

within a framework of sub-citizens are exposed to (Hyndman 2000: 111). This observation can to a certain extent be transferred to any context of bureaucracy, and it might refer to the core of the bureaucratic problem: the gap between the messy reality and the administrative answers stripping reality down to a minimum, leaving out many cases that in their substance contain individuals and their life matters. Leading to the next section, the practice of headcounts further reveals the coercive apparatus bureaucracies unfold.

BEING HIT WITH A STICK ON THE HEAD – COERCION BEYOND FOUCAULT

„The police truncheon is precisely the point where the state’s bureaucratic imperative for imposing simple administrative schema and its monopoly on coercive force come together“ (Graeber 2015: 80).

As elaborated above, the microcosmos of refugee camps and settlements reveals mechanisms of power and control that subject bureaucracy. This is as well the case for the display of coercive mechanisms, which will be explored in this section. In the case of Kenyan camps, coercion has been employed in order to enforce restrictions on the freedom of movement. Montclos and Kagwanja (2000: 220) have described the practice of demolishing illegally self-settled refugees’ homes by Kenyan authorities in order to force the refugees back to the camps. If found outside of camps, refugees in Kenya have to pay high fines since 2006 (Hunter 2009: 15). These examples are not given in order to discuss the justice or injustice of the given incidents, but rather to display the coercion law enforcement, and thus, the enforcement of standards it relies on. In a compilation on standards, Lengwiler (2009: 96) highlights the privilege and power relation intrinsic to the ability of setting standards, examining how standards are set in life insurance policies. As Witold Kula has put it: „The right to determine measures is an attribute of authority in