be constituted as other by their lack of a certain trait. Thus it is reasonable to study self/other nexus and namely the slash – the difference between to identities.

The scholars of the *psychological path* have also elaborated on the question of "self" and "other". Hogg and Abrams for instance argue that:

> *A differentiation arises between oneselves, the we-group, or in-group, and everybody else, or the other-groups, out-groups. The insiders in a we-group are in a relation of peace, order, law, government and industry to each other. Their relation to all outsiders, or other-groups, is one of war and plunder, except so far as agreements have modified it*[6].

---

[1] Hollis (1985), p.226.
[2] Hegel (1977), p.112.
[3] Neumann (1999), p.3.
[4] Durkheim (1964), pp. 115-122.
[5] See: Barth (1969).
[6] Hogg and Abrams (1988), p.17.

Social identification approach sees self-categorization as an explanation of how individuals are turned into groups. It means that when we categorize objects, experiences and other people, we simultaneously categorize ourselves. We find similarities between people and those who are similar to us are labeled our as group, those who are not – are called out-groupers. In this process we define ourselves and distinguish certain traits typical for the whole group.

The *continental philosophical path* is much influenced by Karl Marx's dialectics. "One meets the self and the other as a raw material for a possible dialectical elevation in the name of reason and progress in a number of different loci"[1]. Neumann points out that for instance Sartre and Habermas' theorizing had limited ability to offer new insights about collective identity formation, as it lacked social placement and was too abstract from power and the multiplicity of social bonds other than the bond of reasoned discourse. Still, the Continental philosophical tradition has a major effect on self/other nexus – an "*assimilatory thrust*"[2].

The theorists of the "*Eastern Excursion*" are characterized by the fact that they were writing about self/other nexus and at the same time were out of the mainstream of science. George Simmel[3] for instance argued that the margin of the collective self – referred as "stranger" – is important to study. Strangers (in contrast to enemies) play an important role in collective identity formation, as their presence poses a question who is "self", and who is "stranger".

Carl Schmitt pays attention to another type of the "other" – a public enemy. He argues that one of the functions of the state is to distinguish public enemies from friends. Schmitt defines public enemy the following way:

> *The public enemy does not have to be morally evil, he does not have to be aesthetically ugly, he doesn't have to appear as an economic competitor, and it can even be advantageous to have business dealings with him. He is nevertheless the Other*[4].

When speaking about the Other, one should mention the process of "othering" – making of the other in order to strengthen or maintain its own identity. "Othering" and "Building of identity" are two sides of the same coin and it is not now the question if "othering" takes place, but it is the question of how it is performed.

---

[1] Neumann (1999), p.11.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Simmel (1970).
[4] Schmitt (1963), p.14.

To sum it up, the pervasive theme of these writings is that formation of the self is linked with the formation of the Others. A failure to recognize the Others must have consequences for the formation of the Self.

Then it is possible to point out that formation of the self is an active and ongoing part and condition of identity formation. The creation of social boundaries is an integral part of integration. It would be more fruitful if the focus for studies of identity formation is socially placed on how social boundaries (narratives) come into existence and maintained.

2.4. The Theory of Securitization

The theory of securitization is a relatively new theoretical approach which dwells on the old theme of the Other. The theory of securitization offers a specific technique for separation of the Other from the Self. Securitization is the result of a speech act, which states that the Self is in danger, while the source of the danger is the Other. This act helps to make a clear distinction between Us and Them thus making the Self/Other dissociation more evident.

In this part of the chapter I will pay attention to the theory of securitization on the whole and then proceed to the specific case of securitization – securitization of borders. Securitization of borders is a good example of the B-O relation of the IBO triad. The main function of strong and secure borders is to protect and preserve the Order inside. In this way securitization of borders can be viewed as an example of how Orders endeavor to protect themselves from external enemies making the Border a security issue.

The theory of securitization is one of the recent approaches to security in the Theory of IR. The theory of securitization was developed by Barry Buzan, Ole Weaver and their collaborators – a group of scholars which are known as the "Copenhagen School". The theory of securitization provides one of the most innovative, productive and yet controversial approaches in contemporary security studies. As Jef Hyusmans writes "possible the most thorough and continuous exploration of the significance and implications of a widening security agenda for security studies". [1]

The prime claim of the theory of securitization is that the articulation of security produces a specific threatening state of affairs. "*Within this theory, power is derived from the use of*

---

[1] Huysmans (1998), p.186.

'appropriate' words in conformity with established rules governing speech acts[1]. The theory of securitization *changes the question of whether the words and things of security coincide, to the question of how the words and things of security are made to coincide, meaning through securitizing speech-acts*[2]*"*.

According to the theory of securitization, security is a *social practice. "It is, as such, a way of acting that selectively problematizes and makes visible social issues so as to efface the differences between them; one that lifts such issues above the realm of normal politics, severs their connections to questions of social justice, and subsumes them within a discourse of 'effectiveness' that evinces a strong tendency to trump considerations of civil liberty. Though there are signs that Europe's political elites are coming to view this way of determining the path of further integration as untenable, it is a course of action - not least in the field of justice and home affairs - that has some powerful governmental forces working to sustain it"*[3].

As one of the theorists of the theory of securitization, Ole Waever argues that *"to analyze the entire security discourse as a complex 'speech act' challenges the analyst has to explore the 'securitization' of issues, which may have political implications. The 'securitization' of that event, is doing something to it, in that it allows the use of exceptional measures outside of the regular political process"*[4].

The issue becomes a security one with all the standard operating procedures attached to it, by being called one (if the call is successfully received). Among other advantages, this approach induces caution with regard to elevating too many problems to the status of 'security problems'[5].

Waever claims that different issues of international and domestic politics can become security issues. Some issues that do not refer to security agenda can become such if they are politicized and finally securitized. The issue can be presented as posing an existential threat to a designated referent object. The nature of the existential threat justifies the use of special extraordinary measures, as in this sense the term security is closer to traditional military-political understanding. The state is able to mobilize special powers to handle existential threats.

[1] Balzacq, Thierry (2005). [WWW document]
[2] Neal, Andrew (2005). [WWW document]
[3] Loader, Ian (2005). [WWW document]
[4] Guzzini, Stefano (2002). [WWW document]
[5] Møller, Bjørn (2002). p.2.

"Traditionally, by saying "security", a state representative declares an emergency condition, thus claming a right to use whatever necessary means to block a threatening development"[1].

Weaver defines security as the "move that takes politics beyond the established rules of the game and frames the issue either as a special kind of politics or as above politics"[2]. Weaver offers to view securitization as a more extreme version of politicization. One can imagine a spectrum of issues ranging from non-politicized to politicized and finally ending with securitized ones. In fact each issue can move from one side of the spectrum to another depending on how state deals with it. Non-politicized issues are not subjects of public debate and decision, issues become politicized when they becomes a part of public policy and require government decision and recourse allocations. Finally issues become securitized when they are presented as an existential threat, which requires emergency measures and justifying actions outside the normal bounds of political procedure. Placement of issues on the spectrum varies substantially from state to state and across time.

Although in one sense securitization is presented as a further development of politicization, in another sense it is opposed to politicization. Politicization means that the issue is open for a public discussion and a decision is taken regarding this issue which entails responsibility of the authorities. Securitization in contrast strives to present an issue as urgent and existential, and so important that it should not be exposed to normal politics, but to extraordinary measures removing responsibilities from the authorities.

Weaver writes that "securitization can be studied directly. It doesn't need indicators. The way to study securitization is to study discourse and political constellations"[3]. It is necessary to answer a question: When an argument with its particular rhetorical and semiotic structure achieves sufficient effect to make an audience tolerate violations of rules that would otherwise have to be obeyed? We can establish a fact of securitization if "by means of argument about the priority and urgency of an existential threat the securitizing actor has managed to break free of procedures or rules he or she would otherwise be bound by"[4].

Securitization is not a one sided-process: it includes a securitizing move (which is preformed by the securitizing subject) and acceptance of this move (by the audience). For successful

---

[1] Buzan, Waever, (1997).
[2] Ibid., p.22.
[3] Ibid. p.25.
[4] Ibid. p.25.

securitization the audience should agree with the statement of the securitizing object that a certain issue poses an existential threat and legitimize the actions of the object against that threat. Without such legitimization securitization cannot be complete or successful. This proves the thesis that securitization is socially constructed.

When defining and studying the act of securitization, one might experience a problem of relativity of significance. Weaver and Buzan choose not to define significance as subject-dependent (in other words not to say that securitization of state affairs is more important than securitization of environment), but to use the measure of chain reactions on other securitizations. The security act can be discussed between securitizer and audience, but the measures taken after the discussion can affect other units of social reality. As Weaver puts it "a securitizing move can easily upset orders of mutual accommodation between units[1]". So the significance of securitization can be measured by the number of consequences to other units, not directly involved into securitization. Successful securitization has three components: existential threats, emergency actions (performed by the securitizer), and effects on inter-unit relations by breaking free of rules.

Specific rhetorical structure is a distinguishing feature of securitization. The general rhetorical scheme can be defined as following: appeals to survival, priority of action "because if the problem is not handled now, it will be too late, as we will not exist to remedy our failure"[2]. With the help of such rhetorical scheme it is possible to single out new issues that can be added to security agenda, find new security-referent actors and phenomena in sectors other than military-political one.

Weaver points out that security has one essential quality which is that it stages existential issues in politics to lift them above politics. By labeling an issue as "security" the securitizer claims that there is a need to treat the issue by extraordinary means. The task of the scholar who is studying securitization is not to assess how real and dangerous the threat is, but rather to understand the way the issue was given a label of "security". Securitization is studied with the help of the Theory of speech acts, as the process of securitization is nothing but a speech act. The utterance itself is what is important, as it is the performative power of a speech act which makes an issue securitized.

---

[1] Ibid. p.26.
[2] Ibid.

So, when dealing with securitization, one should study 1) who can "speak" security successful 2) for whom 3) on what issues 4) under what conditions 5) with what effects. It is important to trace the moment when an existential threat (which requires the extraordinary measures) is designated and when the audience accepts this event. This may happen by the direct use of the word "security" or by some metaphorical reference to the concept of security (or defense which is typically equaled to security matters). If a scholar knows who can convert an ordinary issue into "security" matter and under what conditions, "it will sometimes be possible to maneuver the interaction among actors and thereby curb security dilemmas".[1]

Basically, the process of securitization is a performative speech act of a given person. This calls in question the fact that security and securitization can be objective. It is difficult to make a clear division between objective (real threat) and subjective (perceived threat) security. It is reasonable to suppose that securitization, like politicization should be understood as an intersubjective process. It is not easy to judge the securitization of an issue against some measure of whether that issue is "really" a threat[2]. Doing so would demand an objective measure of security that no theory of security has yet provided. The distinction between subjective and objective is useful for avoiding a view of security that is given objectively and for emphasizing the fact that security is determined by actors.

Weaver and Buzan suggest the following defining core of security studies: "the survival of collective units and principles and the politics of existential threat". Such pattern can serve as a basis for applying security analysis to a variety of sectors without losing the essential quality of the concept.

The application of the speech act theory requires a distinction between three types of actors involved in security analysis.

1) Referent objects – things that are viewed as existentially threatened and have a legitimate claim to survival.
2) Securitizing actors – actors who securitize issues by labeling referent objects existentially threatened.
3) Functional actors – actors who somehow strongly influence the dynamics of a sector being neither referent objects nor securitizing actors.

---

[1] Ibid. p.30.
[2] Ibid.

The traditional referent object for security is the state. But actually a securitizing actor can attempt to make anything a referent object with a certain chance for success, as, naturally, some objects refer to security agenda more than the others. Referent objects differ in scale: 1) micro (individuals or small collectives) 2) medium (states, nations - large limited collectives) 3) macro (humanity on the whole). Weaver claims that "the middle-scale of limited collectives has proved the most amenable to securitization as durable referent objects"[1], because such groups engage in self-reinforcing rivalries as there appears a strong division between "we" and "them", so called self/other dissociation which becomes a facilitating condition for securitization of a certain issue.

Securitizing actor is a person or a group, who performs the security speech act. Traditional players in this role are political leaders, bureaucracies, governments, lobbyists and pressure groups. Usually these actors are not referent objects for security, as a rule they play a role of a speaker who speaks in defense of security of the state, nation or some other larger community, principle or system, not in defense of itself.

It is sometimes tricky to analyze these actors, as it difficult to say who or what precisely acts. It is possible to disaggregate a collective into subunits and finally come to and individual who is actually speaking. But it is sometimes more reasonable to view actors as collectives, because they are more than a sum of their members and may have new collective qualities, which no member of the collective possesses alone. When analyzing an actor it is more fruitful to concentrate not on the status of the actor, but on the logic that shapes the action. The question is whether an action is according to individual logic or the organizational logic, and is the individual or the organization generally held responsible by the other actors? Hysmans points out that one danger of the phrases "securitization" and "speech act" is that too much focus can be placed on the acting side, thus privileging the powerful while marginalizing those who are the audience and judge of the act[2].

The concepts of existential threat and emergency measures play an important role in the theoretical apparatus of the theory of securitization. The existential threat can only be understood in relation to the particular character of the referent object in question. The quality of existence varies greatly across different sectors and levels of analysis; so does the nature of existential threats.

---

[1] Ibid. p.36.
[2] See: Huysmans (1996).

The process of securitization has its own specificity in different sectors of social life and should be analyzed in accordance with different sectors and levels of analysis. Waever and Buzan single out five sectors for analysis: military, political, economic, societal and environmental. Sectors are defined as "views of the international system through a lens that highlights one particular aspect of the relationship and iteration among its constituent units"[1]. It is possible to argue that characteristics of units vary substantially inside the sectors and that the nature of the survival and the threat will differ across different sectors and types of units. Thus, Weaver states that "security is a generic term that has a distinct meaning but varies in form"[2]. Security means survival in the face of existential threats, but what becomes such threats depends on the sector. So, each sector has its own specific referent objects, "securitizers" and existential threats. In some sectors securitization is institutionalized, in some sectors securitization is ad hoc. A good example of institutionalized securitization is a military sector, where the existential threat is most evident and states managed to develop special institutions to deal with threats of that kind. Defense Ministries and intelligence offices are labeled as security actors almost automatically, as securitization of such affairs has been performed for centuries and is taken for granted, in other words doesn't require persuasion of the audience.

In the military sector the primary referent object is the state, and possibly some other kinds of political entities. The existential threat is seen as a direct military threat and the main purpose of this sector is to provide the defense of the state and its citizens.

In the political sector there are more referent objects: states, political entities of different kind, supranational referent objects (e.g. the EU). Even international regimes and international society can be threatened by certain situations that violate rules and norms which serve as a foundation for those regimes. The existential threat is defined in terms of the constituting principle – sovereignty of the state which can be threatened by anything that questions recognition, legitimacy or governing authority.

In the economic sector the referent objects are a little bit more difficult to single out. Firms are threatened by bankruptcy, sometimes changes in law (that make them illegal as after communist revolutions).

---

[1] Buzan, Weaver (1997), p.27.
[2] Ibid.

In the societal sector the referent objects are large-scale collective identities that can function independent of the state (such as nations or religions). Taking into account the peculiar nature of this type of referent object, it is difficult to establish hard boundaries that differentiate existential from lesser threats. A lot depends from the way the identity is being constructed. If the holders of the collective identity have a relatively closed-minded view of how their identity is maintained, then the list of existential threats grows (this includes migrants or rival identities which seem to be most natural challenges to identities). If the holders of the identity are relatively open-minded to the way their identity survives, then there are fewer reasons for securitization of societal issues.

In the environmental sector the range of possible referent objects is large (from relatively concrete species to maintenance of climate on the planet). The existential threat seems to be case-specific and dependent on the referent object[1].

The relationship among subjects of securitization is not symmetrical or equal, as a lot depends on the status of the actor, who is performing the speech act. It turns out that some actors are more influential than the others thanks to their position of power which gives them ability to define successfully what security is and what is not[2]. It is possible to make a conclusion that the field is structured or biased, but no one has absolute power to make people accept a claim for necessary security action.

The status of an actor is important, but Weaver and Buzan claim that the practice of securitization should be the center of analysis. Didier Bigo[3] however claims that one should make the actor of securitization the fixed point of analysis and a scholar should be more specific about who is more or less privileged in articulating security when performing a concrete analysis.

The theory of securitization is based on J.L. Austin's speech act theory which will be elaborated in detail in the next chapter.

When applying the theory of speech acts to the theory of securitization it is important to work out a certain securitizing speech act pattern, for we could easily identify the act as such. The internal facilitating conditions are characterized by the plot of the act itself, which includes:

---

[1] See: Buzan, Weaver (1997),
[2] See: Bigo (1996).
[3] Ibid.

1) existential threat

2) point of no return

3) possible way out – this is the general pattern that varies from sector to sector.

The external facilitating conditions:

1) position of authority of a securitizing actor (there should exist certain relationship between speaker and audience and thereby the likelihood of the audience to accept the claims made in securitizing attempt)

2) features of the alleged threats (typically certain objects of reality that are generally held to be threatening) which either help or impede the construction of an image of an existential threat.

"Security is a speech act" – such stance allows the scholars of Copenhagen School to argue simultaneously for both – an expansion and a limitation of the security agenda and its analysis. Indeed, treating security as a speech act provides almost indefinite field of actors, efferent objects and issues for security agenda. The security agenda can be extended well beyond the military security of the territorial state.

At the same time securitization has specific structure which in practice limits nature of security. While securitization is in principle an open process (theoretically any actor can become a securitizer), in practice it is structured by the status of the actors, who can make socially effective claims for securitization. This relates much to the conditions of the socially successful securitizing act.

2.5. Securitization of migration

Securitization of migration should be seen as a part of a framework of social, political and professional processes that develop in the EU. The Union is facing a number of challenges to mechanisms of societal integration and political legitimacy. These include economic and financial globalization, the rise of poverty, the deterioration of living conditions in cities, the revival of racist and xenophobic parties and movements and the rise of multiculturalism. In such setting migration has been presented as a danger to public order, cultural identity and domestic and labour market stability, as a result migration has become securitized. Jef Huysmans argues

that securitization of migration has developed in the EU on the basis of three relating themes: internal security, cultural security and the crisis of the welfare state[1].

European migration policy has not always put migration on security agenda list. It is difficult to generalize about different countries and policies and it can be argued that in the 1950-s and 1960-s immigrants were primarily an extra-workforce in most western European countries. Countries like France, Germany and the Netherlands used a permissive or even promotional migration policy. The political status of immigrants of that time was not politically sensitive. This doesn't mean that the states didn't try to regulate and normalize the situation of immigrants, but the debate about their legal status did not have the prominence and was not a subject of wide political speculation. In the late 1960-s there was a shift from a permissive immigration policy to a control-oriented, restrictive policy[2]. The restrictive policies were motivated by changes in the labour market and by a desire to protect the social and economic rights of the domestic workforce. Political rhetoric however increasingly linked migration to the destabilization of public order[3]. The decisions to halt labour migration were taken, but the immigrant population continued to grow because of permission to immigrate on the basis of family reunion. As a result, public awareness of the immigrant population increased.

The coordination of migration policy inside the EU began in the 1980-s, when migration policy development was institutionalized in European interstate cooperation, the European Union, and European transnational cooperation between functional organizations such as police[4].

Migration policy was then gradually incorporated into the migrational policy of the EU. He treaty on European Union introduced a Third Pillar on Justice and Home Affairs in which migration was an explicit subject of intergovernmental regulation within the EU. But soon dissatisfaction with the intergovernmental approach of the Third pillar emerged. Moving migration-related questions from the Third to the First Pillar became one of the key issues for the Intergovernmental Conference reviewing the treaty on the European Union. In the treaty of the Third Pillar they were communitarized.

Common regulations of migration policy have emphasized the need for restrictions of population flows. Such restrictions include the coordination of visa policy in the Union and the coordination

---

[1] See: Huysmans (2000).
[2] See: Fielding (1992), p.43; Holliefield (1992), pp. 66-73.
[3] See: Doty, (1996).
[4] See: Huysmans (2000), p.755.

and facilitation of readmission agreements. Such institutional achievements were influenced by a thematic change in the problematization of migration in the EU. In the 1980-s migration increasingly was a subject of policy debates about the protection of public order and preservation of domestic stability. "Migration was in this way presented as a challenge to welfare state and to the cultural composition of the nation. A key theme running through these debates was that migration is a danger to the domestic society"*1*.

On the one hand the development of security discourses in the sphere of migration is often presented as a natural and inevitable policy response to the challenges to domestic order. The source of these challenges is the increasing flow of illegal immigrants and asylum-seekers. In such analysis security problem triggers the security policy. The policy is implemented in response to the dangers of illegal migration, in other words problem come first and then the policy is constructed as an instrumental reaction to it.

On the other hand, there "exist defining practices which turn an issue like migration into a security problem by mobilizing specific institutions and expectations"*2*. Migration is rendered problematic in a specific way if police and related departments of the Ministry of Home Affairs take a prominent role in the regulation of migration. As it is part of police's responsibilities to produce security knowledge, thus police will naturally propose security measures to deal with migration and categorize it as a security issue.

Migration is reified as an internal and external danger for the survival of the national community or western civilization. The discourse excludes migrants from the society not as aliens, but as aliens who are dangerous to the reproduction of social traditions and social homogeneity. "The discourse also produces the myth that a homogenous national community or western civilization existed in the past and can be re-established today through the exclusion of those migrants who are identified as cultural aliens"*3*.

Huysmans points out that the process of securitization of migration cannot be reduced to the actions of few agencies. In fact the process includes multiple actors – national governments, European transnational police networks, the media, etc. It is a structural effect of multiplicity of practices.

---

[1] Ibid.,
[2] Ibid. p. 757.
[3] Ibid. p.758.

The result of the Schengen process was that freedom of movement for some has entailed a restriction of freedom for others. Moreover, Schengen process has led to portrayal of migration as a security issue (rather than primarily a social, economic or ethical issue).

3. Method and Analysis

The work is based on two methodologies: the *Theory of Speech Acts* and the *Rhetoric analysis* applied to official documents and mass media data respectively.

The theory of securitization envisages the use of the theory of speech acts based on the book by *J.L. Austin*[1].

The second methodology employed in this work is Rhetoric analysis. This methodology is largely based on the book "*The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*" by Chaim Perelman[2] where the author shows those explicit and implicit beliefs that are used in persuasion, recognizing the middle ground between absolute proof and arbitrary reason-giving. Rhetorical practices used to persuade someone in something are described in the book. The Rhetoric analysis will help to reveal the techniques through which the media discourse persuades the official discourse that the visa issue is a security matter.

3.1. Theory of speech acts

This methodology is largely based on a book by John L. Austin *How to do things with words* where he gives a classification of speech acts and conditions for the smooth functioning of a speech act.

Firstly, Austin draws a line between "constative" and "performative" speech acts. Constative speech acts 'describe' or 'report' about something, can be true or false, not a part of an action. Performative speech acts do not 'describe' or 'report' or constate anything at all, the uttering of a sentence is, or is a part of a doing of action, can be 'happy' and 'unhappy' [3].

In order to securitize the issue, a speech act, describing the existential threats is needed. The act of securitization is simply a speech act, so when studying securitization, one should study 1) who

---

[1] Austin J.L. (1981).
[2] Perelman, Chaim (1969).
[3] Austin J.L. (1981), p.5

can "speak" security successful 2) for whom 3) on what issues 4) under what conditions 5) with what effects. It is important to trace the moment when an existential threat (disease, crime, drug trafficking), which requires the extraordinary measures (strict visa policy) is designated and when the audience accepts this event.

Austin gives a list of conditions necessary for the 'happy' functioning of a speech act:

A.1) There must exist an accepted conventional procedure having a certain conventional effect, that procedure to include the uttering of certain words by certain persons in certain circumstances.

A.2) The particular persons and circumstances in a given case must be appropriate for the invocation of the particular procedure invoked

B.1) The procedure must be executed by all participants both correctly and

B.2) completely.

C.1) Where as often the procedure is designed for use by persons having certain thoughts or feelings, or for the inauguration of certain consequential conduct on the part of any participant, then a person participating in and so invoking the procedure must in fact have those thoughts or feeling, and the participants must intend so to conduct themselves, and further

C.2) must actually so conduct themselves subsequently[1].

In this chapter I'll try to classify the speech acts that can be found in the official documents and newspaper articles and then analyze if they are successful or not according to these criteria. The theory of securitization is employing the speech act theory as methodology, thus to find out whether the issue is securitized or not we should get to know whether the speech act (through which the issue is securitized) is successful or not.

Also, when studying a speech act it is necessary to classify it in accordance with Austin's classification of speech acts. Firstly, Austin makes a clear distinction between "constative" and "performative" speech acts. *Constative speech acts 'describe' or 'report' about something, can be true or false, not a part of an action. Performative speech acts do not 'describe' or 'report' or constate anything at all, the uttering of a sentence is, or is a part of a doing of action[2].*
Performative acts are divided into:

- Locutionary acts (the act of saying something)

[1] Ibid., p. 15.
[2] Ibid. p.5

- Illocutionary acts (the act performed *in* saying something)
- Perlocutionary acts (the act performed *by* saying something)[1].

The perlocutionary act has encouraging force. A perlocutionary act can be defined as a speech act which tries to persuade, convince, scare, enlighten, encourage, inspire, or otherwise make someone do or realize something.

The aim of the research is also to define whether the speech acts by European officials have perlocutionary meaning or not (in other words whether the person saying something with an intention to encourage something to happen or not in our case to make visa issue a security question).

In case of the "EU-Russia" visa discourse speech acts should include existential threats. Such threats can be: illnesses, drug traffic, migration etc. – threats connected with migration and border control coming from the territory of Russia. The structure, semantic, pragmatics of the speech act should be taken into account. The analysis of a speech act should also include the analysis of the intentions of the speaker. Which message the speaker wanted to deliver and what was the final result of the speech act. The task of the research will be to find and analyze the speech acts of the EU officials where the visa issue is securitized.

It will also be interesting to find the examples of *perlocutionary* speech acts, as they have both the labeling power – adding the issue to security agenda, and persuasive or encouraging power which makes people take appropriate measures in order to protect themselves from the existential threat.

Speech acts are divided by Austin into three groups: locutionary (act of speech; has meaning), illocutionary (locutionary + adding different senses; certain force of saying something) and perlocutionary (locutionary produces certain consequential effects)[2].

Austin also gives a list of illocutionary forces of an utterance:
- *Verdictives*[3] (give verdict not necessarily final – estimate, reckoning or appraisal)

Examples of verbs used in 'Verdictives': acquit, convict, estimate, date, grade, assess, measure etc. Verdictives have obvious connections with 'truth and falsity' and 'fairness and unfairness' dimensions. Verdictive can be an official act, judge's ruling – a verdict which is given in virtue

---

[1] Ibid. p.99.
[2] Ibid. p.103
[3] See: Ibid. p.88.

of an official position. Giving of a certain verdict commits us to certain future conduct regarding the issue to which the verdict is given.

- Exercitives[1] (exercising of powers, rights or influence)

Examples of verbs used in 'Exercitives': appoint, degrade, dismiss, choose, advise, veto etc. An exercitive is the giving of a decision in favor of or against a certain course of action. Typical contexts in which exercitives are made: 1) filling offices and appointments, candidatures, elections, admissions, resignations, dismissals and applications 2) advice, exhortation and petition 3) enablements, orders, sentences and annulments 4) the conduct of meetings and business 5) rights, claims, accusations etc.

- Commissives[2] (promising or undertaking)

The commisive commits the speaker to a certain course of action. Examples of verbs used in 'Commissives': promise, undertake, contract, give my word, adopt, guarantee, bet, agree etc.

- Behabitives[3] (attitudes of social behavior)

Behabitives include the notion of reaction to other people's behavior and fortunes and of attitudes and expressions of attitudes to someone else's part of conduct. The use of verbs depends on certain situations: for apologies – apologize; for thanks – thank; for sympathy – condole, commiserate; for attitudes – criticize, don't mind; for greetings – welcome etc.

- Expositives[4] (illustrate how utterances fit into the course of an argument or a conversation). Examples of the expressions of 'Expositives': I cite, I repeat that, I turn next to etc.

There are possibilities of marginal and awkward cases or overlaps. To sum it up, we may say that the *verdictive* is an exercise of judgment, the *exercitive* is an assertion of influence or exercising of power, the *commisive* is an assuming of an obligation or declaring of an intention, the *behabitive* is the adopting of an attitude, and the *expositive* is the clarifying of reasons, arguments and communications.

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid. p.86
[3] See: Ibid. p.83.
[4] See: Ibid. p.85

Such classification will help to distinguish the nature of a speech act and the intention of the speaker. Having this classification of speech acts it is possible to distinguish the purpose of the act and then to analyze the motives of the speaker.

To make a clear conclusion, it is better to create an algorithm of the analysis of each official document:
1. Analyze if the speech act is successful or not (verification of felicity conditions)
2. Distinguish which illocutionary force of an utterance is present in the speech act.
3. Distinguish the perlocutionary speech acts, which will demonstrate the will of the speaker to add certain consequences to the act, thus illustrating the intentions of the speaker to use the speech as a tool of securitization.

3.2. Rhetorical Analysis

This methodology is largely based on the book "*The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*" by Chaim Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca where the authors show those explicit and implicit beliefs that are used in persuasion, recognizing the middle ground between absolute proof and arbitrary reason-giving. The authors describe some rhetorical practices which are used to persuade someone in something. It is highly useful to know these practices, which are widely used in newspaper articles and speeches of officials of different level, as they help to reveal the inner meaning of the text and the true intentions of the speaker.

The authors of the book give a sufficient list of rhetorical techniques which that can be used in order to persuade an opponent and win a debate, or the audience and reach your goal.

When analyzing a speech attention should be paid first of all to the audience the text is directed to. The orator always pays attention to the specific character of the audience, considering both the audience at hand and the universal audience thus modifying the text for a better result. Obviously, it is reasonable to take into consideration the target audience when making conclusions about the character of the message. The structure of the text is of high importance as well: a speech (no discussion, delivery of a certain message from the orator to the audience), a dialogue (real discussion and openness to being persuaded by the other party), a debate (discussion is between the debaters and the audience).

The description of the majority of rhetoric techniques is given in the book as analysis of rhetoric implies analysis of certain rhetorical methods of persuasion. Here is the list of such techniques:

- *"Negative argument - shows the audience why it should have reacted in a certain way to the orator (but did not); the orator shows how the audience has been working from its own incorrect arguments or false motives"*[1].

- *Diversion* - an attempt to prevent real discussion by calling attention away from the issues at hand.

- *"The use of ambiguity - language profitably contains and uses a great deal of vagueness. The orators do not devaluate vague and ambiguous notions (e.g. justice, liberty, wisdom), but try to use them in a certain variety of arenas. For instance, there can be an agreement on a concept, but differences on the specifics of interpretation. Oratorical definition attempts to interpret something in favor of a specific premise or endpoint"*[2].

- Orators often work in probability, when several separate lines of reasoning lead to the same end, all of them are mutually reinforcing; this is called *convergence*. In a formal system, several modes of proof of the same fact make for consilience or congruence. But when there is too much convergence, the orator can be accused of cooking the data; "*a certain measure of incoherence,*" on the other hand, "*is taken as a sign of sincerity*"[3].

- *Premises* - are essential to an argument--many are implicit; many are made explicit to the audience. Depending on the audience, the orator may have to justify the premises prior to launching the argument proper. Premises are based in some way on conceptions of the real: facts (can be challenged by the interlocutor; have to be defended), presumptions (more open to challenge than facts), values (need argumentation).

- *"Loci: these are the common places from which arguments can be said to arise - out of shared premises regarding abstract categories. Loci provide the bases for understanding facts, presumptions, values, hierarchies"*[4].

- *Normal, norm, normative*: the *normal* is what everybody does; the *norm* is what everybody should do; usually there is a quick normative transfer from the perceived normal to the perceived norm. *"The orator must be aware of popularization and vulgarization processes, in which more complex reasoning and methods are simplified for the nonspecialist. In the reverse, nonspecialists, or orators in front of a nonspecialist audience, may try to argue with specialists in mind*[5]*".*

- *Repartee* - pouncing on an admission by your opponent of something favorable to you.

---

[1] Perelman (1969). p. 476.
[2] Ibid. p. 173.
[3] Ibid. p.471.
[4] Ibid. p.83-84.
[5] Ibid. p.100-104.

- *Presence*: Anything presented automatically gains presence. Things that we see tend to gain priority and importance merely because they are in front of us. The same is true for ideas presented to our consciousness. Another peculiarity of perception of a text which an orator can be using is that common presumptions that are often not challenged. It means we tend to trust what we are being told, we connect the quality of an act to the quality of the actor; whatever is made present to us is seen as inherently more interesting (at least at first); we presume that people are basically sensible. We presume the normal and the likely.

- *"Repetition - repeating the first words of sentence in a succeeding sentence; is useful for reinforcing the adherence of the audience, and keeping the argument present in the minds of the audience"*[1]. One of the types of repetition is *interpretation*, explanation of one term using another. Interpretation is not merely about the choice of meanings, but also about a choice of the kinds and levels of meaning. One must beware, in choosing interpretations, to give a sense that one is "coloring" the facts to come out a certain way.

- *"Preterition - the orator shows reticence about using a particular argument because of its unsavory nature. In announcing that he will not be speaking about a particular issue in a certain way, he gives a presence to that argument by the back door"*[2].

- *Cliché* **-** shorthand that helps build adherence and communion with the audience.

- *Obscurity* - announcing that something is difficult to understand.

- *Periphrasis* is a paraphrase of a term (my mother's husband = my father).

- *"Allusion refers to something known outside the presentation at hand"*[3].

- Another device that orators sometimes use is a strategy "to present as a fact of experience what is really only the conclusion of an argumentation".

- *Appeal to authority*, though it is disparaged in the name of truth, is perfectly acceptable any time there is any ambiguity in which reason alone cannot find an answer. The place of argument really rests on who is chosen as authority, and how. Even so, authorities ought not gain a power of interpretation outside their field of expertise[4]. The appeal to authority is qualitative, while the appeal to the "authority" of popular opinion is quantitative.

- *Argumentation by example* implies disagreement over the particular rule the example is invoked to establish, but assumes earlier agreement on the possibility of arriving at a generalization from particular cases[5]. We might distinguish an *example*, which goes to prove a rule, from an *illustration*, which helps determine the scope of a rule that is already granted.

---

[1] Ibid. p.50, pp.174-175.
[2] Ibid. p.487.
[3] Ibid. pp.173-174.
[4] See: Ibid. p.307.
[5] See: Ibid. p.350.

- *Analogy* is often arbitrary, but it serves a good use to its limited extent. A challenge of false analogy occurs when the accuser extends the analogy beyond its usefulness.

One of the main dangers of rhetorical analysis is that the meaning and scope of an isolated argument can rarely be understood without ambiguity. These are due not only to the equivocal character of language, but also to the fact that the springs supporting the argumentation are almost never entirely explicitly described. In establishing the structure of an argument, we must interpret the words of the speaker, supply the missing links, which is always very risky. Indeed it is nothing more than a plausible hypothesis to assert that the real thought of the speaker and of his hearers coincides with the structure which we have just isolated. Indeed it is nothing more than a plausible hypothesis to assert that the real thought of the speaker and of his hearers coincides with the structure isolated in the analysis.

Remarks about logic and quasi-logic arguments: the position of an orator is fortified when he/she can claim that logic and reasoning is better than that of an opponent. An orator can show that an opponent is being inconsistent or is putting forth incompatible premises or conclusions, or is contradicting himself. The response is that one's accuser is trying to make the discussion into a formal system, which makes him either a fanatic or a skeptic about the discussion at hand; the discussion at hand admits incompatibility but only in a limited way; *quasi-logical arguments are acceptable*[1].

---

[1] See: Ibid. pp.194-196.

3.3. Analysis of Empirical Materials

Securitization implies problematization of certain issues, which become perceived as a danger or an existential threat. In visa discourse the negative image of Russia can be constructed through problematization of: criminal threat, uncontrolled migration threat, epidemic threat, drug and human traffic threats – issues that borders and particularly visas are destined to control. Abolition of visas means a certain loss of control over these spheres and can become an existential danger for the citizens of the EU. But existential threat becomes existential if it is proclaimed as such (through securitization). The issues above are securitized in the EU press and our mission now is to analyze how it is done and by what means.

The first part of the analysis concerns the official discourse of the EU about visa policy and border issues.

In order to cope with the new border challenges and geographical realities, the EU has established the agency called FRONTEX, which is a common organization for the management of external borders of the EU. Frontex, the EU agency based in Warsaw, was created as a specialised and independent body tasked to coordinate the operational cooperation between Member States in the field of border security. The activities of Frontex are intelligence driven. Frontex complements and provides particular added value to the national border management systems of the Member States.[1]

The following quote belongs to Franco Frattini (Commissioner responsible for Justice, Freedom and Security) and it illustrates the position of the official body of the EU which deals with border management.

> *It is with great pleasure that I have been able to combine my visit to you today with an excursion to the Eastern external border of Poland (and the EU) … I must say that I am genuinely impressed with the strong professionalism demonstrated by the Polish border guards, and the very high standard of control and surveillance, that we have witnessed. The visit to the external border has further strengthened my confidence in our capability to establish and maintain an area of freedom, security and justice for everyone living in the EU. The spectre of international terrorism, the human tragedies of victims of trafficking and the equally sad and grave consequences of illegal immigration into the EU, are constant reminders that we need to do even more to combat the many and diverse threats facing this area. The European citizens rightly expect us to find efficient solution to these security problems.[2]*

---

[1] See: Frontex official site http://www.frontex.europa.eu/
[2] Frattini, Franco (2005) [WWW document]

This quote deserves thorough analysis according to the scheme settled above.

1. This speech act is successful, as the felicity conditions are true.

   a. The conventional procedure of the speech act can be characterized as an "official speech". The person, in possession of official authority, is pronouncing a certain speech act in front of the audience. The authority of the person is making the words weighty, as the authority of a person is transformed into authority of words.

   b. The circumstances in which the words were uttered are appropriate for the invocation of the particular procedure invoked – it was the inauguration speech of the Frontex Agency – an official event where the principles of the work of the agency are appropriate to be sounded.

   c. The procedure was executed correctly and completely, as we have the full listing of the speech, and also have no evidence that the procedure was somehow interrupted.

2. *"The spectre of international terrorism, the human tragedies of victims of trafficking and the equally sad and grave consequences of illegal immigration into the EU, are constant reminders that we need to do even more to combat the many and diverse threats facing this area"*. This part of the quote has the verdictive illocutionary force. Authority implied to the post of the speaker gives him the right to make judgments concerning the actions that should be taken to protect the Union from the threats it is facing. The speaker also labels certain issues as existential threats, automatically making them topical security questions.

3. The speech act can be classified as perlocutionary as it has clear encouraging phrase "*we need to do even more*". The speech act will have consequences in the form of strict measures of border control.

We can simplify the speech act by Franco Frattini and display it in the form of a scheme:

- Eastern border is a source of threats.
- The threats are: "*international terrorism, the human tragedies of victims of trafficking and the equally sad and grave consequences of illegal immigration*".
- Message: even more actions should be taken to combat these threats.

Non-security issues are labeled as security which is a clear example of securitization of border management practices. In the words of Franco Frattini there is no point that border-crossing practices should be facilitated, the other way round – there is a need "*to do even more to combat the many and diverse threats*".

To sum it up, the official position of the Frontex agency is that the Eastern border is a source of threats which should be dealt with maximum attention.

Another speech act for analysis, which is illustrating the official position of the EU concerning visas, belongs to Richard Wright (the EU's ambassador to Russia):

> *I would like to add that we need to be sure that introduction of visa free travel regime with the third country will not inflict damage to public order and security, I especially emphasize organized crime and terrorism here.*[1]

The message of the speech act is the following: visa regime protects the EU from organized crime and terrorism. There is a threat that the abolition of visa regime will make the EU vulnerable to organized crime and terrorism. The threats are the same, as mentioned by Franco Frattini.

From these quotations we can single out main groups of problems related with the Eastern border of the EU:

- *Terrorism*
- *Human trafficking*
- *Consequences of illegal immigration*

It seems reasonable to specify this list a little bit more replacing the "Consequences of illegal immigration" with "*Organized Crime*" and "*Diseases*". Thus we have 4 groups of threats that can be traced in the discourse about border security.

Diseases

The first issue to analyze is securitization of existential threat connected with diseases and their spread from the territory of Russia to the territory of the EU.

The first article that is chosen for this topic is entitled "The death of Russia[2]" published in a Polish newspaper *Wprost* on 27 January 2005. The author of the article touches upon the problems of demography in Russia and predicts that in the next fifty years the population of Russia will be reduced by half. The author mentions a number of reasons why it will be so: poor

---

[1] Wright, Richard, (2003)
[2] *Wprost* (2005).

public health service, alcoholism, drug addiction etc. A gloomy description is given of the future of Russia thus making a considerable contribution to the creation of the negative image of this country.

> *A kid born in Russia today will live 57 years, that is less than his coeval in Bangladesh... Aids is becoming an epidemic in Russia which can be only compared with the countries of Africa.* Russia *like Africa is moving away from the civilized world… Data about people infected by syphilis – Holland 1 in 100.000, Turkey 5 in 100.000, Russia 144 in 100.000.*[1]

These sentences construct a clear hierarchy of countries:

1. Countries of the EU ("civilized" world, e.g. Holland)
2. Probable members of the EU (e.g. Turkey)
3. "Uncivilized" world which is moving away from the "civilized" world (Russia, Bangladesh, Africa).

Having distinguished this hierarchy is it possible to judge that Russia is seen as a stranger, which is having very serious problems in public health sector. In this ad lib hierarchy Russia is even lower than Turkey (one can remember substantial debates about Turkey's possible entrance of the EU), this gives a clear negative answer to the question "Can Russia enter the EU?". Russia is far politically, but close geographically – the EU has a long common border with Russia which becomes a source of troubles, which exist inside the country. That's why the border should be controlled strictly and visa regime is certainly a good device for that. We see that having taken a few of figures about Russia's public health sector it is possible to draw a strong dividing line between the EU and Russia in the minds of the citizens of the EU.

The theory of speech acts can also be employed here, as the author of the article is referring to an opinion of an expert - Nicholas Eberstedt - demographer and economist from American Enterprise Institute. Let's analyze two of his quotations. Firstly, Eberstedt argues that "taking into account the population of Russia, state of the public health sector and future prospects, we should admit that the country is falling into decay". Secondly, he suggests that:

---

[1] Ibid. p.1.

The prognosis does not take into account demographical consequences of AIDS, which is becoming an epidemic in Russia which can be only compared with the countries of Africa. Russia like Africa is moving away from the civilized world...[1]

These are good examples of a successful speech act because the felicity conditions are matched. Condition *A1* is achieved as there is an accepted conventional procedure which has certain conventional effect. The procedure is an interview where the expert expresses his opinion. The effect of the interview is that the speech is published in an eminent newspaper and many people read it.

Condition *A2* is fulfilled as well, as the expert – Nicholas Eberstedt – is appropriate for the invocation of the particular procedure invoked. Firstly, he is a demographer and economist – a certain status that gives him right to make judgments in his field of study. Secondly, American Enterprise Institute gives him a certain degree of authority making his opinion trustworthy.
Conditions *B1* and *B2* are fulfilled as well. The expert expressed his point of view in the interview while readers of the newspaper got the message of the author.

According to the classification of speech acts, these are illocutionary speech acts as they have a certain verdictive force in them, thus they can be classified as *verdictives*. The verdict of judgment that the expert has is clear: "the country is falling into decay" and "Russia like Africa is moving away from the civilized world". The verdict is worked out in *probability* – the orator is giving a number of facts in present making a judgment about the future. On the whole, when we see a certain speech act we connect the quality of an act to the quality of the actor. In this case the orator has a high status and degree of trust, which almost automatically makes his speech act trustworthy. That's why it is less notable that the orator expresses rather extreme point of view and predictions that he makes are extreme as well. There are many far less pessimistic views on the future of Russia's population[2], but somehow the author of the article chose this very expert to confirm two main points of the article:

He firstly claims that Russia is dying; This point is also proved by another opinion of an expert – Murray Feshbach (Woodrow Wilson International Center expert) – who claims that "Russia will be weak and unstable".

---

[1] Ibid. p.1
[2] *"Promislennie Vedomosti"*. [WWW document].

Secondly, it is suggested that Russia is "dangerous" as it has serious problems in the public health sector.

Another article which dwells on the topic of Russia's situation with diseases is from the British *The Economist*[1]. The article is entitled "Russia's poor health". The author of the article is stating that life expectancy in Russia among men is 59 years. Such decrease can only be seen in the countries of Central and South Africa. The author mentions the reasons of such situation: high death rate from cardiovascular diseases, number of suicides is 5 times more than in Britain, rate of murders is 20 times more than in Western Europe. Here we can trace the dissociation: Russia is like Africa, Russia is not like Europe.

And the author continues, that the situation can get even worse, because of the AIDS epidemic. There are approximately 1 million people infected with AIDS. Moreover, the rate of syphilis infected is ten times higher than in Western Europe[2].

The author is using very strong adjectives to demonstrate the threat which is growing in Russia: "The number of AIDS victims is hard to define, partly because of the astronomical numbers of people infected with tuberculosis"[3]. He goes on to claim that

> *the present demographical policy can transform Russia into a less controllable state. And this, along with the spread of a whole bunch of diseases, must become a reason for concern in other countries. Alas, it has always been difficult to persuade Russians to change their traditions and habits.*

This speech act has perlocutionary force. The author is encouraging "the other countries" to start thinking about Russia's threat immediately. Although it is not a direct appeal to close the eastern border or tighten up the visa policies with Russia, but a clear definition of existential threats - the article, containing such information and encouragement to be concerned about Russia's diseases can lead to anxiety about and fear of Russia. This can create certain fertile background for moods for strengthening of visa policies.

To sum it up, such articles are likely to disturb the society, provoke the fear of spread of diseases, coming from the territory of Russia. This threat is likely to cross the border in the form

---

[1] *The Economist* (2006).
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.

of contagious people who will be spreading the disease across the EU, so, naturally it is reasonable to limit people's access to the territory of the EU. The best way to do that is to impose/support visa restrictions to Russia's nationals.

Crime

The second issue which is securitized in the visa discourse is crime. The first article that I've chosen for illustration is entitled "From Russia with love[1]" published in the Spanish newspaper *La Razon* on 25 March 2005. The author of the article, Eduardo Bajo, touches upon the questions of Russian Mafia and Russian criminals crossing the border and hiding in Spain from Russian authorities. The structure of the article can be presented as following:

1. Description of Russian crime
2. Description of Tendency: Russian criminals travel to Spain

The first part gives us the description of an existential threat:

> *After the collapse of the Soviet Union there appeared around 8000 criminal groups with 120.000 members... under the control of Russian Mafia there can be up to 70% of financial structure of the country and nearly 40% of the GNP is produced.[2]*

The image of Russia is quite clear – a country wallowing in crime and lawlessness. The second part of the article is 'applying' the first part to Spain

> *but not only tourists come to Spain. Crime groups are looking for a place where they could hide their capital from Russian authorities. Thus many Russian criminals have come to our country, attracted by an opportunity to invest their fortune from weapon and drug smuggling, gaming and prostitution.[3]*

This can be considered as a demonstration of Russian crime which is crossing the border of the EU as an existential threat. Again, the securitization of visa issue is a good device to control and filter flows of people from the EU to Russia. The issue is securitized on the condition that the speech act above is successful and matches the criteria of speech acts by Austin. Condition A1 is fulfilled as there is a conventional procedure through which the act is being transmitted –

---

[1] Bajo (2005).
[2] Ibid. p.1
[3] Ibid. p.3

publishing of an article in a newspaper. Condition A2 is fulfilled as well - the particular persons and circumstances in a given case are appropriate for the invocation of the particular procedure – the author of the article (reporter of one of the eminent Spanish newspapers) and the audience of this newspaper. The procedure is executed by all participants both correctly and completely.

The author is actually using little evidence to defend his point of view (case of a bloody assassin Andrey Pylev, leader of a Moscow crime group who killed 35 people and who was finally caught in Spain), but uses many rhetorical practices. For instance, when speaking about Russian crime the author is using emotionally rich adjectives: "dangerous", "bloody", "blood-thirsty", "predatory" whereby he is creating the existential threat. The author of the article is using argumentation by example – giving a single example of a Russian criminal caught in Spain he creates a powerful image of a criminal invasion. The author writes "some of Russian crime groups took notice of Spanish coast". Arguably, such a speech act will have an effect on Spaniards who will 1) become afraid of Russian crime 2) want to protect themselves from Russian criminals and naturally such moods in the Spanish society will *not* contribute to the abolishment of visas between the EU and Russia, which will be perceived as giving open passage to criminals from Russia of all kinds.

The next article illustrating the fear of Russian organized crime was published in *Frankfurter Rundschau* and is entitled "Russian youngsters in Germany choose between drugs, crime and the last chance"[1]. The author of the article claims that "in statistics, associated with drug-addiction, migrants from the east [particularly from Russia]*, occupy an disproportionately high rank"[2].

There is not a single word in the article about crimes committed by migrants from Russia, but the author mentions connections of Russian migrants with crime and mafia in the very title of the article. This can be interpreted as a prejudice towards migrants, as they are a priori seen as possible criminals. At least the author of the article considers it to be normal to say that migrants are likely to "choose crime" without any proof (figures, facts, statistics). The message of the author is – migrants from the Eastern countries are naturally seen as potential criminals and drug addicts.

---

[1] *Franlfurter Rundschau* (2003).
[2] Ibid.

The next extract dealing with crime is from the article by Jaakko Pihlaja entitled "High crime rate in Russia is threatening the safety of Finnish tourists[1]" published in *Helsingin Sanomat*. The author of the article is describing situation in border region between Russia and Finland. The author is structuring the article with the help of a contrast between the Finnish and the Russian territories, comparing the crime rate in the neighboring countries.

> *The number of personal crimes has increased in the Russian cities situated near the border crossing points with Finland – Viborg, Svetogorsk, Sortavala and Kostomuksha in such proportion that workers of Finnish consulates call Finnish tourists to being cautious. According to* Kaleva *newspaper, statistics is that there are more crimes committed in these cities than in the whole Finland.*[2]

The newspaper does not supply the article with figures, but the message is quite clear: the territory of Russia is unsafe and dangerous. The border serves as a natural divide between the safe territory of the EU, and the dangerous territory of Russia, where crime rate in 4 relatively small border cities is as high as in the whole Finland. The article constructs the basis for the moods among the citizens the EU that the border with Russia should be safe and strong in order not to let the wave of crime in the border regions of Russia flow over the territory of the EU.

Another article dwelling on the issue of Russian crime was published in Italian newspaper *Repubblica* and entitled "New Mafias: Russians, Chinese, Nigerians"[3]. The article touches upon the question of new mafias in Italy and the tendency of their quick spread .

> *Foreign mafias are coming: new criminals have faces of Chinese, Nigerians and Russians... Russian Mafia is of special concern. Russian Mafia cartels control large-scale flows of drugs and the main routes of their delivery from Asia.*[4]

Moreover, the author continues that the Russian Mafia took under control many companies in Italy in regions as Toscana, Lazio, Lombardy, Piedmont and Romagna. Although, there is no direct appeal to border issue, it is obvious that to a considerable degree the problems raised in the article are connected with illegal migration and illegal border crossing. The Russian mafia is described as an existential threat to Italian citizens which has roots on the territory of Russia,

---

[1] Pihlaja (2004).
[2] Ibid.
[3] *Repubblica* (2006).
[4] Ibid.

thus the border must fulfill its function – protect Italian citizens from undesirable aliens from Russia.

The article "Russian Godfathers"[1] published in the Italian *La Stampa*. The author points out that "the presence of organized crime groups which moved from Russia has become large-scale"[2]. The author of the article has analyzed the focus of the Russian criminal syndicates and singled out the main spheres of their activities: money laundering, weapon smuggling, human trafficking, drug smuggling. The author supplies the article with a number of examples of murders and other crimes committed by Russian migrants.

> *Tourism and trade are the two kinds of activities which provide an opportunity to invite foreigners to Italy for "individual activities". Such invitations for stay in Italy were issued by Italian entrepreneurs who did at the instance of mafia members*[3].

This extract actually states that it is quite easy for a Russian criminal to overcome the barrier in the form of visa and attendant procedures. This makes the existential threat even more evident, as the border loses its protective function.

A similar article can be found in the German *Die Welt* which is entitled "The strongest blow on Russian mafia is dealt not by Russian, but European cops"[4]. The author of the article points out that "Russian law enforcement agencies are helpless when dealing with mafia. Foreign colleagues sometimes do not understand quite well why: is it lack of professionalism or is it a conscious position*?*" This illustrates the view that the Russian Government cannot do anything with Mafia inside the country, and mafia is crossing the border, which becomes an existential threat to the citizens of the EU.

Another article dealing with the securitization of visa issue is entitled "The West wants to close the road to the EU for the CIS countries*"* by Laura Mandeville. The article was published on 11 May 2003 in a French newspaper *Le Figaro*[5]. The author gives an analysis of the moods among the EU top officials. She makes a conclusion that the "West" is striving to "protect itself from

---

[1] *La Stampa* (2006).
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] *Die Welt* (2001).
[5] Mandeville (2003).

poor authoritarian countries which can turn into staging posts of weapon smuggling to rogue countries". Moreover, the EU is striving to control thousands of economic immigrants, who are leaving their native countries as tourists for the EU and cherishing their hopes for better life staying there. The author is posing a question whether CIS countries are doomed to be "border countries, grey territories eaten from the inside by mafia clans, corruption and poverty or not"[1]. And she gives a positive answer to this question, because the EU is worried by the probability that those countries may export their instability. Instability is meant under drug and weapon traffic. Thus the author believes that the EU is building a new European castle.

The article gives a notion of perception of the countries of CIS (including Russia) in the EU "poor authoritarian countries which can turn into staging posts of weapon and drug smuggling"[2]. This is a clear existential threat to all citizens of the EU. The issue is successfully securitized as Europe is already building a new European Castle. There is a certain metaphor here. Europe is compared to a castle, while the main characteristic of a castle is strong walls – borders in this case. Thus we can say that Europe is strengthening its borders in order to defend itself from the countries of the CIS. In her article Laura Mandeville describes three main reasons for that: fear of illegal immigration, fear of drug and weapon traffic.

Summing up, these certain examples are some of the most evident cases of the process of securitization of border and visa issue. Such articles in the European press create atmosphere of alarm and circumspection towards Russia. The securitization of the issue is successful, as (despite the proclaimed policy of strategic partnership) it seems natural for European officials and citizens to have visas with Russia.

Human Trafficking

There is a number of articles, devoted to human trafficking related to the Eastern border of the EU.

For instance, the German *Junge Welt* has a publication entitled "Human trafficking flourishes"[3] where the author describes the situation with human trafficking from the territory of Russia.

> *In recent years exploitation of women and children in Russia has turned into business which brings in billions of dollars of income to crime syndicates. Crime*

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid.
[3] "*Menschenhandel floriert*" (2002) [WWW document]

syntax transport thousands of women to remote corners of the world annually, while the government is helpless or consciously take no notice of this.[1]

Here the author clearly states that human trafficking is a topical problem for Russia, and the government is helpless:

The destination point of human trafficking from Russia are at least 43 countries, including the majority of Western European countries.[2]

The author refers to research conducted by Donna Hughes[3] and reports by International Organization for Migration.

The Russian Federation is a major sending country for women trafficked into sex industries around the world. Russian women are known to be in sex industries in over 50 different countries. The number of women who have become victims of this criminal trade is unknown, but are estimated to be in the hundreds of thousands.[4]

The authors label the problem as an existential threat, which needs to be dealt with.
Another example of articles bringing attention the human trafficking issue is "Russian Mafia buys girls for 200 dollars"[5].

According to the most conservative estimates, published in the end of 2000 by the International Organization for Migration, in the last decade 300 thousand women have become victims of human trafficking from Russia to Eastern and Western Europe. Since then the scale of human trafficking has become even greater. This growing tendency is dangerous and reluctance of government to deal with it is arouses anxiety… Human trafficking, because of the lack of appropriate legislation is still an unpunished business.[6]

Here the author makes the following verdicts:
1. The scale of human trafficking is growing in Russia.
2. Human trafficking is unpunished business.

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Hughes, Donna M. (2000).
[4] International Organization for Migration. (2001).
[5] "*Ein Maedchen ist der russischen Mafia 200 Dollar wert*" (2003). Translation by author.
[6] Ibid.

Naturally, conclusions of this sort can breed anxiety and fear of Russian illegal migrants in Western countries. In accordance with the articles above, the flow of illegal immigrants from Russia is uncontrollable, and it needs an appropriate deterrent mechanism. Tightening up of visa policies can be a part of the solution to human trafficking problem.

This argument finds its reflection in the EU's policy towards Russia. For instance, The Delegation of the European Commission to the Russian Federation and the Bureau of International Organization for Migration (IOM) in Moscow have presented the EU-funded project "Prevention of Human Trafficking in the Russian Federation". This 30-month, € 4.4 million project is funded by the European Union with co-financing support to date from the Swiss and from the U.S. Governments. According to the EU Commission's press release, "the main objective of the project is to contribute towards the prevention of human trafficking in the Russian Federation as a country of origin, transit and destination"[1].

The next article to be analysed is is entitled "EU presses Russia on Human Trafficking"[2]. The author starts the article with the following idea "Fearing that the increasing tide of illegal immigrants and trafficked people into Russia could be heading its way, the EU presses Russia to tighten its borders*[3]*. The author clearly states that the EU is afraid of the tide of potential illegal immigrants from the territory of Russia. The reaction of the EU – is to encourage Russia to tighten its borders. Border is seen as an instrument which helps to protect the territory from illegal migrants, and the more tight the border is, the more effective it is, thus the more secure the territory and the citizens inside.

The author continues: "At the same time, that swelling wave of illegals has European Union officials worried that it will wash over their shores"[4]. Again, the predicate of the sentence is "worried" which shows that the EU officials are deeply concerned with the problem of illegal migrants. They insist that Russia tightens its southern borders, especially with Central Asian countries.

The article explains the role of human trafficking in the plans of the EU to strengthen visa regulations within the next few years:

---

[1] See: EU commission press release (2006).
[2] *"EU presses Russia on human trafficking"*. (2007) [WWW document]
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid.

The EU, which is the most popular destination for human trafficking from the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and Eastern European countries, has tried to stem the flow by improving border controls and plans to strengthen visa regulations within the next few years.[1]

The article is supplied with the example of the attempt of the German Foreign Office, which has reportedly ordered its consuls in Russia to issue no more than 600 visas a week, a move that analysts say could put a damper on Russian tourism to the country.

The eminent experts try to analyze the reasons for the EU's actions. Evgeny Volk for instance says:

The problem is that all this talk about the necessity to ease the visa regime between Russia and the EU ends up helping people involved in diplomatic or business activity of some sort, but for ordinary Russian citizens, such as tourists, the situation becomes more and more complicated, as happened with the recent initiative of the German Foreign Office.[2]

Evgeny Volk reveals the following tendency: only some categories of people (businessmen, diplomats, students) have facilities when they apply for a visa, but the majority of the population of Russia faces considerable difficulties when getting to the Schengen area.

The concern of European police is well illustrated by the quote of British police commander David Johnston who told in the interview to the Guardian newspaper that Bulgaria could act as a transit point for undesirables from outside the EU[3]: **"When Bulgaria joins the EU those people will only have to cross the border to be in Western Europe. And from there it is just a stepping stone into the UK"**[4]**.**

This quotation creates the feeling that undesirables are closer than they seem. The message of the author is that undesirable individuals can easily get to Western Europe through the insecure border of the Eastern European countries. This argument is used to justify necessity to tighten visa requirements.

---

[1] Ibid.
[2] Op. Cit. Ibid.
[3] See Ibid.
[4] Op. Cit. Ibid.

Terrorism

It is notable that there are less articles about the threat of terrorism from Russia. Only few examples can be found: "Chechen leader threatens to kill Russians abroad"[1] in *The Times* and "Brutality of Chechen War Spills Across the Border"[2] in *The Washington Post* (though it cannot be counted as appropriate for analysis as it is not a European Newspaper). The search for other articles, where the threat of Terrorism (Chechen in the first turn) is described, gives no substantial result. The threat of Chechen terrorists is not seen as a threat to the population of the European Union, but as a threat to the population of Russia. Chechen terrorism is perceived as an internal threat for Russia, which is unlikely to change its target and focus on the nationals of the European Union.

The article "Chechen leader threatens to kill Russians abroad*"* focuses on the attempts of terrorists to cross the borders of Russia. The leader of terrorists Shamil Basaev stated the following: "*We have recourses for killing Russians in almost every country of the world, but up to now we have not performed such operations beyond Russian borders, but now after the events in Katar, we have the right to kill Russians abroad*"[3]. This speech shows that Chechen terrorists see the Russians as their primary targets, and not a word has been mentioned about acts of terror against the citizens of the EU-countries. Thus, it seems reasonable, that the Chechnya issue is seen as an internal problem of Russia, than a source of threats for the EU. The fact that the terrorism is present in the speech by Franco Frattini relates more to the EU's concern about terrorists from the Middle East, who threaten the West in general and the EU separately.

The European media focus more on situation with human rights in Chechnya, than on a possibility of spread of terrorism from Russia to Europe. Obviously when speaking about the threat of terrorism, the Middle East is much more discussed than the Russian Federation.

---

[1] *The Times* (2004).
[2] *The Washington Post* (2002).
[3] *The Times* (2004)..

4. Interpretation of Research Results

The primary question for the research was formulated as follows: "Why is there such contradiction between the level of political practices and political declarations?" The parties have proclaimed the principles of Strategic Partnership, but still have a strict visa regime, which prevents the smooth development of relations.

The official discourse of the EU regarding the visa regime with Russia has two sides. On the one hand the officials of the EU are stating that visa-free regime with Russia is a long-term perspective that the strategic partners have to pursuit, on the other hand we can find quite alarming quotations of European leaders that the Eastern border is a source of illegal migration and other threats.

It is notable, that the latter point of view finds its reflection in political practices of the EU. The understanding of threats is transformed into certain political practices as the existence of visa regime and relatively tight visa policy.

According to Jef Hyusmans, in the EU since 1980's migration has been seen as a challenge to welfare state and to the cultural composition of the nation. In other words migration has been presented as a threat to the domestic society. Gradually, the Schengen system has made migration a security (rather than social, economic or ethical) issue. It refers to migration from the Eastern border of the EU (including border with Russia) as well. But the Eastern border seems to be a special case.

The Eastern border is presented, first of all, in the European media as a source of existential threats. The analysis shows that the threat has been described in media in three aspects: spread of diseases, threat of organized crime and threat of human trafficking (is singled out into a separate burning issue). Articles covering these issues are regularly published across the EU which creates a fruitful background for "visa with Russia" moods.

Although, the question of abolition of visas with Russia is not much discussed in the media, the media (for instance newspapers) are creating a negative image of Russia in the EU, thus it is possible to assume that the media contributes towards the policy of upholding the visa regime with Russia.

When analyzing the media discourse about diseases in Russia with the help of rhetorical analysis, it is possible to trace rather strong adjectives, which create additional prejudice in the society. The newspapers also use visible dissociations: Russia is compared with African countries, and similarities between Russia and African countries are stressed upon. When compared with Europe, the comparison is not in favor of Russia. The image is negative, and the media is attempting to draw a line between Russia and the EU, showing that Russia with its problems is not just a part of Europe, but a threat for the EU. The obvious instrument for the separation of a threat is border and visa regime between the countries, which helps to control and filter the flows of migrants.

When analyzing the publications of European press regarding Russian crime, one can notice the same attitude. Firstly, Russian organized crime is presented as a threat to all Russians. One can find opinions that Russian government and Russian law-enforcement agencies are helpless and do not control the situation in the country. Secondly, one can find opinions that Russian organized crime is posing a threat to the citizens of the EU. Many articles have a clear message that Russian organized crime groups are crossing the border of the EU and trying to establish their illegal business on the territory of the EU. The articles, describing this process are likely to disturb the citizens of the EU and bias them against immigrants from Russia on the whole. The newspapers are using quite explicit examples of how Russian mafia is invading the European Union: money laundering, drug dealing, weapon smuggling. Russian mafia is compared to Italian Mafia, and it is even mentioned that the Russians are occupying the spheres typical for Italians, thus showing that Russian organized crime is as dangerous as its Italian adversary. A number of examples of considerable crimes by Russians well discussed in the European media, comparison of Russian crime groups with famous Italian mafia together with the opinion about helplessness of Russian government, create the image of an existential threat, which can be used as a reason for justification of strict visa policies with Russia.

The issue of human trafficking is directly connected with visa regime, as visas help to control the flow of migrants and prevent stay of trafficked people in the country of destination. It is interesting that European officials single out human trafficking from crime and view it as a separate existential threat to the citizens of the EU. The publications have two common messages to the reader: 1) the scale of human trafficking is growing (thus, the citizens of the EU should await more illegal migrants in the course of time) 2) Human trafficking is unpunished business in Russia (thus, there is no sufficient evidence that the number of trafficked people will be reduced). This is an alarming combination, which encourages people of the EU to view illegal

migration as a serious existential threat. The articles witness that "Fearing that the increasing tide of illegal immigrants and trafficked people into Russia could be heading its way the EU presses Russia to tighten its borders".[1] Here we can trace how media discourse is firstly transforming into fear of common citizens of the EU, and then into the official policy of the Union.

The threat of terrorism from the territory of Russia is not presented as an existential threat to the Europeans. Terrorism is seen as an internal issue of Russia, which is unlikely to change its primary target (Russian citizens) and focus on the citizens of the European Union. The EU is more concerned about the situation with human rights in Chechnya, which is another topic of research. The presence of terrorist threat in the visa discourse can be interpreted as a tribute to the Global War against terrorism, and no as a tribute to the threat of Russian terrorists specifically.

To sum it up, we can distinguish a certain background to the issue of the Eastern border control, which is created by the European media. The press is creating a threat, "making the devil blacker than it is". The background message of the media can be formulated as follows:

- The Eastern neighbours of the EU have troubles inside their borders (crime, diseases, terrorism)
- The troubles of the neighbours can, and already cross the border of the EU, becoming troubles of the EU.
- The EU needs to protect its border with Eastern neighbours, to prevent the spread of these troubles on its territory.

Such message of the press doesn't correlate with most of the speeches of the EU officials. All the themes mentioned in newspapers gain little official strength and are not used for securitization of migration policy on the high official level. The strict visa policy of the EU towards Russia doesn't find support in the media representations of Russia as a stranger who has many problems which might be moved to the EU via migration. If the EU citizens possess this image of Russia, then the reasonable solution for the problem is introduction of strict visa policies. The process of securitization can be defined as successful if the citizens of the EU find it natural to have visa regime with Russia. The citizens of the EU do not protest against it and are led to believe that it is a necessary protective tool, which is used by the EU to separate itself from the existential threats.

---

[1] *"EU presses Russia on human trafficking"* (2007).

At the same time there is an economic discourse in the EU, which is operating alongside with the securitization discourse. The economic discourse emphasizes the need to use flexible border strategies. This discourse finds its reflection in the intentions of the EU to abolish visa regime with Russia as a long term perspective. The talks are held regularly on this issue, the recent success is the adoption of the two bilateral agreements on the facilitation of visa and on readmission. This event marks the formal completion of negotiations between the two sides, which have lasted more than five years. The two agreements are destined to open the way for easier travel and people-to-people contact across Europe, while attempt fighting illegal migration.

Sami Moisio, for instance, has argued that "These two dimensions are now visible, for example, in the Polish-Ukraine border where the strict Schengen border meets the open energy channel from Russia to Western Europe"[1]. The EU-Russian border can be characterized by the same phenomenon. It would offer a rewarding theme for further research to probe how and on what basis the economic discourse challenges the highly securitized visa issue.

To sum it up, we can distinguish a certain aspect of attitude to Russia. Russia is perceived as a threat, the European Other. Although it is not a military threat any more, it is still obvious that the archaic "model" of relations with Russia has not changed completely, and we can still find reasoning of a threat in the discourse about Russia in the EU.

In the theoretical chapter I referred to Iver B. Neumann's research[2] where two models of attitude vis-à-vis Russia are distinguished:

1. Russia has been defined as a threat – here we can remember the old scheme of Russian "barbarian at the gate". The Russian national interest will always pose a threat to the European countries and interfere into European course of affairs, thus Europe should do everything possible to isolate Russia and protect itself from the Russian invasion.

2. Russia has been defined as a learner – the country which is likely to become civilized, if it learns the European lesson well. Russia is a "tabula rasa" – and has an opportunity for a fresh start. The adoption of European norms and values can cause positive changes and approach Russia to European community of countries.

---

[1] Moisio (2007).
[2] Neumann, (1999) pp. 65– 13.

Neumann's research refers to the period between the XVI century and the end of the XX century. But he gives no model of today's relations between the EU and Russia and filling in that caveat was the task of this research.

One can assume that the EU has changed its attitude from what it had to Soviet Russia. Soviet Russia was seen as a military threat, which can invade into Europe with the use of military forces. But when the Soviet Union collapsed, the military threat has been sidelined in the security agenda of the EU. So called soft security issues were placed on the agenda and great attention was given to migration, ecology, economic security etc. Political relations with Post-Soviet Russia were established, the concept of Strategic Partnership has been introduced.

Since the introduction of the Strategic Partnership, the dominant model of attitude towards Russia was of a learner. Initially, Strategic Partnership has been developed in the framework of Partnership and Cooperation Agreement, and then a new scheme of Four Common Spaces was introduced. In practice this scheme means that Russia has to approach its legislation to the EU standards. This course of relations proves that the EU is a "superior" partner and Russia is an "inferior partner", while Russian officials constantly claim that true Strategic Partnership needs equality between its sides. Such situation serves as a serious obstacle to smooth development of relations, because it is a common plea from the Russian side that relations lack equality.

At the same time, our research shows that despite the "softening" of security threats, the EU has not abandoned the old and problematic basic model of attitude to Russia – that of a threat. Hard security threat has just been transformed into a soft security threat. Fear of military invasion has been altered by the fear of illegal migration flows and Russian organized crime. Securitization has become a serious brake in the development of relations between the two sides, as it is the abolition of visa regime and intensification of travel of common people across partners that can bring trust, understanding and stimulus to relations.

It is possible to conclude that there is no serious contradiction in the policy of the EU and the level of political practices. The EU is applying two discourses to the Russian border at once:
- The discourse of securitization, which is destined to protect the territory of the EU from existential threats from Russia via visa regime.
- The economic discourse, which makes the border penetrable for goods, services, capital and certain categories of Russian nationals. In this case Russia is seen as a partner, but

not an equal partner, but an inferior, transforming partner, that is only in the beginning of its way to democracy and market economy.

The policy of the EU combines two models of attitude to Russia at the moment: Russia – "learner", Russia – "threat". What's negative in this situation is that Russia does not accept such attitude and demands equality in relations, which is, obviously, not implied by these two models. Inability of the EU to accept Russia as an equal partner is the reason of fundamental problems in relations between the partners at the moment.

It is possible to make a certain conclusion regarding the present state of affairs between the EU and Russia. Russia is seen more as a learner which follows the European political and economic example and when working out its legislation concerning Strategic Partnership - use European norms and standards. The present reforms are regarded as the process of the replacement of the unsuccessful strategy of modernization by the European example which is more successful. This conclusion reveals the basis for the development of the political dialogue between the EU and Russia and namely the concept of Strategic Partnership. The vision of Russia as a learner contributes to understanding that Russia becomes more European and less differs from Europe. But obviously such model of relations "teacher – learner" is not suitable for true Strategic Partnership. Strategic Partnership implies equal partners who respect each other's interests, while model with one superior partner implies that one partner has to sacrifice its own interests to have a privilege to take part in Strategic Partnership.

One can also argue, that the EU has two discourses towards Russia –economic discourse and security discourse. This tension can be seen in the visa issue. On the one hand, it is reasonable and profitable to abolish visas, on the other hand – visas are kept because the securitization was successful and it is supported by the media's view on the problem. Thus the talks on visa abolishment are going slowly – they do not find much of a public support.

5. Conclusion

This work is an attempt to analyze the relations between the EU and Russia and namely the problems in relations that the partners have at the moment. The author attempted to distinguish a model of attitude of the EU to Russia, which can help to understand the relations between the partners better.

Analysis has been based on a single aspect of relations – the visa issue which well demonstrates the dual nature of relations. On the one hand the relations need a visa-free regime, as it will provide a better cooperation between the common citizens of the EU and Russia. On the other hand the EU is afraid to abolish visas with Russia, because the uncontrollable flow of visitors will pour into the EU, spreading the existential threats that are present on the territory of Russia across the EU. The fear of these threats which has its roots in history is reproduced in media discourse, then its carried on by the official discourse. As a result, the possibility of a visa free regime between Russia and the EU is successfully securitized.

The visa regime thus shows that the EU has not got rid of the fear of Russian Other. The fear of military invasion of Soviet Russia, has been transformed into a mild fear of soft security threats of Post-Soviet Russia. This fear serves as a brake in relations, slowing the pace of building of the Strategic Partnership.

The reasons for introduction of visa regime are relatively poorly studied, thus this research can give an example of how securitization of certain issues can call forth a visa regime with a certain country. The research has shown how the theory of securitization can be combined with border studies for this purpose.

This research also continues the logic of Iver B. Neumann, who defined a number of theoretical models of relations between Europe and Russia. The research has indicated that a combination of two old models of vision of Russia can be found in the present policy of the EU. Russia is still seen as a threat, and Russia is seen as a learner, or inferior partner. No new model has been offered by the EU after the end of the Cold War, and probably this is the main reason why Russia and the EU cannot agree on many questions of their mutual integration.

It is possible to assume that true Strategic Partnership with Russia is only possible when Russian dignity is respected and Russia is recognized as an equal partner. The EU should abandon the

age-old models of perception of Russia and establish a new one, where the equal principles or relations are implied. Without such actions the Strategic Partnership with Russia can never turn into true integration scheme and will remain just a declarative motto without appropriate realization.

The author hopes that the research will contribute to the solution of the fundamental problems and misunderstanding between the partners, as destiny of Europe depends on how they develop their relations and settle mutual problems. The Strategic Partnership between Russia and the EU can make Europe stable, prosperous and peaceful.

Bibliography

Printed primary sources

1. "*A blow on Russian money- laundering Mafia*". Neue Zuercher Zeitung. 11.06.2002. [WWW document] <http://www.inosmi.ru/translation/147939.html> Date of access: 23.11.2006.

2. Bajo, Eduardo (2005), *From Russia with love*. La Razon 25.03.2005.

3. "*Brutality of Chechen War Spills Across the Border*" (2002) *Washington Post*. 23.07.2002.

4. "*Chechen leader threatens to kill Russians abroad*". (2004) *The Times*. 01.04.2004.

5. *Joint statement regarding "Four common spaces"*. [WWW document] <http://ec.europa.eu/comm/external_relations/russia/sum05_03/js.htm> Date of access: 5.04.2007

6. Chizhov, V. (2003) *Speech on the topic of visa-free regime between Russia and the EU*. [WWW document] <http://www.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/c1e31b7c684d2dd843256c2c002a4eb8/9debe22f988ed2bd43256c dc00411cd5?OpenDocument> Available at: 23.11.2006.

7. "*Ein Maedchen ist der russischen Mafia 200 Dollar wert*". Frankfurter Rundschau. 03.07.2003.

8. "*Ermittlern gelingt bisher groesster Schlag gegen Russenmafia*". Die Welt. 22.08.2001.

9. *EU's Common Strategy towards Russia* [WWW document] <http://www.delrus.ec.europa.eu/ru/p_319.htm> Date of access: 5.04.2007

10. EU's *Council Regulation (EC) No 574/1999 of 12 March 1999* [WWW document] <http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!DocNumber&lg=en&type_d oc=Regulation&an_doc=1999&nu_doc=574> Date of access: 14.03.06.

11. The EU commission press release (2006) "*The European Union contributes to prevention of human trafficking in Russia*". [WWW document] < http://www.delrus.ec.europa.eu/en/news_793.htm>

12. "*EU presses Russia on human trafficking*". *Business Week*. 23.02.2007. [WWW document] <http://www.businessweek.com/globalbiz/content/feb2007/gb20070223_311905.htm?chan=glob albiz_europe_around+the+globe>Fielding**,** A. (1992) *Migration, institutions and politics: the evolution of European migration policies*. *In King (ed.)* pp. 40-62.

13. Frattini, Franco (2005), Commissioner responsible for Justice, Freedom and Security. Inauguration speech of the Frontex Agency. [WWW document] <http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/05/401&format=HTML&a ged=1&language=EN&guiLanguage=en> Available at: 23.01.2007.

14. ICAO (2004), *Updating of the consolidated statement of continuing ICAO policies in the air transport field A35-WP/44.* International Civil Aviation Organization, Montreal.

15. International Organization for Migration. (2001). New IOM figures on the global scale of trafficking. *Trafficking in Migrants Quarterly Bulletin*, No. 23.

16. *List of countries whose nationals may be exempted from the visa requirement* [WWW document] <http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexplus!prod!DocNumber&lg=en&type_doc=Regulation&an_doc=2001&nu_doc=539> Date of access: 14.03.06.

17. Mandeville, Laura (2003), *The West wants to close the road to the EU for the CIS countries.* Le Figaro. 11.05.2003.

18. "*Menschenhandel floriert*". Junge Welt 10. 06. 2002. [WWW document] <http://www.jungewelt.de/2002/07-09/005.php>

19. *Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia Declaration* (2007), [WWW document] <http://www.gazeta.ru/2006/12/13/oa_226384.shtml> Date of access: 5.03.2007.

20. "*New Mafias: Russians, Chinese, Nigerians*". Editorial, Repubblica. [WWW document] <http://www.repubblica.it/> Date of access: 23.11.2006.

21. *Partnership and Cooperation Treaty* [WWW document] <http://europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/ceeca/pca/pca_russia.pdf > Date of access: 5.04.2007.

22. Pihlaja, Jaakko (2004), *High crime rate in Russia is threatening the safety of Finnish tourists.* Helsingin Sanomat. 20.12.2004. (Translation by author)

23. "*Promislennie Vedomosti*". [WWW document] <http://www.promved.ru/may_2002_06.shtml> Date of access: 23.11.2006.

24. Readmission agreement between the EU and Russia. [WWW document] <www.delrus.ec.europa.eu/ru/images/pText_pict/615/Readmission_RU.doc> Date of access: 5.04.2007

25. *Results of the EU-Russia Summit in Rome* [WWW document] <http://ec.europa.eu/comm/external_relations/russia/summit11_03/jps061103.htm> Date of access: 5.04.2007

26. *Road Map For The Common Space Of Freedom, Security And Justice.* P. 21. [WWW document] <www.europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/russia/summit_05_05/finalroadmaps.pdf> Date of access: 14.03.2006.

27. "*Russia's Poor Health*". The Economist. [WWW document] <http://www.economist.com/world/europe/displaystory.cfm?story_id=E1_SRJTNVJ>

28. *"Russian youngsters in Germany choose between drugs, crime and the last chance"*. Frankfurter Rundschau. 15.01.2003. [WWW document] <http://www.inosmi.ru/translation/168975.html>

29. "*Russian Godfathers*". *La Stampa*. 24.10.2006.

30. *Schengen Acquis, The*. [WWW document] <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2000:239:0001:0473:EN:PDF> Date of access: 5.03.2007.

31. "The death of Russia". Wprost. [WWW document] <http://www.inosmi.ru/stories/05/08/08/3450/216658.html> Date of access: 23.11.2006.

32. *Treaty of Amsterdam* [WWW document] <http://www.eurotreaties.com/amsterdamtreaty.pdf> Date of access: 14.03.2006.

33. Turina, Irina (2007), *Interview to Gazeta.ru.* [WWW document] <http://www.gazeta.ru/2007/01/31/oa_230340.shtml> Date of access: 5.03.2007.

34. Visa facilitation agreement between the EU and Russia. [WWW document] <http://www.delrus.ec.europa.eu/ru/images/pText_pict/614/Visa_facilitation_RU.doc> Date of access: 5.04.2007

35. *Visa requirements for nationals of third countries* [WWW document] <http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/l14007b.htm> Date of access: 14.03.2006.

Printed secondary sources

36. Abbott, Andrew (1995), *Boundaries of social work or social work of boundaries?* Social Service Review.

37. Albert, Jacobson, Lapid (2001) *Identities, Borders, Orders: Rethinking International Relations Theory*, University of Minnesota Press.

38. Andreas P and Snyders T. (2000) Eds. *The wall around the West – state borders and immigration controls in North America and Europe*. Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham MD.

39. Austin J.L. (1981), *How to do things with words*. Harvard University Press.

40. Balzacq, Thierry (2005), *The Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience and Context*. European Journal of International Relations Vol. 11, No. 2 (2005) [WWW document] <http://ejt.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/11/2/171> Date of access 23.11.2006.

41. Barth, Frederick (1969) *Ethnic groups and boundaries.* Oslo: Norwegian University Press.

42. Berg, Eiki; Ehin, Piret. (2005), *What kind of border regime is in the making?*. Cooperation and Conflict: Journal of the Nordic International Studies Association, vol. 41 (1), pp. 53-71.

43. Bigo, Didier (1996), *Polices en réseaux: L'expérience européenne.* Presses de la Fondation nationale des sciences politiques.

44. Buzan, Waever et al. (1997), *Security: A New Framework for Analysis.* Lynne Rienner Pub.

45. Collinson, S. (1996), *Visa requirements, carrier sanctions, 'safe third countries' and 'readmission': the development of an asylum of an "buffer zone" in Europe.* Transactions of the Institute of the British Geographers, No. 21, pp. 64-75.

46. Deudney, Daniel and Ikenberry, John (1999), *The Nature and Sources of Liberal International Order.* Review of International Studies, p.25

47. Doty, R.L. (1996), *Immigration and National identity: constructing the nation*, Review of International studies, 1996, Vol.22, No.3, pp. 235-55.

48. Durkheim, Emile (1964), *The division of labour in society.* New York: Free Press.

49. Eder, Klaus**.** *The Narrative Construction of the Boundaries of Europe.* European Journal of Social Theory, 2006, vol.9 (2) pp. 255-71.

50. Eisenstadt, Shmuel. (1998), Japanese Civilization: A Comparative View, University Of Chicago Press.

51. Grabbe, Heather (2000). *The sharp edges of Europe: extending Schengen Eastwards.* International affairs, Vol.76, No. 3, 2000, pp. 519-536.

52. Goodin, Robert E. (1996), *The Theory of Institutional Design*, Cambridge University Press.

53. Guzzini, Stefano (2002), *Constructivism and the role of institutions in international relations.* Copenhagen Peace Research Institute. [WWW document] <http://www.diis.dk/graphics/COPRI_publications/COPRI_publications/publications/38-2002.pdf> Date of access: 23.11.2006.

54. Hall, Rodney (1999), *National Collective Identity: Social Constructs and International Systems.* New York: Columbia University Press, 3-50.

55. Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1977), *Phenomenology of Spirit.* Oxford University Press.

56. Hogg, Michael & Dominic Abrams (1988), *Social identifications: a social psychology of intergroup relations and groups processes.* London: Routledge.

57. Hollis, Martin (1985), *Of masks and men.* In *The category of the Person: anthropology, philosophy, history,* edited by Michael Carrithers. Cambridge University press.

58. Hollifield**,** J.F. (1992), *Immigrants, Markets and States*. Cambridge-Harvard University press.

59. Hughes, Donna M. (2000), *The 'Natasha' trade: The transnational shadow market of trafficking in women*. Journal of International Affairs, 53 (2), 625-651.

60. Huysmans, Jef (1998), *Revisiting Copenhagen: Or, On the Creative Development of a security Studies Agenda in Europe.* European Journal of International Relations 4(4).

61. Huysmans, Jef (1996), *Making/unmaking European disorder: Meta-theoretical, theoretical, and empirical questions of military stability after the Cold War.*

62. Hysmans Jef (2000), *The European Union and the Securitization of migration.* Journal of Common Market Studies.

63. Ikenberry, John (1997) *New Thinking in International Relations.* Westview.

64. Koslowski R. (2000), *European Union Migration Regimes, Established and Emergent* In *Jopke C. (ed.) Challenge to the Nation-State. Immigration in Western Europe and the United States*, Oxford University Press, pp. 153-88.

65. Lavenex S. and Ucarer E.M. (2004) *The external dimension of Europeanization – the case of immigration policies.* Cooperation and Conflict 39. pp. 417-43.

66. Lax, Henrik (2007), *EU - Russia visa policy still lacks ambition.* [WWW document] < http://www.alde.eu/index.php?id=42&tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=8402&cHash=1780c98c0f>

67. Loader, Ian (2005) *Policing, Securitization and Democratization in Europe.* [WWW document] <http://www.libertysecurity.org/article209.html> Date of access: 23.11.2006.

68. Mathias, Jacobson David, Lapid Yosef (2001), *Identities, Borders, Orders: Rethinking international relations theory.* University of Minnesota Press.

69. McLennan, G. (1995), *Pluralism.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

70. Møller, Bjørn (2002). *The Concept of Security: The Pros and Cons of Expansion and Contraction (*Tampere: General Conference of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), 2000).

71. Moisio, Sami (2007), *"Transnational relations in the European North: Conceptual and Regional perspectives".* Course of lectures in Tampere University. November 2007.

72. Neal, Andrew (2005), *Society Must Be Defended, or The Archaeology of the Exception.* [WWW document] <http://www.libertysecurity.org/article383.html> Date of access: 23.11.2006.

73. Neumann, Iver B. (1999), *Uses of the Other: The "East" in European identity formation.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

74. Neumayer, E. (2006) *Unequal access to foreign spaces: how states use visa restrictions to regulate mobility in a globalized world.* Royal Geographic Society, pp. 72-84.

75. O'Byrne D.J. (2002) *On passports and border controls.* Annals of Tourism Research, 2002, vol.28., pp. 399-416.

76. Paasi, Anssi (2006), *The Role of Identities and Boundaries in the Contemporary World.* [WWW document] < http://www.geo.ut.ee/nbc/paper/paasi.htm > Date of access: 15.05.2007.

77. Perelman, Chaim (1969), *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation.* University of Notre Dame Press.

78. Ruggie, John (1998) *Constructing the World Polity: Essays on International Institutionalization*. Routledge.

79. Salter M.B. (2003), *Rights of passage: the passport in international relations. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner*.

80. Salter M. B. (2004) *Passports, mobility and security: how smart can the border be?* International Studeis Perspectives, 2004, No.5, pp. 71-91.

81. *Schmitt, Carl (1963), Der Dergiff des Politischen.* Berlin: Dunker and Humbolt.

82. Sedelmeir**,** U. (2002), *Sectoral Dynamics of EU Enlargement: Advocacy, Access, and Alliances in a Composite Policy*. Journal of European Public Policy, 2002, vol.9, pp. 627-49.

83. Simmel, Georg (1970), *The stranger.* In: *On individuality and social Forces: Selected Writings.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

84. Soguk N (1999), *States and Strangers: Refugees and displacements of statecraft.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

85. Somers M. R., Gibson G. D., (1994), *Reclaiming the Epistemological 'Other': Narrative and the Social Constitution of Identity*, Social Theory and the Politics of Identity, (ed.) by Craig J. Calhoun, UK, USA, Blackwell, Oxford/Cambridge.

86. Spener, David (1998) *The U.S.-Mexico Border: Transcending Divisions, Contesting Identities. Editor, with Kathleen Staudt.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

87. Torpey J. (1998) *The Coming and going: on the state monopolization of the legitimate 'means of movement*. Sociological Theory 16, pp. 239-59.

88. Torpey J. (2000), *The invention of the passport – surveillance, citizenship and the state.* Cambridge University Press, 2000.

89. Wang H. (2004), Regulation *transnational flows of people: an institutional analysis of passports and visas as a regime of mobility*. Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power, 2004, vol.11, pp. 351-76.

90. Wright, Richard (2003), *Bezvizovii rezhim mezhdu Rossijei I ES: ot utopii k realnosti.* Moscow, p.11.